



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.


We also ask that you:


- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>







2



PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

ON THE SUBJECT OF THE

CONFEDERATION

OF THE

BRITISH NORTH AMERICAN PROVINCES,

3rd Session, 8th Provincial Parliament of Canada.

3273

~~~~~  
**PRINTED BY ORDER OF THE LEGISLATURE.**  
~~~~~



QUEBEC:

HUNTER, ROSE & CO., PARLIAMENTARY PRINTERS.

1865.

F15000
A3

to yvlu
AUGUST 1960

INDEX.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

PROCEEDINGS.

February 3.—Hon. Sir E. P. TACHÉ moved that an Address be presented to HER MAJESTY, praying that a measure be submitted to Imperial Parliament, based on certain resolutions, 1.

February 9.—Hon. Mr. SANBORN moved an amendment with reference to the Constitution of the Legislative Council, 124.

February 13.—Hon. Mr. REESOR moved that the debate be adjourned for ten days, 162. Negatived by 37 to 19.

February 14.—Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST moved an amendment to Hon. Mr. SANBORN's amendment, that the debate be adjourned until certain information be laid before the House, 189. Negatived by 38 to 20.

February 16.—House divided on Hon. Mr. SANBORN's amendment, 245. Negatived by 42 to 18.

February 17.—Hon. Mr. CURRIE moved in amendment to the main motion, that the House should not assent to the measure without a further manifestation of the public will than has yet been declared, 269. House divided on said amendment, 316. Negatived by 31 to 19.

February 20.—Hon. Mr. AIKINS moved an amendment with reference to the Constitution of the Legislative Council, 317. A question of order being raised, the Hon. the SPEAKER ruled the said amendment out of order, 318. Hon. Mr. REESOR moved in amendment, that the transmission of the Address should be delayed, until the resolutions should be approved by a direct vote of the electors of the province, 327. A question of order being raised, the SPEAKER ruled the said amendment to be in order, 328. House divided on said amendment, 333. Negatived by 36 to 19. House divided on main motion, 346. Carried by 45 to 15. Committee appointed to draft an Address. Draft Address reported, agreed to, and ordered to be engrossed. Ordered that an Address be presented to the Governor General by the whole House, requesting him to transmit said Address to HER MAJESTY, 346.

February 23.—The House waited on His Excellency with their Address to HER MAJESTY. His Excellency's reply, 421.

* * The names of the Electoral Divisions represented by elected members are given in *Italics*. Life members are distinguished by [L] following the name.

AIKINS, Hon. JAMES C. [*Home*], 154-159, 208, 217, 316-317.

ALEXANDER, Hon. GEORGE [*Gore*], 80-82, 207-208.

ALLAN, Hon. GEORGE W. [*York*], 115-118.

ARMAND, Hon. JOSEPH F. [*Alma*], 209-210.

BELLEAU, Hon. Sir N. F. [L], 180-186, 189, 317.

BENNETT, Hon. THOMAS [*Eastern*], 206-207.

BLAIR, Hon. A. J. FERGUSSON [*Brock*], 11, 300.

BLAKE, Hon. OLIVER [*Thames*], 325-326.

BOSSÉ, Hon. J. N. [*De La Durantaye*], 208.

BOULTON, Hon. GEORGE S. [L], 152-154, 156.

BUREAU, Hon. J. O. [*De Lorimier*], 189-193, 309-310, 327, 345.

CAMPBELL, Hon. A., Commissioner of Crown Lands [*Cutaraqui*], 20-24, 45, 156, 159, 160, 161, 175, 178, 202, 223, 272, 281, 290-298, 303, 340, 341, 342, 512.

CHRISTIE, Hon. David [*Erie*], 212-222, 224, 277, 279.

CURRIE, Hon. JAMES G. [*Niagara*], 45-53,

- 208-209, 210-212, 218, 269-284, 340, 341, 342, 512.
- DE BEAUJEU, HON. GEORGE S. [L], 205, 322-324.
- DICKSON, HON. WALTER H. [L], 284-290, 327.
- FERRIER, HON. JAMES [L], 193-198, 233, 276.
- FLINT, HON. BILLA [Trent], 318-322.
- GUÉVREMONT, HON. J. B. [Saurel], 313.
- HAMILTON, HON. JOHN [Inkerman], 324-325.
- LETELLIER DE ST. JUST, HON. L. [Grandville], 12, 13, 186-189.
- MACPHERSON, HON. DAVID L. [Saugeen], 125, 149-152, 200, 201, 204, 283.
- MCCREA, HON. WALTER [Western], 167-173, 277, 279.
- MCMASTER, HON. WILLIAM [Midland], 229-231.
- MOORE, HON. PHILIP H. [L], 83, 160, 162, 225-229.
- OLIVIER, HON. L. A. [De Lonaulière], 173-180, 189, 310-316.
- PRICE, HON. DAVID E. [Laurentides], 338-339.
- READ, HON. ROBERT [Quinté], 326-327.
- REESOR, HON. DAVID [King's], 158, 161, 162, 163-167, 327, 328-333, 339-340.
- ROSS, HON. JOHN [L], 71-80, 160, 213, 270, 271, 280, 300-301, 327.
- RYAN, HON. THOMAS [Victoria], 333-338, 340.
- SANBORN, HON. JOHN S. [Wellington], 118-125, 222-225, 244-245.
- SEYMOUR, HON. BENJAMIN [L], 199-206, 298-300.
- SIMPSON, HON. JOHN [Queen's], 160, 231-234.
- SKEAD, HON. JAMES [Rideau], 242-244.
- SPEAKER, The—HON. U. J. TESSIER, [Gulf], 208, 317, 318, 328, 421.
- TACHÉ, HON. COL. SIR E. P., Receiver General and Minister of Militia [L], 1-11, 76, 83, 175, 177, 210, 211, 234-242, 333, 342-346.
- VIDAL, HON. A. [St. Clair], 82-83, 301-309, 346.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

PROCEEDINGS.

February 3.—Hon. Atty. Gen. MACDONALD moved that an Address be presented to HER MAJESTY, praying that a measure be submitted to Imperial Parliament, based on certain resolutions, 18. Hon. Mr. HOLTON objected that the motion was not in order, inasmuch as the Address should be founded on Resolutions originated in Committee of the Whole, 18. The SPEAKER ruled that the motion was in order, 19.

March 7.—Hon. Atty. Gen. MACDONALD moved the previous question, 703. Hon. Atty. Gen. CARTIER having moved the adjournment of the debate till the first sitting of the House, to-morrow, after routine business, Hon. Mr. HOLTON moved in amendment that the debate be adjourned till the 13th instant, and that an Address be presented to the Governor General, praying him to cause to be laid before the House, in the meantime, various information relating to the subjects embraced in the resolutions, 767. Objection being taken, the SPEAKER ruled the amendment out of order, 768. The SPEAKER's decision appealed from, 768.

Sustained on a division of 59 to 20. Hon. Mr. DORION moved in amendment that the debate be adjourned for one month, or until such time as the people of the Province should have an opportunity of constitutionally pronouncing their opinion, 769. Objection being taken, the SPEAKER ruled the amendment out of order, 770. Hon. Mr. CARTIER's motion agreed to, 770.

March 10.—Objection having been taken by Hon. Mr. HOLTON, the SPEAKER ruled that the motion for the "previous question" was in order, 893. The House divided on the motion for the "previous question," 962. Agreed to by 85 to 39. The House divided on the main motion, of the Hon. Atty. Gen. MACDONALD, 962. Agreed to by 91 to 33.

March 13.—Hon. Atty. Gen. MACDONALD moved that a Committee be appointed to draft an address founded on the resolutions, 962. Hon. J. H. CAMERON moved in amendment an Address to the Governor General, for an appeal to the people before the resolutions should be submitted to the Imperial Parliament for their final action, 962. Objection being taken, the

SPEAKER ruled the amendment to be in order, 963. House divided on Mr. CAMERON's amendment, 1020. Negatived by 84 to 35. Hon. Mr. HOLTON moved an amendment, that the measure should not go into operation, until approved by the Parliament of Canada, after the next general election, 1021. House divided on said amendment, 1025. Negatived by 79 to 31. Hon. JOHN SANDFIELD MACDONALD moved an amendment with reference to the subject of Education in Upper Canada, 1025. House divided on said amendment, 1026. Negatived by 95 to 8. Mr. BOURASSA moved an amendment that

Roman Catholic minority of Upper Canada be placed on same footing as Protestant minority of Lower Canada, 1026. House divided on said amendment, 1027. Negatived by 85 to 20. Main motion agreed to on a division and Committee appointed, 1026. Draft Address, reported, 1027. Agreed to and ordered to be engrossed, 1032. Ordered that an Address be presented to the Governor General by the whole House, requesting him to transmit said Address to HER MAJESTY, 1032.

March 14.—The House waited on His Excellency with their Address to HER MAJESTY. His Excellency's reply, 1032.

ALLEYN, Hon. CHAS. [*Quebec West*], 641, 642, 669-673.

ARCHAMBEAULT, Mr. LOUIS [*L'Assomption*], 544-545.

BEAUBIEN, Dr. J. O. [*Montmagny*], 351, 550-551.

BELLEROSE, Mr. J. H. [*Laval*], 476-482.

BIGGAR, Mr. JAMES L. [*East Northumberland*], 882-884.

BLANCHET, Dr. JOSEPH G. [*Lévis*], 545-550.

BOURASSA, Mr. FRANÇOIS [*St. Johns*], 1026.

BOWMAN, Mr. I. E. [*North Waterloo*], 803-805.

BROWN, Hon. GEORGE, President of the Council [*South Oxford*], 14, 84-115, 412, 450, 474, 476, 663, 664, 709-710, 711, 739, 752, 753, 754, 757, 758, 989-995.

BURWELL, Mr. L. [*East Elgin*], 447-448.

CAMERON, Hon. J. H. [*Peel*], 14, 662, 716, 962-975, 995, 1006.

CAMERON, Mr. M. C. [*North Ontario*], 448-463, 645, 681, 716-719, 744-747, 770, 975-986.

CARTIER, Hon. G. E., Attorney General East [*Montreal East*], 19, 53-62, 407, 408, 411, 412, 452, 590, 540, 571, 576, 642, 692, 713-715, 731, 770, 841, 932, 945, 1022.

CARTWRIGHT, Mr. R. J. [*Lennox and Addington*], 820-825.

CAUCHON, Hon. J. [*Montmorency*], 15, 371, 393, 554-584, 695-702, 778.

CHAMBERS, Mr. F. H. [*Brockville*], 770-775.

COCKBURN, Hon. JAMES, Solicitor General West [*West Northumberland*], 810.

CORNELLIER dit GRANDCHAMP, Mr. HIP-POLYTE [*Joliette*], 349.

COWAN, Mr. JAMES [*South Waterloo*], 742, 957-958.

DENIS, Mr. PAUL [*Beauharnois*], 644, 871-880, 986.

DE NIVERVILLE, Mr. C. B. [*Three Rivers*], 947-952.

DORION, Hon. A. A. [*Hochelaga*], 15, 245-269, 378, 379, 570, 571, 584, 654-657, 664, 682-695, 731-734, 767, 769, 944-947, 986, 1021.

DORION, Mr. J. B. E. [*Drummond and Arthabaska*], 856-871, 929, 987.

DUFRESNE, Mr. JOSEPH [*Montcalm*], 554, 608, 922-931, 1017.

DUNKIN, Mr. CHRISTOPHER, [*Brome*], 19, 482-512, 512-544.

EVANTUREL, Hon. FRANÇOIS, [*Quebec County*], 569, 576, 711-713, 943.

FERGUSON, Mr. THOS. R. [*South Simcoe*], 958-961, 1013-1015.

FORTIER, Mr. MOISE [*Yamaska*], 941-943.

GAGNON, Mr. A. [*Charlevoix*], 952-953.

GALT, Hon. A. T., Minister of Finance, [*Sherbrooke*], 19, 62-71, 661, 662, 947.

GEOFFRION, Mr. FÉLIX [*Verchères*], 389, 390, 580, 775-783.

GIBBS, Mr. THOMAS N. [*South Ontario*], 668, 810-814, 987-988.

HARWOOD, Mr. A. CHARTIER DE LOTBIN-ÈRE [*Vaudreuil*], 825-841.

HAULTAIN, Col. FREDERICK W. [*Peterborough*], 627-648.

HOLTON, Hon. L. H. [*Chateauguay*], 14, 17, 18, 147-148, 394, 408, 411, 419, 440, 475, 660, 661, 664, 704-709, 725, 730-731, 767, 768, 893, 937-941, 994, 996-997, 1008, 1021.

HOWLAND, Hon. W. P. [*West York*], 766.

HUNTINGTON, Hon. LUCIUS S. [*Shefford*], 953-957, 1015-1017.

- JACKSON, Mr. GEORGE [*Grey*], 884-889, 988.
- JOLY, Mr. H. G. [*Lotbinière*], 346-362, 384, 392, 393, 679, 998-1000.
- JONES, Mr. D. F. [*South Leeds*], 814-820.
- LAFRAMBOISE, Hon. MAURICE, [*Bagot*], 742-744, 841-856.
- LANGVIN, Hon. H. L., Solicitor General East [*Dorchester*], 362-392, 579, 691, 781.
- MACDONALD, Hon. J. A., Attorney General West, [*Kingston*], 13, 14, 16, 18, 25-45, 648-650, 658, 665, 703, 705, 725-730, 944, 962, 1000-1007, 1027, 1031.
- MACDONALD, Mr. JOHN, [*Toronto West*], 760-765, 766.
- MACDONALD, Hon. J. SANDFIELD [*Cornwall*], 13, 251, 420, 421, 642, 650-654, 662, 663, 666, 667, 720-725, 734-742, 1008-1013, 1025.
- MACFARLANE, Mr. ROBERT [*Perth*], 1022-1024.
- MACKENZIE, Mr. A., [*Lambton*], 421-434, 738, 767, 1009, 1017-1018, 1025.
- MACKENZIE, Mr. HOPE F. [*North Oxford*], 673-681, 1009.
- MAGILL, Mr. CHAS. [*Hamilton*], 997-998.
- MCCKEY, Mr. T. D. [*North Simcoe*], 889-893.
- MCDUGALL, Hon. WILLIAM, Provincial Secretary [*North Lanark*], 492, 538, 719-720, 985.
- MCGEE, Hon. T. D'ARCY, Minister of Agriculture [*Montreal West*], 125-146, 643, 653, 669.
- MCGIVERIN, Mr. W. [*Lincoln*], 464-475.
- McKELLAR, Mr. ARCHIBALD [*Kent*], 765-766.
- MORRIS, Mr. ALEXANDER, [*South Lanark*], 434-446.
- O'HALLORAN, Mr. JAMES [*Missisquoi*], 792-799.
- PAQUET, Dr. A. H. [*Berthier*], 789-792.
- PARKER, Dr. T. S. [*North Wellington*], 668, 936-937, 1018-1020.
- PERRAULT, Mr. JOSEPH F. [*Richelieu*], 559, 585-626, 926.
- POULIOT, Mr. J. B. [*Témiscouata*], 880-882.
- POWELL, Mr. W. F. [*Carleton*], 715-716.
- RANKIN, Col. ARTHUR [*Essex*], 667, 912-922.
- RÉMILLARD, Mr. EDOUARD [*Bellechasse*], 783-789.
- ROSE, Hon. JOHN [*Montreal Centre*], 394-419.
- ROSS, Mr. JOHN J. [*Champlain*], 882.
- ROSS, Mr. JOHN S. [*Dundas*], 799-803.
- RYMAL, Mr. JOSEPH [*South Wentworth*], 932-936, 993, 1020.
- SCATCHERD, Mr. THOS. [*West Middlesex*], 747-760.
- SCOBLE, Mr. JOHN [*West Elgin*], 852, 906-912.
- SHANLY, Mr. WALTER [*South Grenville*], 899-906.
- SMITH, Mr. ALEXANDER M. [*Toronto East*], 897-899.
- SPEAKER, The Hon. LEWIS WALLBRIDGE [*South Hastings*], 19, 559, 664, 703, 768, 770, 893, 963, 1032.
- STIRTON, Mr. DAVID [*South Wellington*], 738.
- TASCHEREAU, Mr. HENRI E. [*Beauce*], 893-897.
- WALLBRIDGE, Mr. T. C. [*North Hastings*], 419, 657-660, 672.
- WALSH, Mr. AQUILA [*Norfolk*], 805-810.
- WEBB, Mr. WILLIAM H. [*Richmond and Wolfe*], 931-932.

THE LEGISLATURE OF CANADA,

3RD SESSION, 8TH PARLIAMENT,

1865.

GOVERNOR GENERAL.

His Excellency The Right Honorable CHARLES STANLEY, Viscount MONCK, Baron MONCK of Ballytrammon, in the County of Wexford, *Governor General of British North America, and Captain General and Governor in Chief in and over the Provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and the Island of Prince Edward, and Vice Admiral of the same, &c., &c., &c.*

THE MINISTRY.

Hon. Sir ETIENNE PASCAL TACHÉ, *Receiver General, Minister of Militia, and Premier.*
 Hon. JOHN ALEXANDER MACDONALD, *Attorney General West.*
 Hon. GEORGE ETIENNE CARTIER, *Attorney General East.*
 Hon. ALEXANDER TILLOCH GALT, *Minister of Finance.*
 Hon. ALEXANDER CAMPBELL, *Commissioner of Crown Lands.*
 Hon. THOMAS D'ARCY MCGEE, *Minister of Agriculture and Statistics.*
 Hon. JEAN CHARLES CHAPAIS, *Commissioner of Public Works.*
 Hon. GEORGE BROWN, *President Executive Council.*
 Hon. WILLIAM McDUGALL, *Provincial Secretary.*
 Hon. WILLIAM PEARCE HOWLAND, *Postmaster General.*
 Hon. HECTOR LOUIS LANGEVIN, *Solicitor General East.*
 Hon. JAMES COCKBURN, *Solicitor General West.*

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

The Honorable ULBIO J. TESSIER, *Speaker.*

LIFE MEMBERS.

Residences.	Names of Members.	Residences.	Names of Members.
Kingston	Hon. John Hamilton.	Otteau du Lac. Hon. George Saveuse de Beaujen.	
Philipsburg . .	" Philip H. Moore.	Toronto	" John Ross.
London, C. W . .	" George J. Goodhue.	Hamilton . . .	" Samuel Mills.
Brockville . . .	" James Morris.	Quebec	" Louis Panet.
Toronto	" James Gordon.	Quebec	" Sir Narcisse F. Belleau.
Montreal	" James Ferrier.	Montreal	" Charles Wilson.
Perth	" Roderick Matheson.	Port Hope . . .	" Benjamin Seymour.
Cobourg	" George S. Boulton.	Sorel	" David M. Armstrong.
Montmagny . . .	" Sir Etienne P. Taché.	Cobourg	" Ebenezer Perry.
Montreal	" James Leslie.	Niagara	" Walter H. Dickson.
Montreal	" Frederick A. Quesnel.		

ELECTED MEMBERS.

Electoral Divisions.	Names of Members.	Electoral Divisions.	Names of Members.
Alma	Hon. Joseph F. Armand.	De Lormier . . .	Hon. J. O. Bureau.
Bathurst	" James Shaw.	De Le Vallière .	" J.-Bte. G. Proulx.
Bedford	" A. B. Foster.	De Salaberry . .	" Louis Rénaud.
Brock	" A. J. Fergusson Blair.	Eastern	" Thomas Bennett.
Burlington . . .	" Harcourt Burland Bull.	Erie	" David Christie.
Catarqui	" Alexander Campbell.	Gore	" George Alexander.
De La Durantaye	" Joseph Noel Bossé. .	Grandville . . .	" Luc Letellier de St. Just.
De Lanauidière .	" L. A. Olivier.	Gulf	" Ulric Joseph Tessier.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.—*Concluded.*

ELECTED MEMBERS.

Electoral Divisions.	Names of Members.	Electoral Divisions.	Names of Members.
<i>Home</i>	Hon. James C. Aikins.	<i>Rideau</i>	Hon. James Skead.
<i>Inkerman</i>	" John Hamilton.	<i>Rigaud</i>	" Eust. Prud'homme, Jr.
<i>Kennebec</i>	" Charles Cormier.	<i>Rougemont</i>	" William Henry Chaffers
<i>King's</i>	" David Reesor.	<i>Saugeen</i>	" David L. Macpherson.
<i>La Salle</i>	" Antoine J. Duchesnay.	<i>Sauvel</i>	" Jean Bte. Guévremont.
<i>Laurentides</i>	" David Edward Price.	<i>Shawenegan</i>	" Charles Malhiot.
<i>Lauzon</i>	" Elzéar H. J. Duchesnay	<i>Stadacona</i>	" Jean Elie Gingras.
<i>Malahide</i>	" E. Leonard.	<i>St. Clair</i>	" Alexander Vidal.
<i>Midland</i>	" Wm. McMaster.	<i>St. Lawrence</i>	" George Crawford.
<i>Mille-Isles</i>	" Léandre Dumouchel.	<i>Tecumseth</i>	" Donald McDonald.
<i>Montarville</i>	" Louis Lacoste.	<i>Thames</i>	" Oliver Blake.
<i>Newcastle</i>	" Asa A. Burnham.	<i>Tyent</i>	" Billa Flint.
<i>Niagara</i>	" James George Currie.	<i>Victoria</i>	" Thomas Ryan.
<i>Queen's</i>	" John Simpson.	<i>Wellington</i>	" John Sewell Sanborn.
<i>Quinté</i>	" Robert Read.	<i>Western</i>	" Walter McCrea.
<i>Repentigny</i>	" P. Urgel Archambault.	<i>York</i>	" George William Allan.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

The Honorable LEWIS WALLBRIDGE, *Speaker.*

MEMBERS.

Constituencies.	Names of Members.	Constituencies.	Names of Members.
<i>Argenteuil</i>	Hon. John J. O. Abbott.	<i>Halton</i>	John White.
<i>Bagot</i>	Hon. M. Laframboise.	<i>Hamilton (City.)</i>	Charles Magill.
<i>Beauce</i>	Henri E. Taschereau.	<i>Hastings (North Riding)</i>	Thomas C. Wallbridge.
<i>Beauharnois</i>	Paul Denis.	<i>Hastings (South Riding)</i>	Hon. Lewis Wallbridge.
<i>Bellechasse</i>	Edouard Rémillard.	<i>Hochelaga</i>	Hon. Antoine A. Dorion.
<i>Berthier</i>	Anselme H. Pâquet.	<i>Huntingdon</i>	Robert B. Somerville.
<i>Bonaventure</i>	Théodore Robitaille.	<i>Huron and Bruce</i>	James Dickson.
<i>Brant (East Riding)</i>	John Young Bown.	<i>Iberville</i>	Alexandre Dufresne.
<i>Brant (West Riding)</i>	Edmund Burke Wood.	<i>Jacques Cartier</i>	Guillaume G. Gaucher.
<i>Brockville (Town.)</i>	Fitzwm. H. Chambers.	<i>Joliette</i>	Hip. C. dit Grandchamp.
<i>Brome</i>	Christopher Dunkin.	<i>Kamouraska</i>	Hon. Jean C. Chapais.
<i>Carleton</i>	William Fred. Powell.	<i>Kent</i>	Archibald McKellar.
<i>Chambly</i>	{ Charles Boucher de Boucherville.	<i>Kingston</i>	Hon. J. A. Macdonald.
<i>Champlain</i>	John Jones Ross.	<i>Lambton</i>	Alexander Mackenzie.
<i>Charlevoix</i>	Adolphe Gagnon.	<i>Lanark (North Riding)</i>	Hon. Wm. McDougall.
<i>Châteauguay</i>	Hon. Luther H. Holton.	<i>Lanark (South Riding.)</i>	Alexander Morris.
<i>Chicoutimi & Saguenay</i>	Pierre A. Tremblay.	<i>Laprairie</i>	Alfred Pinsonneault.
<i>Compton</i>	John Henry Pope.	<i>L'Assomption</i>	Louis Archambeault.
<i>Cornwall (Town.)</i>	Hon. J. S. Macdonald.	<i>Laval</i>	Joseph H. Bellerose.
<i>Dorchester</i>	Hon. H. L. Langevin.	<i>Leeds and Greenville</i> }	Francis Jones.
<i>Drum'd & Artkabaska</i>	Jean Bte. Eric Dorion.	<i>(North Riding.)</i>	
<i>Dundas</i>	John Sylvester Ross.	<i>Leeds (South Riding)</i>	David Ford Jones.
<i>Durham (East Riding)</i>	John Shuter Smith.	<i>Lennox and Addington</i>	Richard J. Cartwright.
<i>Durham (West Riding)</i>	Henry Munro.	<i>Levis</i>	Jos. Goderic Blanchet.
<i>Elgin (East Riding.)</i>	Leonidas Burwell.	<i>Lincoln</i>	William McGiverin.
<i>Elgin (West Riding.)</i>	John Scoble.	<i>L'Islet</i>	Louis B. Caron.
<i>Essex</i>	Arthur Rankin.	<i>London (City.)</i>	Hon. John Carling.
<i>Frontenac</i>	William Ferguson.	<i>Lotbinière</i>	Henri Gustave Joly.
<i>Gaspé</i>	John Le Boutillier.	<i>Maskinongé</i>	Moïse Houde.
<i>Glengarry</i>	Donald A. Macdonald.	<i>Megantic</i>	George Irvine.
<i>Grenville (South Riding)</i>	Walter Shanly.	<i>Middlesex (E. Riding.)</i>	Crowell Willson.
<i>Grey</i>	George Jackson.	<i>Middlesex (W. Riding.)</i>	Thomas Scatherd.
<i>Haldimand</i>	David Thompson.	<i>Missisquoi</i>	James O'Halloran.
		<i>Montcalm</i>	Joseph Dufresne

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY—*Concluded.*

Constituencies.	Names of Members.	Constituencies.	Names of Members.
<i>Montmagny</i>	Jos. Octave Beaubien.	<i>Rouville</i>	Joseph N. Poulin.
<i>Montmorency</i>	Hon. Joseph Cauchon.	<i>Russell</i>	Robert Bell.
<i>Montreal (City) Centre</i>	Hon. John Rose.	<i>St. Hyacinthe</i>	Rémi Raymond.
" " <i>East</i>	Hon. Geo. E. Cartier.	<i>St. Johns</i>	François Bourassa.
" " <i>West</i>	Hon. T. D'Arcy McGee.	<i>St. Maurice</i>	Charles Lajoie.
<i>Napierville</i>	S. Coupal dit La Reine.	<i>Shefford</i>	Hon. L. S. Huntington.
<i>Niagara (Town)</i>	Angus Morrison.	<i>Sherbrooke (Town)</i>	Hon. Alex. T. Galt.
<i>Nicolet</i>	Joseph Gaudet	<i>Simcoe (North Riding)</i>	Thomas D. McConkey.
<i>Norfolk</i>	Aquila Walsh.	<i>Simcoe (South Riding)</i>	Thomas R. Ferguson.
<i>Northumberland (E. Riding.)</i>	James Lyon Biggar.	<i>Soulanges</i>	William Duckett.
<i>Northumberland (W. Riding.)</i>	Hon. James Cockburn.	<i>Stanstead</i>	Albert Knight.
<i>Ontario (North Riding)</i>	Matthew C. Cameron.	<i>Stormont</i>	Samuel Ault.
<i>Ontario (South Riding)</i>	Thos. Nicholson Gibbs.	<i>Temiscouata</i>	Jean Baptiste Pouliot.
<i>Ottawa (City)</i>	Joseph Merrill Currier.	<i>Terrebonne</i>	Louis Labreche-Viger.
<i>Ottawa (County)</i>	Alonzo Wright.	<i>Three Rivers (City)</i>	Chas. B. De Niverville.
<i>Oxford (North Riding)</i>	Hope F. McKenzie.	<i>Toronto (City) East</i>	Alex. Mortimer Smith.
<i>Oxford (South Riding)</i>	Hon. George Brown.	" " <i>West</i>	John Macdonald.
<i>Ped</i>	Hon. John H. Cameron.	<i>Two Mountains</i>	Jean Baptiste Daoust.
<i>Perth</i>	Robert Macfarlane.	<i>Vaudreuil</i>	{ Antoine Chartier de Lotbinière Harwood.
<i>Peterborough</i>	Fred. Wm. Haultain.	<i>Verchères</i>	Félix Geoffrion.
<i>Pontiac</i>	John Poupore.	<i>Victoria</i>	James Wicks Dunsford
<i>Portneuf</i>	Jean Docile Brousseau.	<i>Waterloo (N. Riding)</i>	Isaac Erb Bowman.
<i>Prescott</i>	Thomas Higginson.	<i>Waterloo (S. Riding)</i>	James Cowan.
<i>Prince Edward</i>	Walter Ross.	<i>Welland</i>	Thomas Clark Street.
<i>Quebec (City) East</i>	Pierre Gabriel Huot.	<i>Wellington (N. Riding)</i>	Thomas S. Parker.
" " <i>Centre</i>	Hon. I. Thibaudeau.	<i>Wellington (S. Riding)</i>	David Stirtan.
" " <i>West</i>	Hon. Charles Alleyne.	<i>Wentworth (N. Riding)</i>	William Notman.
<i>Quebec (County)</i>	Hon. F. Evanturel.	<i>Wentworth (S. Riding)</i>	Joseph Rymal.
<i>Renfrew</i>	Robert MacIntyre.	<i>Yamaska</i>	Moise Fortier.
<i>Richmond and Wolfe</i>	William Hoste Webb	<i>York (East Riding)</i>	Amos Wright.
<i>Richelieu</i>	Joseph F. Perrault.	<i>York (North Riding)</i>	James Pearson Wells.
<i>Rimouski</i>	George Sylvain.	<i>York (West Riding)</i>	Hon. Wm. P. Howland.

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

ON THE

SUBJECT OF THE CONFEDERATION OF THE BRITISH NORTH AMERICAN PROVINCES.

*Third Session, Eighth Provincial Parliament of Canada, in the
Twenty-eighth year of the Reign of Her Majesty QUEEN
VICTORIA.*

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

FRIDAY, February 3, 1865.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She may be graciously pleased to cause a measure to be submitted to the Imperial Parliament for the purpose of uniting the Colonies of Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, and Prince Edward Island, in one Government, with provisions based on the following Resolutions, which were adopted at a Conference of Delegates from the said Colonies, held at the city of Quebec, on the 10th of October, 1864:"

1. The best interests and present and future prosperity of British North America will be promoted by a Federal Union under the Crown of Great Britain, provided such Union can be effected on principles just to the several Provinces.

2. In the Federation of the British North American Provinces, the system of Government best adapted under existing circumstances to protect the diversified interest of the several Provinces, and secure efficiency, harmony and permanency in the working of the Union, would be a General Government, charged with matters of common interest to the whole country; and Local Governments for each of the Canadas, and for the Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, charged with the control of local matters in their respective sections. Provision being made for the admission into the Union, on equitable terms, of Newfoundland, the North-West Territory, British Columbia and Vancouver.

3. In framing a Constitution for the General Government, the Conference, with a view to the perpetuation of our connection with the Mother

Country, and the promotion of the best interests of the people of these Provinces, desire to follow the model of the British Constitution, so far as our circumstances will permit.

4. The Executive Authority or Government shall be vested in the Sovereign of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and be administered according to the well-understood principles of the British Constitution, by the Sovereign personally, or by the Representative of the Sovereign duly authorized.

5. The Sovereign or Representative of the Sovereign shall be Commander-in-Chief of the Land and Naval Militia Forces.

6. There shall be a General Legislature for Parliament for the Federated Provinces, composed of a Legislative Council and a House of Commons.

7. For the purpose of forming the Legislative Council, the Federated Provinces shall be considered as consisting of three divisions: 1st, Upper Canada; 2nd, Lower Canada; 3rd, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island; each division with an equal representation in the Legislative Council.

8. Upper Canada shall be represented in the Legislative Council by 24 Members, Lower Canada by 24 Members, and the three Maritime Provinces by 24 Members, of which Nova Scotia shall have 10, New Brunswick 10, and Prince Edward Island 4 Members.

9. The Colony of Newfoundland shall be entitled to enter the proposed Union, with a representation in the Legislative Council of 4 Members.

10. The North-West Territory, British Columbia and Vancouver shall be admitted into the Union on such terms and conditions as the Parliament of the Federated Provinces shall deem equitable, and as shall receive the assent of Her Majesty; and in the case of the Province of British Columbia or Vancouver, as shall be agreed to by the Legislature of such Province.

11. The Members of the Legislative Council

shall be appointed by the Crown under the Great Seal of the General Government, and shall hold office during life: if any Legislative Councillor shall, for two consecutive sessions of Parliament, fail to give his attendance in the said Council, his seat shall thereby become vacant.

12. The Members of the Legislative Council shall be British subjects by birth or naturalization, of the full age of thirty years, shall possess a continuous real property qualification of four thousand dollars over and above all incumbrances, and shall be and continue worth that sum over and above their debts and liabilities, but in the case of Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island, the property may be either real or personal.

13. If any question shall arise as to the qualification of a Legislative Councillor, the same shall be determined by the Council.

14. The first selection of the Members of the Legislative Council shall be made, except as regards Prince Edward Island, from the Legislative Councils of the various Provinces so far as a sufficient number be found qualified and willing to serve; such Members shall be appointed by the Crown at the recommendation of the General Executive Government, upon the nomination of the respective Local Governments, and in such nomination due regard shall be had to the claims of the Members of the Legislative Council of the opposition in each Province, so that all political parties may, as nearly as possible, be fairly represented.

15. The Speaker of the Legislative Council (unless otherwise provided by Parliament), shall be appointed by the Crown from among the Members of the Legislative Council, and shall hold office during pleasure, and shall only be entitled to a casting vote on an equality of votes.

16. Each of the twenty-four Legislative Councillors representing Lower Canada in the Legislative Council of the General Legislature shall be appointed to represent one of the twenty-four Electoral Divisions mentioned in Schedule A of Chapter first of the Consolidated Statutes of Canada, and such Councillor shall reside or possess his qualification in the Division he is appointed to represent.

17. The basis of Representation in the House of Commons shall be Population, as determined by the Official Census every ten years; and the number of Members at first shall be 194, distributed as follows:

Upper Canada	82
Lower Canada	65
Nova Scotia	19
New Brunswick	15
Newfoundland	8
Prince Edward Island	5

18. Until the Official Census of 1871 has been made up, there shall be no change in the number of Representatives from the several sections.

19. Immediately after the completion of the Census of 1871, and immediately after every decennial census thereafter, the Representation from each section in the House of Commons shall be readjusted on the basis of Population.

20. For the purpose of such readjustments, Lower Canada shall always be assigned sixty-five Members, and each of the other sections shall, at each readjustment, receive, for the ten years then next succeeding, the number of Members to which it will be entitled on the same ratio of Representation to Population as Lower Canada will enjoy according to the Census last taken by having sixty-five Members.

21. No reduction shall be made in the number of Members returned by any section, unless its population shall have decreased, relatively to the population of the whole Union, to the extent of five per centum.

22. In computing at each decennial period the number of Members to which each section is entitled, no fractional parts shall be considered, unless when exceeding one-half the number entitling to a Member, in which case a Member shall be given for each such fractional part.

23. The Legislature of each Province shall divide such Province into the proper number of constituencies, and define the boundaries of each of them.

24. The Local Legislature of each Province may, from time to time, alter the Electoral Districts for the purposes of Representation in such Local Legislature, and distribute the Representatives to which the Province is entitled in such Local Legislature, in any manner such Legislature may see fit.

25. The number of Members may at any time be increased by the General Parliament,—regard being had to the proportionate rights then existing.

26. Until provisions are made by the General Parliament, all the laws which, at that date of the Proclamation constituting the Union, are in force in the Provinces respectively, relating to the qualification and disqualification of any person to be elected, or to sit or vote as a Member of the Assembly in the said Provinces respectively; and relating to the qualification or disqualification of voters and to the oaths to be taken by voters, and to Returning Officers and their powers and duties,—and relating to the proceedings at Elections,—and to the period during which such elections may be continued,—and relating to the Trial of Controverted Elections, and the proceedings incident thereto,—and relating to the vacating of seats of Members, and to the issuing and execution of new Writs, in case of any seat being vacated otherwise than by a dissolution—shall respectively apply to elections of Members to serve in the House of Commons, for places situate in those Provinces respectively.

27. Every House of Commons shall continue for five years from the day of the return of the writs choosing the same, and no longer; subject, nevertheless, to be sooner prorogued or dissolved by the Governor.

28. There shall be a Session of the General Parliament once, at least, in every year, so that a period of twelve calendar months shall not intervene between the last sitting of the General Parliament in one Session, and the first sitting thereof in the next Session.

29. The General Parliament shall have power to make Laws for the peace, welfare and good government of the Federated Provinces (saving the Sovereignty of England), and especially laws respecting the following subjects:—

1. The Public Debt and Property.
2. The regulation of Trade and Commerce.
3. The imposition or regulation of Duties of Customs on Imports and Exports,—except on Exports of Timber, Logs, Mastis, Spars, Deals and Sawn Lumber from New Brunswick, and of Coal and other minerals from Nova Scotia.
4. The imposition or regulation of Excise Duties.
5. The raising of money by all or any other modes or systems of Taxation.
6. The borrowing of money on the Public Credit.
7. Postal Service.
8. Lines of Steam or other Ships, Railways, Canals and other works, connecting any two or more of the Provinces together, or extending beyond the limits of any Province.
9. Lines of Steamships between the Federated Provinces and other Countries.
10. Telegraph Communication and the Incorporation of Telegraph Companies.
11. All such works as shall, although lying wholly within any Province, be specially declared by the Acts authorizing them to be for the general advantage.
12. The Census.
13. Militia—Military and Naval Service and Defence.
14. Beacons, Buoys and Light Houses.
15. Navigation and Shipping.
16. Quarantine.
17. Sea Coast and Inland Fisheries.
18. Ferries between any Province and a Foreign country, or between any two Provinces.
19. Currency and Coinage.
20. Banking—Incorporation of Banks, and the issue of paper money.
21. Savings Banks.
22. Weights and Measures.
23. Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes.
24. Interest.
25. Legal Tender.
26. Bankruptcy and Insolvency.
27. Patents of Invention and Discovery
28. Copy Rights.
29. Indians and Lands reserved for the Indians.
30. Naturalization and Aliens
31. Marriage and Divorce.
32. The Criminal Law, excepting the Constitution of Courts of Criminal Jurisdiction, but including the procedure in Criminal matters.
33. Rendering uniform all or any of the laws relative to property and civil rights in Upper Canada, Nova Scotia, New

Brunswick, Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island, and rendering uniform the procedure of all or any of the Courts in these Provinces; but any statute for this purpose shall have no force or authority in any Province until sanctioned by the Legislature thereof

34. The establishment of a General Court of Appeal for the Federated Provinces.

35. Immigration.

36. Agriculture.

37. And generally respecting all matters of a general character, not specially and exclusively reserved for the Local Governments and Legislatures.

30. The General Government and Parliament shall have all powers necessary or proper for performing the obligations of the Federated Provinces, as part of the British Empire, to foreign countries arising under Treaties between Great Britain and such countries.

32. The General Parliament may also, from time to time, establish additional Courts, and the General Government may appoint Judges and officers thereof, when the same shall appear necessary or for the public advantage, in order to the due execution of the laws of Parliament.

32. All Courts, Judges, and officers of the several Provinces shall aid, assist and obey the General Government in the exercise of its rights and powers, and for such purposes shall be held to be Courts, Judges and officers of the General Government.

33. The General Government shall appoint and pay the Judges of the Superior Courts in each Province, and of the County Courts in Upper Canada, and Parliament shall fix their salaries.

34. Until the Consolidation of the Laws of Upper Canada, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island, the Judges of these Provinces appointed by the General Government, shall be selected from their respective Bars.

35. The Judges of the Courts of Lower Canada shall be selected from the Bar of Lower Canada.

36. The Judges of the Court of Admiralty now receiving salaries shall be paid by the General Government.

37. The Judges of the Superior Courts shall hold their offices during good behaviour, and shall be removable only on the Address of both Houses of Parliament.

38. For each of the Provinces there shall be an Executive Officer, styled the Lieutenant Governor, who shall be appointed by the Governor General in Council, under the Great Seal of the Federated Provinces, during pleasure: such pleasure not to be exercised before the expiration of the first five years, except for cause: such cause to be communicated in writing to the Lieutenant Governor immediately after the exercise of the pleasure as aforesaid, and also by Message to both Houses of Parliament, within the first week of the first session afterwards.

39. The Lieutenant Governor of each Province shall be paid by the General Government.

40. In undertaking to pay the salaries of the Lieutenant Governors, the Conference does not desire to prejudice the claim of Prince Edward Island upon the Imperial Government for the amount now paid for the salary of the Lieutenant Governor thereof.

41. The Local Government and Legislature of each Province shall be constructed in such manner as the existing Legislature of each such Province shall provide.

42. The Local Legislature shall have power to alter or amend their constitution from time to time.

43. The Local Legislatures shall have power to make laws respecting the following subjects:

1. Direct taxation, and in New Brunswick the imposition of Duties on the Export of Timber, Logs, Masts, Spars, Deals, and Sawn Lumber; and in Nova Scotia, of Coals and other minerals.
2. Borrowing money on the credit of the Province.
3. The establishment and tenure of local offices, and the appointment and payment of local officers.
4. Agriculture.
5. Immigration.
6. Education; saving the rights and privilege which the Protestant or Catholic minority in both Canadas may possess as to their Denominational Schools at the time when the Union goes into operation.
7. The sale and management of Public Lands excepting Lands belonging to the General Government.
8. Sea Coast and Inland Fisheries.
9. The establishment, maintenance and management of Penitentiaries, and Public and Reformatory Prisons.
10. The establishment, maintenance and management of Hospitals, Asylums, Charities, and Eleemosynary Institutions.
11. Municipal Institutions.
12. Shop, Saloon, Tavern, Auctioneer and other Licenses.
13. Local Works.
14. The Incorporation of Private or Local Companies, except such as relate to matters assigned to the General Parliament.
15. Property and Civil Rights, excepting those portions thereof assigned to the General Parliament.
16. Inflicting punishment by fine, penalties, imprisonment or otherwise, for the breach of laws passed in relation to any subject within their jurisdiction.
17. The Administration of Justice, including the Constitution, maintenance and organization of the Courts,—both of Civil and Criminal Jurisdiction, and

including also the Procedure in Civil matters.

18. And generally all matters of a private or local nature, not assigned to the General Parliament.

44. The power of respiting, reprieving, and pardoning Prisoners convicted of crimes, and of commuting and remitting of sentences in whole or in part, which belongs of right to the Crown, shall be administered by the Lieutenant Governor of each Province in Council, subject to any instructions he may, from time to time, receive from the General Government, and subject to any provisions that may be made in this behalf by the General Parliament.

45. In regard to all subjects over which jurisdiction belongs to both the General and Local Legislatures, the laws of the General Parliament shall control and supersede those made by the Local Legislature, and the latter shall be void so far as they are repugnant to, or inconsistent with, the former.

46. Both the English and French languages may be employed in the General Parliament and in its proceedings, and in the Local Legislature of Lower Canada, and also in the Federal Courts and in the Courts of Lower Canada.

47. No lands or property belonging to the General or Local Governments shall be liable to taxation.

48. All Bills for appropriating any part of the Public Revenue, or for imposing any new Tax or Impost, shall originate in the House of Commons or House of Assembly, as the case may be.

49. The House of Commons or House of Assembly shall not originate or pass any Vote, Resolution, Address or Bill for the appropriation of any part of the Public Revenue, or of any Tax or Impost to any purpose, not first recommended by Message of the Governor General or the Lieutenant Governor, as the case may be, during the Session in which such Vote, Resolution, Address or Bill is passed.

50. Any Bill of the General Parliament may be reserved in the usual manner for Her Majesty's Assent, and any Bill of the Local Legislatures may, in like manner, be reserved for the consideration of the Governor General.

51. Any Bill passed by the General Parliament shall be subject to disallowance by Her Majesty within two years, as in the case of Bills passed by the Legislatures of the said Provinces hitherto; and, in like manner, any Bill passed by a Local Legislature shall be subject to disallowance by the Governor General within one year after the passing thereof.

52. The Seat of Government of the Federated Provinces shall be Ottawa, subject to the Royal Prerogative.

53. Subject to any future action of the respective Local Governments, the Seat of the Local Government in Upper Canada shall be Toronto; of Lower Canada, Quebec; and the Seats of the Local Governments in the other Provinces shall be as at present.

54. All Stocks, Cash, Bankers' Balances and

Securities for money belonging to each Province at the time of the Union, except as hereinafter mentioned, shall belong to the General Government.

55. The following Public Works and Property of each Province shall belong to the General Government, to wit:—

1. Canals.
2. Public Harbours.
3. Light Houses and Piers.
4. Steamboats, Dredges and Public Vessels.
5. River and Lake Improvements.
6. Railway and Railway Stocks, Mortgages and other debts due by Railway Companies.
7. Military Roads.
8. Custom Houses, Post Offices and other Public Buildings, except such as may be set aside by the General Government for the use of the Local Legislatures and Governments.
9. Property transferred by the Imperial Government and known as Ordnance Property.
10. Armouries, Drill Sheds, Military Clothing and Munitions of War, and
11. Lands set apart for public purposes.

56. All lands, mines, minerals and royalties vested in Her Majesty in the Provinces of Upper Canada, Lower Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, for the use of such Provinces, shall belong to the Local Government of the territory in which the same are so situate; subject to any trusts that may exist in respect to any of such lands or to any interest of other persons in respect of the same.

57. All sums due from purchasers or lessees of such lands, mines or minerals at the time of the Union, shall also belong to the Local Governments.

58. All assets connected with such portions of the public debt of any Province as are assumed by the Local Governments shall also belong to those Governments respectively.

59. The several Provinces shall retain all other Public Property therein, subject to the right of the General Government to assume any Lands or Public Property required for Fortifications or the Defence of the Country.

60. The General Government shall assume all the Debts and Liabilities of each Province.

61. The Debt of Canada, not specially assumed by Upper and Lower Canada respectively, shall not exceed, at the time of the Union, \$62,500,000; Nova Scotia shall enter the Union with a debt not exceeding \$8,000,000; and New Brunswick with a debt not exceeding \$7,000,000.

62. In case Nova Scotia or New Brunswick do not incur liabilities beyond those for which their Governments are now bound, and which shall make their debts at the date of Union less than \$8,000,000 and \$7,000,000 respectively, they shall be entitled to interest at five per cent. on the amount not so incurred, in like manner as is hereinafter provided for Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island; the foregoing resolution being

in no respect intended to limit the powers given to the respective Governments of those Provinces, by Legislative authority, but only to limit the maximum amount of charge to be assumed by the General Government; provided always, that the powers so conferred by the respective Legislatures shall be exercised within five years from this date, or the same shall then lapse.

63. Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island, not having incurred Debts equal to those of the other Provinces, shall be entitled to receive, by half-yearly payments, in advance, from the General Government, the Interest at five per cent. on the difference between the actual amount of their respective Debts at the time of the Union, and the average amount of indebtedness per head of the Population of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

64. In consideration of the transfer to the General Parliament of the powers of Taxation, an annual grant in aid of each Province shall be made, equal to eighty cents per head of the population, as established by the census of 1861; the population of Newfoundland being estimated at 130,000. Such aid shall be in full settlement of all future demands upon the General Government for local purposes, and shall be paid half-yearly in advance to each Province.

65. The position of New Brunswick being such as to entail large immediate charges upon her local revenues, it is agreed that for the period of ten years, from the time when the Union takes effect, an additional allowance of \$63,000 per annum shall be made to that Province. But that so long as the liability of that Province remains under \$7,000,000, a deduction equal to the interest on such deficiency shall be made from the \$63,000.

66. In consideration of the surrender to the General Government by Newfoundland of all its rights in Mines and Minerals, and of all the ungranted and unoccupied Lands of the Crown, it is agreed that the sum of \$150,000 shall each year be paid to that Province, by semi-annual payments; provided that that Colony shall retain the right of opening, constructing and controlling Roads and Bridges through any of the said Lands subject to any Laws which the General Parliament may pass in respect of the same.

67. All engagements that may before the Union be entered into with the Imperial Government for the defence of the Country, shall be assumed by the General Government.

68. The General Government shall secure, without delay, the completion of the Intercolonial Railway from Rivière du Loup, through New Brunswick, to Truro in Nova Scotia.

69. The communications with the North-Western Territory, and the improvements required for the development of the Trade of the Great West with the Seaboard, are regarded by this Conference as subjects of the highest importance to the Federated Provinces, and shall be prosecuted at the earliest possible period that the state of the Finances will permit.

70. The sanction of the Imperial and Local

Parliaments shall be sought for the Union of the Provinces, on the principles adopted by the Conference.

71. That Her Majesty the Queen be solicited to determine the rank and name of the Federated Provinces.

72. The proceedings of the Conference shall be authenticated by the signatures of the Delegates, and submitted by each Delegation to its own Government, and the Chairman is authorized to submit a copy to the Governor General for transmission to the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Having read the motion, the hon. gentleman commenced to speak in French, when Hon. Mr. Ross requested he should address the House in English.

HON. MR. LETELLIER thought, as there were two members of the government in the House, one who spoke best in French (Sir E. P. TACHÉ), and one who did the same in English, it would be better for the Hon. Premier to speak in French, and then his colleague could do the same in English; but Hon. Sir E. P. TACHÉ concluded that as there were English members who did not understand French at all, while the French members all understood English, it would be best for him to speak in the latter language, and proceeded to do so.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ then said that in moving the resolution he felt it his duty first to make a few preliminary remarks, and to give fully and thoroughly the reasons which had induced him to assume the grave responsibility of laying this measure before the House and the country. The reasons were two-fold. They related first to the intrinsic merits of the scheme itself, divested of all other considerations, and next, to the settlement of the domestic difficulties which for some years had distracted the country, and the means we might and ought to employ to restore good feeling, harmony and concord therein. He would, then, first address himself to what he considered the intrinsic merits of the scheme of Confederation, and he would therefore say that if we were anxious to continue our connection with the British Empire, and to preserve intact our institutions, our laws, and even our remembrances of the past, we must sustain the measure. If the opportunity which now presented itself were allowed to pass by unimproved, whether we would or would not, we would be forced into the American Union by violence, and if not by violence, would be placed upon an inclined plain which would carry us there insensibly. In either case the result would be the same. In our

present condition we would not long continue to exist as a British colony. To sustain this position he thought it was only necessary to look at the present state of Canada, its extent, its agricultural and mineral resources, its internal means of communication—natural and artificial,—its geographical position and its climate. The extent of the Canadian territory was, perhaps, not defined, but it was sufficiently well known to enable him to state that it was as large as many empires in Europe, larger than France or Austria. He knew that the portion cultivated was, in respect to its superficial area, only as to the sea-coast to the sea itself. We had vast forests not yet opened or occupied, and yet we had a population numbering over two and a half millions of souls. With such an extent of territory and so fertile a soil, he had no doubt whatever that in less than half a century Canada would embrace a population equal to that of the large empires of the old world. Then with regard to our internal communications, natural and artificial, there was the noble St. Lawrence, which, with great propriety, might be called the father of rivers, for this stream, in point of navigable extent, was longer than any other river in the world. Some of its tributaries which would help to people the interior, were larger than the first-class rivers of Europe, and as to its lakes, none such are to be found elsewhere, especially in view of the facilities they afford to trade. Then the minerals of Canada, which were only now beginning to attract attention, were of the most valuable character, and as practical men asserted, much more valuable than the richest auriferous regions could be. The honorable member then referred to the artificial communications of the country, viz., our Canals, which, he said, were on a scale unequalled in America, or, indeed, in the world. Our Railway system too, in proportion to our means and population, was as extensive as could be found anywhere else; yet with all these advantages, natural and acquired, he was bound to say we could not become a great nation. We labored under a drawback or disadvantage which would effectually prevent that, and he would defy any one to take a map of the world and point to any great nation which had not seaports of its own open at all times of the year. Canada did not possess those advantages, but was shut up in a prison, as it were, for five months of the year in fields of ice, which all the steam engineering apparatus of human ingenuity could not overcome, and so long as this state of things continued, we must con-

sent to be a small people, who could, at any moment, be assailed and invaded by a people better situated in that respect than we were. Canada was, in fact, just like a farmer who might stand upon an elevated spot on his property, from which he could look around upon fertile fields, meandering streams, wood and all else that was necessary to his domestic wants, but who had no outlet to the highway. To be sure he might have an easy, good-natured neighbor, who had such an outlet, and this neighbor might say to him, "Don't be uneasy about that, for I will allow you to pass on to the highway, through my cross road, and we shall both profit by the arrangement." So long as this obliging neighbor was in good humor everything would go on pleasantly, but the very best natured people would sometimes get out of temper, or grow capricious, or circumstances might arise to cause irritation. And so it might come to pass that the excellent neighbor would get dissatisfied. For instance, he might be involved in a tedious and expensive law suit with some one else; it might be a serious affair—in fact, an affair of life or death, and he might come to the isolated farmer and say to him, "I understand that you and your family are all sympathising with my adversary; I don't like it at all, and I am determined you will find some other outlet to the highway than my cross road, for henceforth my gate will be shut against you." In such a case what is the farmer to do? There is the air left, but until the aerostatic science is more practically developed, he can hardly try ballooning without the risk of breaking his neck. (Laughter.) Well, that was precisely our position in reference to the United States. Since the Atlantic and St. Lawrence Railway was opened we have had a very convenient outlet to the sea, and he, with other hon. members now present, would remember the joyful jubilee which was held on the occasion of its opening at Boston in 1851 or '52. For one he was perfectly delighted, as being a man of a different origin, to mark how the two branches of the Anglo-Saxon race fraternised. How they did shake hands to be sure! How they did compliment each other as possessing qualities superior to all other people. They were indeed very affectionate and almost swore eternal friendship and fidelity, and he (Sir E. P. TACHÉ) had no doubt whatever of their perfect sincerity at the time. The consequences of this great work had, no doubt, been highly advantageous to both sides, for their commercial relations had enlarged very much, so much indeed that now the transac-

tions with the United States were, as he believed, more extensive than those with Great Britain. If the advantages had been all on one side this increase would, of course, not have taken place. But how were we situated now? Difficulties had supervened, in which we were in no wise concerned, but which originated with themselves. It was North against South solely, yet these difficulties had affected the good feeling between them and this country. To be sure there had been no misunderstanding at all between our respective Governments, but the minds of the people on both sides had been considerably affected. The people of the Northern States believed that Canadians sympathized with the South much more than they really did, and the consequences of this misapprehension were: first, that we had been threatened with the abolition of the transit system; then the Reciprocity Treaty was to be discontinued; then a passport system was inaugurated, which was almost equivalent to a prohibition of intercourse, and the only thing which really remained to be done was to shut down the gate altogether and prevent passage through their territory. Would any one say that such a state of things was one desirable for Canada to be placed in? Will a great people in embryo, as he believed we were, coolly and tranquilly cross their arms and wait for what might come next? For his part he held that the time had now arrived when we should establish a union with the great Gulf Provinces. He called them great advisedly, for they had within themselves many of the elements which went to constitute greatness, and of some of which we were destitute.—Canada was unquestionably wanting in several of these important elements, and he had been very sorry a few days ago to hear an hon. member of this House make comparisons unfavorable to those countries. That hon. member had said the Lower Provinces were poor and needy, and that like all other poor people they would no doubt be glad to connect themselves with a wealthy partner. He had also said their product of wheat was very small, and that one of the inferior counties in Upper Canada yielded more than the whole of New Brunswick. Well, the allegations in respect of the produce of wheat might be true; but that did not necessarily constitute them poor provinces. Let the honorable member look at Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island and New Hampshire, which, in respect of agricultural produce, might be said to be poor, so poor that an American had once told him (Sir E. P. TACHÉ) that they did not even grow

grass, and their inhabitants had to file the teeth of their sheep in summer to enable them to get a subsistence. (Laughter.) Yet were these states poor? Had they no resources from their trade and manufactures? If they did not produce wealth in one way they certainly did in others, and so it was with New Brunswick. If it did not produce wheat, it produced timber in immense quantities. It had a very extensive fishing coast which was a source of great wealth. Some honorable gentlemen would perhaps remember what an eminent man from Nova Scotia—the Hon. JOSEPH HOWE—had said at a dinner in this country in 1850, that he knew of a small granite rock upon which, at a single haul of the net, the fishermen had taken 500 barrels of mackerel. That was a great haul no doubt—(laughter)—but the honorable gentleman had not given the size of the barrels. (Laughter.) Still no one could deny that the Gulf Provinces were of immense importance, if only in respect of their fisheries. Then they were rich in minerals. Their coal alone was an element of great wealth. It had been said that where coal was found the country was of more value than gold. Look at England, and what was the chief source of her wealth if not coal? Deprived of coal, she would at once sink to the rank of a second or third rate power. But Canada had no coal, and notwithstanding all her other elements of greatness, she required that mineral in order to give her completeness. What she had not, the Lower Provinces had; and what they had not, Canada had. Then as to ship-building, it was an industry prosecuted with great vigor and success in those provinces, especially in New Brunswick, and some of the finest vessels sailing under the British flag had been built in the port of St. John, which annually launched a considerable number of the largest class. They were not beggars, nor did they wish to come into the union as such; but as independent provinces, able to keep up their credit, and provide for their own wants. They would bring into the common stock a fair share of revenue, of property, and of every kind of industry. As to their harbours, he (Sir E. P. TACHÉ) had had the good fortune to visit them personally, and would say they could not be surpassed anywhere; in fact he believed they were unequalled in the world. He would especially refer to that of Halifax, and would ask honorable members to imagine an extensive roadstead, protected by several islands standing out in the sea, so as to break the

waves and quiet the waters in the worst of storms. This most beautiful harbour could accommodate, in perfect safety, more than 100 of the largest vessels; but this was not all, for at the east end where it diminished into a gully, but with very deep water, you enter into a large natural basin, rounded as it were by the compass, and of an extent sufficient to take in all the navies of the world. The entrance to this magnificent inner harbour was rendered inaccessible to any foe by the fortifications erected at the mouth, and the entrance could, moreover, be so barred that no hostile fleet could ever get through. He did not suppose the fleets of England would ever need to take refuge there—(hear, hear)—although it had been loudly alleged that they could be blown out of the water in an incredibly short space of time—(laughter)—but it might afford shelter to isolated vessels, in case they were hard pushed by superior numbers. Well, under the union, Canada would become a partner in these advantages, and with the harbours of Halifax and Quebec, they might well feel proud of their country. On the whole, he thought that the Confederation of all the Provinces had become an absolute necessity, and that it was for us a question of to be or not to be. If we desired to remain British and monarchical, and if we desired to pass to our children these advantages, this measure, he repeated, was a necessity. But there were other motives and other reasons which should induce us to agree to the scheme. Every honorable gentleman in the House knew the political position of the country, and were acquainted with the feelings of irritation which have prevailed for many years. They knew it happily not by their experience in this House, but by the tone of the public press, and by the discussions in another place where taunts and menaces were freely flung across the floor by contending parties. They knew what human passions were, and how, when bitter feelings continued for a long time, the distance between exasperation and actual conflict was not very great. They had now before their own eyes an example of the effects of such disagreements. It was persistently believed by many that the rival interests would never come to a rupture, but for three years they had been waging a conflict which had desolated and ruined the fairest portion of the country, and in the course of which acts of barbarity had been committed which were only equalled by the darkest ages. We in Canada were not more perfect, and the time had arrived when, as he believed, all the patriotic men in the country ought to unite in

providing a remedy for the troubles we had to contend with. It might be said that the remedy proposed was not required, but he would like to know what other could be proposed. Legislation in Canada for the last two years had come almost to a stand still, and if any one would refer to the Statute Book since 1862, he would find that the only public measures there inscribed had been passed simply by the permission of the Opposition. This was the condition of things for two years, and if this were an evil there was another not less to be deplored; he referred to the administration of public affairs during the same period. From the 21st May, 1862, to the end of June, 1864, there had been no less than five different Governments in charge of the business of the country. The honorable member here gave a history of the several changes until the MACDONALD-DORION Administration died, as he stated, of absolute weakness, falling under the weight they were unable to carry. Their successors were not more successful, and being defeated were thinking of appealing to the country, which they might have done with more or less success, gaining a constituency here, and perhaps losing another elsewhere. They had assumed the charge of affairs with an understanding that they would have a right to this appeal, and while they were consulting about it they received an intimation from the real chief of the Opposition, through one of their own friends, to the effect that he was desirous of making overtures to them, with the view of seeking to accommodate the difficulties. The honorable gentleman and some of his friends then came into contact with the leaders of the Government, and it was agreed between them to try to devise a scheme which would put an end to the misunderstandings, and at the same time secure for Canada and the other provinces a position which would ensure their future safety and procure them the respect and confidence of other nations. They arranged a large scheme and a smaller one. If the larger failed, then they were to fall back upon the minor, which provided for a federation of the two sections of the province. At the time these measures were resolved upon, the country was bordering on civil strife, and he would ask if it was not the duty of both sides to do all they could to prevent the unfortunate results which would have followed. An honorable member opposite (Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST) had said, a few days ago, that it would have been easy to have prevented the necessity for a Confederation of all the provinces, by granting

to Upper Canada the increased representation, or the demand of representation according to population, which they had been contending for.

HON. MR. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST begged to say that the Hon. Premier must have misunderstood him. What he had said was that if the proposition had been made to the people whether they should have a Confederation of all the provinces, or give Representation according to Population to Upper Canada, they would have chosen the latter; and when he had alluded to some other mode of accommodating the difficulties, he meant that if the Government had applied to other parties in the Legislature than those they had had associated with themselves, they might have succeeded without having recourse to Confederation.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ said that he had not been alone in interpreting the honorable member as he had done, for two city journals had taken the same view of his remarks.

HON. M. LETELLIER said he was aware of it, but they were mistaken for all that.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—Well, it did not much matter; but the honorable member should recollect that Lower Canada had constantly refused the demand of Upper Canada for representation according to population, and for the good reason that, as the union between them was legislative, a preponderance to one of the sections would have placed the other at its mercy. It would not be so in a Federal Union, for all questions of a general nature would be reserved for the General Government, and those of a local character to the local governments, who would have the power to manage their domestic affairs as they deemed best. If a Federal Union were obtained it would be tantamount to a separation of the provinces, and Lower Canada would thereby preserve its autonomy together with all the institutions it held so dear, and over which they could exercise the watchfulness and surveillance necessary to preserve them unimpaired. [The honorable member repeated this portion of his speech in French, for the express purpose of conveying his meaning in the clearest and most forcible manner to his fellow-members for Lower Canada, who might not have apprehended so well the English.] But there might be a portion of the inhabitants of Lower Canada who might at a first glance have greater reason to complain than the French Roman Catholics, and these were the English Protestants. And why? Because they were in a minority; but

he thought that if they took the trouble fully to consider the subject, they would be reassured and satisfied with the scheme. First a great event had taken place; the law of Lower Canada had been consolidated, and the English-speaking people residing in that section had got reconciled to it; in fact they were well satisfied therewith. In this respect, then, they were secure. But they might say that the majority in the Local Legislature might hereafter be unjust to them, but he thought that, on looking at the past, their fears might be allayed. Before the union of the provinces, when the large majority of members in the Legislature were French, the English inhabitants had never found cause of complaint against them. In no instance had injustice been attempted. The difficulty was that the minority wanted to rule and wanted to possess the whole power of the state in their hands. That the people of Lower Canada always acted towards the English with liberality was best exemplified by facts. Before the union, while the constituencies were almost exclusively French, English Protestant gentlemen were frequently returned to Parliament, and he had now opposite to him an honorable member who had for twenty years represented an entirely French and Roman Catholic county. He doubted if in the course of those twenty years that honorable member had ever been asked whether he were Scotch or Protestant. They took the man for his sterling worth. It was even a fact that the French had elected members with extraordinary names, and as everybody knew, there was sometimes a good deal in a name. (Hear, hear.) Now if there was one name which French Canadians disliked more than another, it was that of Luther. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) Yet they had elected a gentleman bearing that significant appellation. He was glad they had, and he had no doubt he had been elected because of his personal worth; but it unquestionably showed a great deal of liberal feeling on the part of the electors. (Hear, hear.) But if an English Protestant was bad in the eyes of a French Canadian, a French Protestant was infinitely worse, and yet the county of Lotbinière had elected a French Canadian Protestant without even questioning his religion. That gentleman was a most worthy, able and well educated person, and every way well qualified for the important trust. But again, quite lately, in a division in Lower Canada numbering over fifty thousand souls, of which only one thousand four hundred were English, an election of a member to this Chamber had

taken place, the candidates being a French Roman Catholic gentleman, long and well known, and an English Protestant—and with what result? Why, that the English Protestant had beaten the French Canadian Roman Catholic by one thousand votes. (Hear.) Could any greater proof of a tolerant and liberal feeling be exhibited? These examples should show, as he thought, that the Protestants of Lower Canada were sure to meet with not justice simply, but with the largest toleration. It might perhaps be said that Mr. PRICE, who had been elected for the division of which he spoke, being a large merchant doing business in Chicoutimi, had used the influence which his position gave him over many electors who were in his debt to obtain success; but whatever might be said of Chicoutimi, it could not be said of the county of Charlevoix, where he had no such business relations, and yet he obtained a majority there too. The fact was, the result might be considered not only as a mark of confidence in Mr. PRICE, the son elected, but as a token of respect and gratitude to Mr. PRICE, senior, who had by his energy and enterprise opened up the Saguenay country, and who, in a certain sense, might be said to be the father of that region. Much had been said on the war of races, but that war was extinguished on the day the British Government granted Canada Responsible Government, by which all its inhabitants, without distinction of race or creed, were placed on a footing of equality. (Hear, hear.) The war of races found its grave in the resolutions of the 3rd September, 1841, and he hoped never to hear of it again. We were so situated that there must needs be mutual forbearance. This life was one of compromise. Not only was forbearance needed in public life, but in domestic life. If one member in a family insists upon having all his own way, there will be trouble, and so through all possible relations of humanity. He believed the French Canadians would do all in their power to render justice to their fellow-subjects of English origin, and it should not be forgotten that if the former were in a majority in Lower Canada, the English would be in a majority in the General Government, and that no act of real injustice could take place, even if there were a disposition to perpetrate it, without its being reversed there. He had now given to the House the motives which had led him to take the responsibility of introducing this important measure, and he trusted they would be viewed as sufficient. When the proper time for the discussion of the details came, he would be

prepared to give such explanations as might seem requisite, and as to the mode and time of the discussion he would leave that to the decision of the House.

HON. MR. FERGUSON BLAIR—[Owing to some noise in the House, the reporter did not clearly understand the opening remarks of the hon. member, except so far as that he desired to convey the impression that what he was about to say was not to be regarded as committing any one but himself; that he did not speak for any party or as representing any party in the House. The hon. member was also understood to allege he did not think the political struggles and difficulties alluded to by the Hon. Premier could be taken as sufficient to justify the great constitutional change now proposed]. He thought that in the course of party struggles for supremacy, the Opposition had erred in seeking to oust the Ministry before they themselves were prepared to assume the charge with a reasonable prospect of being able to carry on the Government with success. This was the British system, and an instance had lately occurred in the Imperial Parliament exemplifying it. On the Danish question Mr. D'ISRAELI could have defeated the Ministry, but, being aware that he could not form a strong Administration, many of his party abstained from voting. Such a condition of things could happen just as well in an assembly of 300 as in one of 600, and he did not think the change proposed would guarantee immunity from future difficulties of the same kind, therefore they might happen in the General Government as well as in that of Canada alone. But looking at the scheme as presented, and forgetting all past party disputes and the charges against the public men concerned, it came before the House in such a shape as to make it necessary to accept or reject it. He must say he could not but attach great weight to a scheme prepared by men of different political opinions, by eminent men who had met together for the express purpose of arranging it, and who had agreed upon its provisions. If it were obstructed by any serious amendments, involving a prolonged delay, such delay might be fatal, and if it were to pass, he thought it should be allowed to do so at a sufficiently early period to permit of its being laid before the Imperial Parliament this year. (Hear, hear.) He could not shut his eyes to the fact that whether or not the union added strength to the provinces interested, it would unquestionably add to their respectability and standing, both at home and abroad. (Hear.) The people of England were, evi-

dently looking to the proposed change with confidence and hope, and as likely to perpetuate the connection of the provinces with the empire for a long time to come. But it was well known that there was an anti-colonial party in England persistently urging that it would be an advantage to the nation to get rid of the colonies. The question of defending them was an embarrassing one, and unless some such scheme as this were adopted, it might present grave difficulties. If the scheme were rejected, the effect would be very injurious upon our credit. (Hear.) But if adopted, the reverse would be the case. Its acceptance would also improve our position in the eyes of our neighbors in France and other nations; indeed it would, in all probability, give us a national standing, without the necessity of separating from the mother country. For these reasons he had come to the conscientious conclusion that it would be highly injurious to reject the scheme, and that it was our duty to pass it as soon as was consistent with a due consideration of what was due to so important a subject. He did not think it necessary to express, at greater length, his reasons for giving the motion his support, but he again desired it to be well understood that he spoke only for himself, and not in concert with any one else. At the same time he might say, that from what he knew personally of the feeling of his section of the country, it was highly favorable to the measure. There might be some matters of detail upon which there was a difference of opinion, and when the resolutions came up in their order, he would indicate what they were. The proposed submission of the scheme to the electors would involve a delay which could not be compensated for by any benefit proposed to be derived from such a course; but if there should hereafter be any very important public movement and numerous petitions in favor of an appeal to the people, then the subject would present a different aspect. Or if the majority in favor of the scheme in the other branch of the Legislature should be very small, that might be deemed a sufficient reason for submitting it to the country. As to the course to be pursued in the decision on the merits, he did not know whether it would be best to have it in Committee of the Whole or with the Speaker in the chair.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ thought it would be better that the Speaker should continue in the chair, but with the understanding that every honorable member should be at liberty to speak as freely and frequently as if the House were in committee.

HON. MR. FERGUSSON BLAIR assented.

HON. MR. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST said, that if he were sufficiently master of English he would address the House in that language, but not being so would have to use the French. The difficulties to which allusion had been made were produced by two causes. They were not constitutional, however, but parliamentary, and, as he believed, could have been surmounted without recourse to the constitutional change which it was proposed to adopt without appeal to the country. It was true that difficulties had succeeded to difficulties, and that legislation was stopped, but if the leaders had sought in the Legislature itself for the means of removing them, he believed they would have been found. Who would guarantee the Government under the new Constitution from the recurrence of similar troubles? There would of course be an Opposition as in the smaller House. If similar difficulties happened, would the Confederation seek relief in another change of Constitution. On the contrary, would not relief be sought in the means he had suggested. At any rate he did not think such a change as the union of all the British provinces was required. In 1820, when a union of Upper and Lower Canada was proposed, it was objected that if it did not work a larger union would follow, and then, lastly, a legislative union of all the provinces. Two of these steps had already been taken, and we were going on with rapid strides towards the last. In such a case it was not hard to conceive what would be the position of Lower Canada. It was a misfortune that we had to contend with national prejudices, but it was impossible to forget them. In the event of a legislative union would the guarantees proposed to Lower Canada under the federation system be found? Would it not then be at the mercy of those they now feared? He admitted we had a rich country as represented; we had wheat fields, mineral resources, forests, rivers and lakes, but to make them available did we require an increase of territory? We had territory enough, and an increase would be a source of weakness, not of strength. Would it not add to our already large frontier, and make us more vulnerable to invasions. The union would not increase the power of England to protect us, and England would have the same interest in protecting the colonies without as well as with the union. New Brunswick might be rich in coal, in wood and in fisheries, and do a large business in ship building, but these things would seek the best markets under any circum-

stances, and he did not see that a union with us would increase their value, and if it did it would be no advantage. Then, as to Nova Scotia with its small population and fine harbour—where would be the advantage of connection with her? Though not united, would not the harbour be equally available to our vessels? He would now say he preferred to Confederation a legislative union of Upper and Lower Canada with inequality of representation in the Lower House and equality in the Upper. This would not add to the expenses of the province, and would be more consonant with our interests and the sentiments [ideas] of the people. Though there should be inequality in the Assembly, the equality in the Legislative Council would act as a counterpoise, and prevent one section from invading the interests of the other. Then did not Confederation consecrate [establish] the principle of representation according to population? It would give larger to one of the nationalities, and, as the General Government would be able to veto the acts of the Local Government, would there be no danger to Lower Canada? If representation by population had been so much opposed in this part, it was doubtless because there was cause of fear, yet this very power was to be conferred upon the Federal Government. If it could not be given with safety under our present regime, how could it be safer to give it to the Confederation. The advantage of the plan to Upper Canada was well understood, for immediately after the coalition they all agreed to say they had gained what they had so long contended for.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—Well, after all, they only got what the honorable member himself proposed to give them.

HON. MR. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST said he always preferred a short direct course to a long tortuous one. The friends of the new movement had tried to conceal the fact that representation according to population was to be conceded to Upper Canada, but they had failed, and the avowal had come out at last. The resolutions not being before the House, it would be improper to go into the merits of the details, but he could not avoid alluding to one point which was of profound interest. It was clear that the constituencies had not sent honorable members to this House for the purpose of electing themselves members for life, as they were invited to do. They were not sent here to change the Constitution, but to uphold it. (Hear.) You were, in fact, about to declare that the local governments would have power to recommend to the

General Government that you should be appointed for life. If so, then let the people say whether such power should be conferred. Take the means to make sure that the members of the Assembly shall appeal to the country. In New Brunswick the question was about to be submitted to the people through a general election. To be sure, it was said that the term of Parliament there had expired; but if the Ministers in New Brunswick had understood they could force a vote, as was about to be done in Canada, he doubted whether the general election would have taken place immediately. He believed, too, that the Conference generally had regarded this as the most proper mode. Then he did not think that such a change should have been brought about under a Coalition Government. This was contrary to British usage, and he believed that if a petition was numerously signed, and forwarded to the Imperial Government, representing that this important change had been brought about by a coalition, the act would be declared unconstitutional. The scheme was practically unknown to the people. Under some pressure it had been sent confidentially to the members, but what did the country understand of it?—little or nothing. It had been said that if the scheme were not adopted now it would be in danger; but would it not keep good for a little while? Was it feared that the people would find out that it would occasion increased expense, and so refuse to have it? If only for the reason that it was not known to the people, he would vote against it. When the details came to be discussed, he believed some of them would not be approved; and he also thought that the project did not embrace all the provisions which it should embrace. Finally, he thought the Government should not set its face against some changes in the scheme, were it only in the matter of the election of members to the Legislative Council, and he hoped the House would lead them to consent to that alteration. When the resolutions came up, he would make it his duty to speak more positively to the particulars in question. The honorable member then sat down, saying he approved of the mode of discussion proposed. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. CURRIE then moved that the debate be adjourned until Monday, which was carried.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

FRIDAY, February 3, 1865.

ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD said the Speaker having desired that he should not go on with the Address about the union of the colonies, he proposed not to take it up till Monday next, but as the matter was one of the utmost importance, he thought it would be well now to settle the mode of conducting the discussion. He would propose that after the discussion commenced, it should continue day after day, and that for the purpose of greater regularity the Speaker should remain in the chair. At the same time he would propose that the rule which prevented members speaking more than once when the Speaker was in the chair should be suspended, in order that every member might have the same liberty of free discussion as he would have in Committee of the Whole.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD said the Attorney General's proposition that discussion should continue day after day, was one which, in his opinion, ought not to be entertained by the House. This was a very grave question, and he thought the people of this country had a right to consider maturely the sentiments promulgated by their representatives with regard to it. He was sorry, therefore, to have heard it announced by the Attorney General that the Government were to hurry the measure through, to the exclusion of all other matters.

ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD said he had not stated this. His idea was that after the debate commenced it should go on each day after half-past seven, leaving the afternoon sitting for other business. If the discussion was to be confined to government days, the debate of Tuesday would be forgotten by Friday, the same arguments would be gone over, and they would sit the whole year round to finish it.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD said other changes of no less importance than this, with reference to Clergy Reserves, Legislative Council, Seigneurial Tenure, &c., had been before the people for a quarter of a century, and fully discussed session after session before being finally disposed of. Public opinion in that way was fully matured on these questions, but here they were called on at a few days' notice to change entirely the Constitution we lived under, and time was not to be allowed for public opinion to be expressed on it. He objected also to the suspension of the rules of Parliament, so as to make the discussion take

place with the Speaker in the chair, instead of in Committee of the Whole. If there was any question on which the House should adhere to its forms, it was a question like this—when the Government was so strong, so outrageously strong—(laughter)—the minority should be protected by the rules of the House being fully maintained. He observed the President of the Council laugh. He had learned a good deal from that gentleman in standing up for the rules of the House. But now, forsooth, the lion and lamb were lying together, and the Government, knowing that they had it in their power, were now to carry the measure through by brute force—the force of the majority.

ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD said there was nothing irregular in his proposing that discussion should go on with the Speaker in the chair. The suspension of the rules he proposed was for the protection of the minority, by allowing each member to speak and state his objections as often as he pleased.

HON. J. H. CAMERON approved of the proposition that discussion be conducted with the Speaker in the chair. With reference to the other proposition that it should go on from day to day, he suggested that after Attorney General MACDONALD had stated his views at length on Monday, the debate should be adjourned for at least one week, that people in the country might have the views of the Government fully before them, before the debate fairly commenced. After that it might go on day after day.

HON. MR. HOLTON said he had not regarded the Attorney General's proposition in exactly the same light as the member for Cornwall, but was willing to accept it as indicating a desire on the part of the Government to afford facilities for a full and free discussion. He thought, however, it would be advantageous if, after the general discussion took place with the Speaker in the chair, the House went into Committee of the Whole, to consider the details. He thought three days in the week sufficient for the discussion.

HON. MR. BROWN said the member for Chateauguay had rightly apprehended the object of the Attorney General when he treated his proposition as dictated by a desire to afford the fullest opportunity of discussing this great question. Nothing could be further from their intention than to hurry the measure through by brute force, as charged by the member for Cornwall. Although the Attorney General had proposed that the discussion should continue day after day, he had not suggested for a moment that the whole should

be hurried on; the debate at any period might be adjourned, if deemed necessary, to allow time for the expression of public opinion. There were 130 members, and almost every member would desire to speak on the question, and he thought clearly the proper course was to devote every day after half-past seven to the discussion, to allow all the members on both sides to state their views, that they might go to the country and be fully considered. He thought there was a good deal of force in the suggestion of the member for Peel, that after the views of the Government had been stated distinctly to the House the debate should be adjourned for a short time. Of course the Attorney General East, as well as the Attorney General West, would desire to explain the scheme from his point of view, so would the Minister of Finance; and probably he also (Mr. BROWN) from his own particular stand point would like to say something about the scheme. After the views of the Government had thus been put before the House, there could be no difficulty about adjourning the debate for a time, that the country might distinctly understand what they were about.

After some remarks by Hon. Mr. CAUCHON and Mr. DUNKIN,

Mr. POWELL asked whether the House was expected to adopt the scheme in its entirety, or would it be open to the House to adopt one portion of it and reject another portion of it?

HON. MR. HOLTON—That is not a fair question.

HON. MR. BROWN—Perfectly fair.

Mr. POWELL thought Mr. Holton's regard for fair play excessive, when it even impelled him to interfere on behalf of the Administration.

HON. MR. HOLTON—I think it would be unfair to answer such a question.

ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD said he agreed that Mr. Cameron's proposition was a reasonable one. The Government would, in the first place, lay their case before the House, and through the press before the country, and then allow a reasonable time for the country to judge of the case as presented by the Government. It would not, of course, be presented by himself alone, as the President of the Council had said. The subject was so large in itself and comprehended so great a variety of details, that he fancied all the members of the Government would find it necessary to express their views on particular portions of this great scheme. In answer to the member for Carleton, the Government desired to

say that they presented the scheme as a whole, and would exert all the influence they could bring to bear in the way of argument to induce the House to adopt the scheme without alteration, and for the simple reason that the scheme was not one framed by the Government of Canada, or by the Government of Nova Scotia, but was in the nature of a treaty settled between the different colonies, each clause of which had been fully discussed, and which had been agreed to by a system of mutual compromise. Of course it was competent to the House to vote against the Address as a whole, or to adopt amendments to it, but if they did so, it would then be for the Government to consider whether they would press the scheme further on the attention of the House. It was obvious that unless the scheme were adopted as it had been settled between the different provinces, if they prosecuted it further, they would have to commence *de novo*, and he had no hesitation in expressing his belief that if the scheme was not now adopted in all its principal details, as presented to the House, we could not expect to get it passed this century. It had been only in consequence of a very happy concurrence of circumstances, which might not easily arise again, that the different provinces had been enabled to arrive at the conclusion now presented, and he should exceedingly regret in the interests of Canada and of the future of British North America, if anything should delay beyond this year the completion and conclusion of this great scheme. The resolutions on their face bore evidence of compromise; perhaps not one of the delegates from any of the provinces would have propounded this scheme as a whole, but being impressed with the conviction that it was highly desirable with a view to the maintenance of British power on this continent that there should be Confederation and a junction of all the provinces, the consideration of the details was entered upon in a spirit of compromise. Not one member of the Canadian Government had his own views carried out in all the details, and it was the same with the other delegates. But after a full discussion of sixteen days, and after the various details had been voted on, the resolutions as a whole were agreed to by a unanimous vote; every one of the delegates, whatever his view to any of the details, being satisfied to adopt the whole scheme as adopted by a majority for each individual resolution, and to press it upon his own Legislature as the only practicable scheme that could be carried; such being the case, he

trusted the Government would have the support of a very large majority of the House in carrying the scheme just as it stood, members sacrificing their individual opinions as to particular details, if satisfied with the Government that the scheme as a whole was for the benefit and prosperity of the people of Canada.

HON. MR. HOLTON would like to inquire whether, according to the course of proceeding proposed by the Attorney General, the several resolutions of the Conference would be submitted separately to the House as affirmative propositions?

ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD said "no." The proposition submitted to the House is that an Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that a bill should be passed based on these resolutions. All amendments might be moved to that one resolution. It would be the same thing, in fact, as to move them upon each resolution separately.

HON. MR. HOLTON held that the Government ought to ask for an affirmative vote from the House on each of these resolutions. They had been prepared and passed by a self-constituted body, without the House or the people ever having been consulted on the subject. Unless the House were a sham altogether, the least reference that could be paid to it would be to obtain a direct affirmation of each of the basis on which the projected Constitution which was hereafter to govern us were to be founded.

HON. MR. CAUCHON wished information as to whether the scheme was to be discussed as a whole, or whether there would be an opportunity given to consider each part of it separately? There were part of the resolutions about which there might be some misunderstanding and difference of opinion, as for example those clauses by one of which it was stated that the civil laws of the country were to be under the control of the local governments, and by the other of which the law of marriage was placed under the control of the General Government. The law of marriage pervaded the whole civil code, and he wanted to know how it could be placed under a different legislature from that which was to regulate the rest of the civil law. He did not, however, see why an affirmative vote on each resolution would enable the House to pronounce with more freedom on these details than the course proposed by the Attorney General.

HON. A. A. DORION said the member for Montmorency misapprehended the scope of the objection made by the member for Chateau-

guay. That objection was that the freedom of Parliament would be better consulted, and more opportunity would be given to learn the sense of the House by the different clauses of the Address being moved *seriatim*, in the same way as supplies were voted. This was the manner in which the Irish Union Act had been passed, as well as the bill to change the Government of India, the Canadian Union Act of 1840, Legislative Council Act, and other important measures. This was the uniform course of Parliament, and there was no precedent to be found for any contrary mode of proceeding. He thought the course proposed on the Opposition side of the House the most reasonable—that there should be a general discussion on the scheme, in which Members of the Government should state their views; that then there should be an adjournment for a week to enable the public to consider these speeches, and that then the subject should be discussed three whole days each week till disposed of. This would, in fact, be devoting more time to it than the plan that was proposed by the President of the Council, and would secure more fair, open and full opportunity for discussion.

ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD could understand the object of the hon. member for Hochelaga. That hon. gentleman was opposed to Confederation, and the course he proposed was just that which was calculated to throw the scheme to another Parliament and till another conference was held, so that Confederation might not be effected till the day of judgment. These resolutions were in the nature of a treaty, and if not adopted in their entirety, the proceedings would have to be commenced *de novo*. If each province undertook to change the details of the scheme, there would be no end to the discussions and the conferences which would have to be held.—Then, as to having a debate three days a week, it would extend the session beyond all bounds, especially as after the Confederation scheme was disposed of, there would be a measure for organizing the local governments under that scheme.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Why not bring that measure down with this?

ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD said that they were two different propositions, and they could be only dealt with separately. If the House declared, by its vote, that Confederation was desirable, then it would be proper to consider the nature of the local governments; but if it failed to accept the principle of Confederation, then it would be entirely useless to bring up

the other measure. Besides, to bring down both measures at once would make confusion worse confounded, because members would, of necessity, introduce their views upon local governments into the consideration of the Confederation question.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD commented upon the declaration that the resolutions of the Conference were tantamount to a treaty, and asked by what authority the Government had undertaken to negotiate a treaty. He contended that all forms of the House should be strictly observed, so that there should be no infringement upon the rights of the minority.

MR. THOMAS FERGUSON asked whether it was the intention of the Government to carry this measure into force without submitting it to the people?

ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD said he could answer his honorable friend at once. If this measure received the support of the House, there would be no necessity of going to the people. If, however, the measure were defeated, it would be for the Government to consider whether there should not be an appeal to the country. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

MR. SCATCHERD asked whether it was intended to make any amendments in the scheme to meet the suggestions contained in the despatch of the Colonial Secretary.

ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD, in reply, said of course he could not answer what the policy of the Imperial Government might be; all he could say was this, that the representatives of the various colonial governments, after this treaty had been made, agreed to go home and press upon the legislatures of their respective provinces this measure as a whole, and to present in all the colonial legislatures addresses identical in their nature to Her Majesty, asking Her to pass an Act based upon these resolutions, such address being an expression of the deliberate opinion of the colonies. It would then become the duty of the Imperial Government and Legislature to act as they pleased in the matter. He hoped and believed they would not make any alterations in the scheme adopted by the Conference. He was quite satisfied that if the local legislatures asked them to pass the scheme as it stood, they would leave us to be the best judges of our own affairs and carry the measure through.

HON. MR. HOLTON said he had given notice the other day of three questions he intended to put to the Government before going

into Committee of Supply, but as the present was an equally favorable opportunity, he trusted there would be no objection to his putting them now.

ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—No, go on.

HON. MR. HOLTON said the first question had a reference to the subject to which the Attorney General had alluded in the course of his remarks just now. It was, whether it was the intention of the Government to bring down their projects for local constitutions for the two sections of Canada before inviting the House to proceed with the discussion of this question of Confederation. The honorable gentleman had already answered that question by saying it was not the intention of the Government to introduce this measure, and had given reasons for this course. Upon these reasons he (Hon. Mr. HOLTON) desired to say one word. He maintained that the question now before the House was, should they revolutionize the country, should they revolutionize the government of the country? (Hear, hear.) That was undoubtedly the question, and he would like to know distinctly whether the form of the proposed new government, local as well as general, formed part of the same scheme? He felt that the House could not be in a position to consider the proposed forms of the Constitution until they had before them, at least in a general way, the forms of government which were to obtain between the two sections of the province, of the union of which a dissolution was to be wrought by the measure before the House. Then another question which he had proposed to put had reference to the educational system of Lower Canada. The Minister of Finance, in a speech at Sherbrooke, had promised that the Government would introduce a bill to amend the school laws of Lower Canada. The honorable gentleman must be aware that this was a question on which there was a great deal of feeling in this section of the province amongst the English-speaking, or the Protestant class, of the population. He did not like to introduce anything of a religious character into discussions of this House, but in debating the great changes which it was proposed to effect in our system of government, the effect of them upon that class to which he referred must be considered. Among that class there was no phase or feature of these threatened changes which excited so much alarm as this very question of education. Well, the Minister of Finance had said, with great solemnity, as having the authority of his colleagues for it, that this session the Government would bring down

amendments to the school laws of Lower Canada, which they proposed enacting into law before a change of government should take place, and which would become a permanent settlement of that question. The question he then desired to put was whether they intended to submit these amendments before they asked the House to pass finally upon the other scheme of Confederation, and if so, to state when the House might look for that measure, as it would undoubtedly exercise very considerable influence upon the discussion of the Confederation scheme, and probably in the last resort from several members from Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) Then the third question of which he had given notice had reference to the Intercolonial Railway. It was a novelty that, perhaps, might not be found in the constitution of any country, to introduce a provision for the construction of a railroad, canals, turnpike roads or other public works. (Laughter.) But the novelty existed in this case, and we are told that a part of the proposed Constitution was to build the Intercolonial Railway, as to the usefulness of which there had been a great difference of opinion amongst members of the House and in the country.

After the dinner recess,

HON. MR. HOLTON, continuing his remarks, said it appeared now to be proposed to make the construction of a railway part of the Constitution of the country. The President of the Council, who had formerly strongly opposed the Intercolonial Railway, had now become so enamoured of it and its adjuncts that he was reported to have declared in a speech at Toronto, that rather than not have those adjuncts, to wit, the union of all the provinces, which he had also previously opposed as vigorously as the railway itself, he would consent to building six intercolonial railways. (Laughter.) He thought the House was entitled to know what was to be done with reference to that railway before they were asked to consider the great question of which it formed a part. He desired also some information as to the position of the North-West question on which the President of the Council had always taken strong grounds, maintaining that Canada had a territorial right extending over all that region. He took it for granted the President of the Council still maintained his position, but he wished to know from him authoritatively the manner in which the Government proposed to deal with the question. He desired, also, some information on the subject of the defences, and what was to be the measure of our con-

tributions under the proposed scheme for that important object.

ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD said the Government would cheerfully give an answer to Hon. Mr. HOLTON's questions. As to the local constitutions of Upper and Lower Canada, when subordinate provinces of the Confederation, Government proposed to submit to the House a scheme or schemes to be considered by members of Upper and Lower Canada, respecting the constitutions of their respective governments. But the action with regard to them must be the action of Parliament. That action would only be asked after the Confederation scheme was adopted, for until it was settled that there was to be Confederation, it was idle to discuss what should be the constitutions of the several provinces. As to the school question, it had been announced by Hon. Mr. GALT, at Sherbrooke, that before Confederation took place, this Parliament would be asked to consider a measure which he hoped would be satisfactory to all classes of the community. There was a good deal of apprehension in Lower Canada on the part of the minority there as to the possible effect of Confederation on their rights on the subject of education, and it was the intention of the Government, if Parliament approved the scheme of Confederation, to lay before the House this session, certain amendments to the school law, to operate as a sort of guarantee against any infringement by the majority of the rights of the minority in this matter.

HON. A. A. DORION—Will it apply to both Upper and Lower Canada?

ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD said he believed, as regarded Upper Canada, the matter would remain in *statu quo*, as the present law there was quite satisfactory to the minority. As regarded the Intercolonial Railroad, the resolutions shewed precisely what was the intention of the Government in that matter. The railroad was not, as stated by Hon. Mr. HOLTON, a portion of the Constitution, but was one of the conditions on which the Lower Provinces agreed to enter into the constitutional agreement with us. The North-West question he would leave in the hands of the President of the Council, who understood it thoroughly, and could, no doubt, give Hon. Mr. HOLTON a satisfactory answer. With respect to the defences of the province, they were now the subject of negotiations with the Imperial Government, and the fullest information would be given to the House on that subject. He might mention that the Maritime Provinces, recognizing the peculiar position of Canada geogra-

phically, and its danger in case of hostilities, had most cordially agreed that any sum this Parliament might vote for the defence of Canada, they would undertake their share of.

MR. WALLBRIDGE asked if he was to understand that a guarantee was to be given in the Constitution of the Federal Government to Roman Catholic separate schools?

ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—I only said this, that before Confederation is adopted, the Government would bring down a measure to amend the school law of Lower Canada, protecting the rights of the minority, and which, at the same time, I believe, would be satisfactory to the majority, who have always hitherto shown respect for the rights of the minority, and, no doubt, will continue to do so.

HON. MR. BROWN said Hon. Mr. HOLTON had done no injustice to him in supposing he held now precisely the same sentiments on the North-West question he formerly did. He believed it of vast importance that that region should be brought within the limits of civilization, and vigorous measures had been taken to ascertain what could be done with that view. It was not long since he returned from England, where the matter was very fully discussed, and he had not as yet had an opportunity of submitting the thing so fully to the Council that a decision could be had upon it, but he had no doubt that in a very short time they would be able to communicate to the House ample information as to their intentions.

The discussion was then made regular by Atty. Gen. MACDONALD formally proposing that an Address be presented to Her Majesty.

HON. MR. HOLTON said that the universal law of Parliament with respect either to bills or addresses looking to the disposal of public property or funds, or additions to the burdens of the country, was that the measure must originate in Committee of the Whole. This Confederation scheme disposed of the whole assets of the country, and established burdens which were to be applied to the purposes of the provinces of New Brunswick and Newfoundland, besides paying eighty cents per head of population to all the various provinces. This appropriation of property indeed ran throughout the scheme. Not only so, but the usage on all similar occasions was to introduce the measure in Committee of the Whole. The act of union between England and Ireland was originated in this way, and so was our own act of union in the legislature of Upper Canada under the management of Mr. POULET THOMPSON, who was well known to be an able English parliamentarian. The

same course was taken on our own Reform Bill under the HINCKS Government.

ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD said that any measure appropriating money must originate in Committee of the Whole, but it was otherwise with an Address to the Crown, asking to recommend a grant of money. This was an address asking the Crown to make a great constitutional change. Now, supposing that it was asking to have the Constitution done away with altogether, must such an address originate in committee? Clearly not. The money to be appropriated was to be granted by legislatures which did not yet exist.

HON. A. A. DORION—There is nothing more plain than that, according to the standing order of the House of Commons, any measure appropriating money or any Address to the Crown asking for a grant of money, or that expenses may be incurred, must originate in Committee of the Whole. Our own 80th rule was in a similar sense, setting forth that motions tending to grant an aid or to make any charge upon the people must originate in committee. Now, surely these resolutions tended to create a charge upon the people. Among other things they bound the country to make a railway.

ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—That will be made by the Confederate Government, not by this Government. We are not granting any money.

HON. A. A. DORION—Nor do you ever grant money when you ask the Crown to recommend the grant, since the Crown may refuse; surely if a matter involving \$5 or \$50 must originate in committee, so large a matter as this must do so.

ATTY. GEN. CARTIER spoke of Hon. Mr. DORION's remarks as absurd, as not a farthing of money was being appropriated. It was quite true the rule of the Imperial Parliament might seem to go as far as Hon. Mr. DORION said, but we had no such rule. Ours was founded on the Union Act, which merely said that no appropriation could be made, except after a Message from His Excellency, which must be referred to a committee. The Union Act was our law, and to-morrow the British Parliament, with the sanction of the Queen, might abolish the Constitution.

MR. DUNKIN—The Attorney General was the very BAYARD of defenders of every little corporation which had received its charter from that legislature; that was of every corporation or company which enjoyed his favor, from none of which he would take away the

smallest part of the privileges ever conferred upon them, and yet he asserted that the whole privileges and rights of this great colony could be taken away to-morrow by the Imperial Parliament. He (Mr. DUNKIN) denied that all our rights were held at pleasure, but, if they were, that had nothing to do with the matter. If we were precluded from giving away small sums of money, except in a particular way, surely we were debarred from giving away all our rights. The British Parliament could declare that a man is a woman, and he must thereafter legally be called a woman, but that did not make him one.

HON. MR. GALT said clearly no charge was put on the people by this Address; not a penny could be taken out of the public chest in consequence of it. He thought also the spirit of the rules was no more infringed than their letter, by taking the course proposed by the Attorney General West; because, if the Address passed, the Imperial Act would refer again to the people the power of disposing of this property by their votes.

MR. SPEAKER decided as follows:—

The honorable member for Chateauguay has submitted that the motion is not in order, "inasmuch as the proposed Address prays the Crown to recommend to the Imperial Parliament the passage of an Act laying new burdens on the people of this Province, and making dispositions as to the public property and money of this Province, the law of Parliament requires that it should be founded on Resolutions originated in Committee of the whole House." Now, the 4th clause of the 14th section of the Consolidated Statutes of Canada, "The Legislative Assembly shall not originate or pass any Vote, Resolution or Bill for the appropriation of any part of the said Consolidated Revenue Fund, or of any other tax or impost, to any purpose which has not been first recommended by a Message of the Governor to the Legislative Assembly, during the Session in which such Vote, Resolution or Bill is passed;" and the 88th Rule of this House, "If any motion be made in the House for any public aid or charge upon the people, the consideration and debate thereof may not be presently entered upon, but shall be adjourned till such further day as the House shall think fit to appoint; and then it shall be referred to a Committee of the whole House before any Resolution or Vote of the House do pass thereupon," which seems to be based thereon, refer to Resolutions or to an Address upon which some future action of this House is to be based. I fail to see in this motion that the action of this House is to be involved any further after passing this Resolution. As this matter was discussed before I left the chair, at six o'clock, I took occasion to put in writing my opinion upon the subject. I will read: "The motion is for an Address to Her Majesty, in which

the Resolutions on Confederation of the Provinces are set out. How does this differ from an Address moved to His Excellency, which always comes on motion upon a two days' notice given as in this case? I cannot see how, as a point of Order, I can treat the matter other than as in the ordinary case of an Address. The argument is that it will be inconvenient so to discuss it. That is not addressed to a question of Order, but to one of convenience. The case cited by the honorable member for Chateaugay of Resolutions upon the question of a Bill for the Government of India was not one of Resolutions for an Address, but of Resolutions simply, containing the proposed principles of the Bill intended to be introduced. It is not pretended here that this House has any right to pass such a Bill, or that it is intended to present one on that subject here. The reasons why it is convenient to discuss matters in the form of a Resolution on which a Bill is afterwards to be introduced, is that Resolutions more easily admit of alteration. The Government have expressed their determination not to admit of any alterations in these Resolutions. Thus it is obvious that the same reasons for going into Committee do not hold. The member who moves an Address can force the vote on his motion in the manner he has put it, unless the form of it be changed by amendment, and this appears to be the only course open here. In truth the word 'Resolutions' might very well have been omitted altogether from this motion. Whatever might have been the result on a mere question of convenience, it is certain that the Speaker does not decide that matter. His duties are to preserve order and decorum, and to decide questions of Order."

ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD moved that the debate be adjourned and made the first order for Monday after half-past seven o'clock, P.M.

HON. MR. HOLTON raised the objection that this motion could not be put without two days' notice.

ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD said if this was the sort of tactics to be pursued, and an attempt made to embarrass the Government at every step, he must withdraw the concession made to the member for Peel, and would give notice that he would move on Tuesday, that the debate be continued from day to day until the Address was finally adopted or rejected by the House.

After some discussion, Hon. Mr. HOLTON withdrew his objection, and Atty. Gen. MACDONALD his notice.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL:

MONDAY, *February 6, 1865.*

HON. MR. CAMPBELL said that, with the permission of the honorable member who had the floor (Hon. Mr. CURRIE), he would offer a few remarks upon one portion of the scheme of Confederation, to which allusion had been specially made in the House, and which, to a limited extent, had occupied the attention of the country. He referred to the proposed constitution of the Legislative Council under that scheme; and in offering the reasons which had led the Canadian Government and the other members of the Conference, which, as honorable members knew, was composed of the leading men in the legislatures of the several provinces—the leading men in opposition as well as the leading men in office—to decide as they had done, he begged the House to believe that the decision had not been arrived at hastily, but after prolonged and anxious discussion, and after a full and careful consideration of the subject. It was not to be supposed that the Government of Canada had itself laid down the scheme of the constitution as embraced in the resolutions on the table of the House. Honorable gentlemen must not misunderstand him. He did not mean to say that the Government did not heartily concur in and adopt the scheme, but that it was not its work alone, but that of the delegates from the other provinces as well. It was the result of deliberation, accommodation and compromise. When it became necessary for the Government to press the resolutions, he trusted honorable members would not suppose that they did so out of that love which people have for the creation of their own intellect, but would remember they were the joint production of the gentlemen to whom he alluded, and that any pertinacity on his part arose from a sense of the sacrifices they had made to secure an agreement, and the difficulties which any failure now would create. He felt it had been impossible for the Conference to arrive at any other understanding, and he only wished that those who looked with disfavor upon their plan, could have witnessed the anxious debates held at Charlottetown and Quebec before it was finally settled. The result arrived at would, he hoped, promote the welfare of the provinces interested, and be remembered with gratitude by their inhabitants many long years hence. [And supposing this Chamber and the other were to come to a different opinion

and reject the resolutions, what would be the effect? The sacrifices and compromises submitted to by the representatives of the several provinces would go for nothing; the efforts of the eminent men who had put aside personal and party differences to accomplish what they deemed a great and good work would be futile; and yet, by such men only could such a scheme have been devised and matured. Considering then the earnest efforts made to secure this agreement, and the improbability that, if rejected, any other could be attempted with better hope of success, he felt he had a right to ask the House to give the subject a fair, patient, and favorable consideration. If an amendment were proposed here, and another there, and especially if the provision respecting the constitution of the House were changed, it was pretty certain that the whole thing would miscarry, for he well knew that in respect of this point the legislatures of the Lower Provinces would come to a different conclusion. If the elective principle were insisted upon in Canada, and its Government bound over to maintain it, even though another Conference were called, no agreement could be expected, for as he had already said, the delegates from the other provinces would be sure to be charged with exactly different instructions. And as of this particular point, so of a hundred others, until it would be utterly impossible again to arrive at anything like unanimity. As the honorable member for Brock had so well said on a previous evening, any failure now would be extremely damaging to our credit abroad. It was well known that the fact of our public men having thrown aside their political partizanship for the purpose of advancing the welfare of the country, the holding of the Conference, and the agreement secured, had already done us a great deal of good at home. But not only would this first fruit of the work be forfeited, but an injury more than correspondingly great would follow. (Hear, hear.) [The honorable member elaborated this idea at some length with the view of showing the beneficial effect the adoption of the scheme of Confederation had produced, and the disastrous consequences which its rejection by Parliament must inevitably entail.] He did not propose to follow his honorable friend the Premier in the discussion of the merits of the project as a whole; the able manner in which that honorable member had presented it could not but have commended itself to every candid mind. (Hear, hear.) He (Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL) would, however, take up the point to

which he had alluded at the commencement, and from which he had for a moment digressed, and give the reasons which had induced the Conference to determine as they had done, upon the constitution of the Upper House. And the main reason was to give each of the provinces adequate security for the protection of its local interests, a protection which it was feared might not be found in a House where the representation was based upon numbers only, as would be the case in the General Assembly. The number of representatives to the Legislative Council under the Federal constitution would be limited, and they would be appointed for life instead of elected by the people. For the purpose of securing equality in that House, the Confederation would be divided into two sections, viz.: Upper Canada, Lower Canada, and the Maritime Provinces, and each of these sections would send twenty-four members to the House. In Upper Canada, as had been stated lately by an honorable member, the population has increased very rapidly, and would probably go on increasing in a much larger ratio than that of Lower Canada or the other provinces, and if the Legislative Council were elective, the time might come when the people of that section would fancy themselves entitled to an increased representation in the Council, and commerce to agitate for it. They might object to the fishing bounties paid the Lower Province, to the money expended there in fortifications, or to something else, and claim a representation in the Council, more in accordance with their population to enforce their views; and in view of such contingencies the delegates from those provinces conceived it would not be safe to trust their rights to an elective House. It was then determined that in one branch there would be a fixed number of members nominated by the Crown, to enable it to act as a counterpoise to the branch in which the principle of representation according to population would be recognized. It might be said that the principle of limitation of numbers could have been adopted, and that of election preserved. Well, he did not say the scheme was perfect, but it was the best that could be devised, and as the Lower Provinces felt the danger from their inferiority of numbers, being only 800,000 against double that number in Upper Canada alone, it was essential that the security which a fixed representation in the Council afforded to them should be acceded to. The Conference acted upon the conviction that they were not building a structure for a temporary purpose, but,

as they hoped, for centuries, and knowing how the doctrine of representation according to population had operated in distracting the popular branch of the Legislature in Canada, they endeavored to provide against a similarly disturbing cause in the Confederation. And their precaution appeared to him to be founded in wisdom and justice. For the sake of argument let it be supposed that the elective principle is maintained, and that the limit of numbers now proposed, viz., 24 members for each of the three grand sections in the Council is also fixed; let it be supposed further, that the population of Upper Canada continues to augment as in the past, what may not be that of the Saugeen, Tecumseth and Eastern Divisions (which now have 130,000, 90,000 and 60,000 respectively) forty or fifty years hence? And is it not possible, nay, would it not be likely, that these great constituencies, when comparing them with the divisions in Prince Edward Island, numbering some twenty thousand to twenty-five thousand souls, would be disposed to set up claims for additional representation? Who that looks to the future will say that with an elective Upper House the Constitution will last? It was the apprehension of danger to its permanency that decided the Conference to adopt the principle of nomination to the superior branch, and it was the only way which suggested itself for averting it. And he must say for himself, that he fully and entirely concurred in the decision. He felt that the principle of election kept alive a germ of doubt as to the security of the Lower Provinces, and he was glad that a way was found of removing it altogether. It was well known that even in the United States, where there was so prevalent a disposition to submit everything to the decision of the people, the principle of limitation to the Upper House was so fully recognized and settled by the Constitution, that no attempt was ever made to change it. In this way the smallest state, like Rhode Island, was as fully represented as the state of New York. And if that was considered necessary in a country so compact together as the United States, how much more would it not be proper in a Confederation, some of the sections of which were separated from each other by long, narrow strips of land, or wide estuaries, with small representation in the popular branch, and looking chiefly to their equality in the Upper Chamber for security for local rights and interests and institutions. He was gratified, upon another ground, that this decision had been attained, and this, was on the ground of the respect he

bore to the life-members of this Chamber. In the law which had made the House elective there was no wiser provision than that which had guaranteed the seat of the members appointed by the Crown, who then composed it. He had always felt the great advantage of the presence of those honorable members here. If the elective system had entirely superseded the nominated House, removed those gentlemen and brought together forty-eight entirely new members, the country would have suffered a grievous loss; but the old members kept their places and the new ones came in twelve at a time, two years apart, so that the change from one system to the other was effected without any injury. The nominated members had retained their influence, and the tone of calmness and gravity which had obtained in their deliberations was insensibly acquired by the elective members as they came in, to the manifest advantage of the House. We (speaking of the elected members) had picked up the spirit of, and the instruction the Crown members were so fully competent to give us, and so had been enabled to discharge our duties in a way we could not possibly have done if had we been left to ourselves. If the life-members had been deprived of their seats, it was not probable that many, if any of them, would have sought a restoration to them by the elective process, for they were generally gentlemen of wealth, position, and delicacy of feeling, whose habits of mutual deference, quietness and order, would have unfitted them, or made them averse to face the turmoil and excitement of the unfavorable electioneering contests. These honorable gentlemen, under an elective system, must have been deprived of their seats, and their services have been lost to the country; whilst under the nominative system they will stand on the same footing as the other members of this House, and have a fair representation along with the members holding their seats by election in the Legislative Council of the Confederate Parliament. (Hear, hear.) Passing on to another point, he would remark that some persons had asked what would be done if the two Chambers of the Confederation came into collision? He had already remarked that the Legislative Council was intended as a counterpoise to the weight of numbers in the Assembly, but such a counterpoise did not necessarily imply the probability of collision. It was not likely that the two branches would come into such collision upon minor subjects, or subjects of minor importance, for two such bodies should not, for

the mere sake of resistance, oppose each other in such a way; they would not venture to do it. He did not remember that there had been any really difficult matter of this kind for a long time. This House had rejected the Squatters' Bill, as it was called, seven or eight times after it had been passed by the Assembly, but that had not impaired the good understanding between them. Indeed the effect had been of the best. The hon. life-member from Cobourg [Hon. Mr. BOULTON], whom he did not see in his place, had, by the force of reasoning, convinced the House that the bill was destructive of the rights of property, and the consequence was that, year by year, the measure had been pruned of its most offensive features, until now, as he was informed, it was hardly open to objection. He could not recall another instance of persistent difference of opinion between the Chambers. The real danger of collision would be where one Chamber invaded the prerogatives of the other, and that danger, if it existed at all, would be greatly increased were the Legislative Council made elective. (Hear, hear.) If the members were elected they might say, "We come from the people just as directly as the members of the Assembly do, and our authority is, therefore, as full and complete as theirs. Nay, more, for where we each represent 1000 electors, they only each represent 300, and we have, therefore, as much right to initiate money bills and impost bills as they have." Make the Council purely elective, and he would not promise that an agitation of this kind would not spring up. It had not been a theme as yet on the floor of the House, but it was well known that it had been freely discussed in the corridors, and if the subject had not been formally introduced, it was probably because it was thought by those who debated it that they could not rely upon the life-members. (Hear, hear.) Let the Council propose to deal with taxation and the elective system would be sure in the course of time to urge it on to do so, and immediately the spirit of the Assembly would be aroused to resistance. This would be the way to provoke collisions, and with an elective Council it was not unlikely at all to be resorted to. In England, where the Upper House was composed of a class entirely distinct from the Commons, and having interests, as a general thing, diverse from those of the people, even there the collisions between the two branches had been but infrequent. Indeed there had been only one very serious collision in the course of centuries. When, however, such conjunctures arose, the crown overcame

them by the appointment of a sufficient number of peers whose political views accorded with those of the government. The right to sit in the House of Lords being, however, hereditary, the son generally inherited the politics of his father, and so the character of the body was always pretty well understood; but be it what it might, and as much as possible removed from popular influences, it had yet learned so far to respect the will of the people as to know when to make concession of its own opinions. He did not say that it bowed to every breeze and instantly yielded to every demand, nor did he think that any Legislative Upper Chamber should do so, and be content merely to reflect the temper and complexion of the other branch. On the contrary, he held that when it had good and sufficient evidence, sufficient to satisfy itself that a proposed measure was unjust, it was bound to resist, and public opinion which generally came out right in the end, would sustain it in such an attitude. But there was very much less danger in countries like this that difference of opinion would even be as frequent between the Legislative Chambers as between the Lords and Commons in England. and the reason was clear: our Legislative Councillors would not come from so different a class of society to the general population, as the peers of the British nation, compared with the people of that nation. The lords had ideas of caste and privileges which none of our people were imbrued with, and the common sympathy existing between all classes here would be felt equally by the Legislative Councillors and the Members of the Assembly. Both would be equally subjected to popular influences and be more or less controlled by them. The interests of the Legislative Councillor, though a nominee of the Crown, would be the same as those of the mass, and the legislation which would be good for them would, as a general thing, be good for him too. He would have no ancestral estates, privileges, immunities and titles to protect, like the peers of England. He would be affected by the social changes which affected others, and would be moved by the same aims and aspirations as his friends around him. This being the case, it was not very probable that his opinions would even be set in opposition to those of other men as to make it likely that he would come in collision with them, or that, as a House, the Council would be in danger of a serious quarrel with the Assembly. Then the changes which time would inevitably bring about in a body like the proposed Legis-

lative Council, would be sufficiently great to prevent the possibility of a continued antagonism between it and the other branch, if unhappily it should arise. The demise, the resignation and the loss of seat from other causes, would do this, and afford the Government of the day the opportunity of so reconstructing the House as to bring it more in harmony with public sentiment. He did not say it was desirable that at all times the Legislative Council should be a reflection of such opinion, though it was, of course, desirable that it should not continue violently to shock it. He would have that House conservative, calm, considerate and watchful, to prevent the enactment of measures which, in its deliberate judgment, were not calculated to advance the common weal. Any more rapid changes in the composition of the House than those he now indicated, he did not consider wholesome or desirable. From the history of the present Chamber for the last few years, it would be seen that such changes, whether among the life members or the elected members, were much more frequent than might be generally supposed. According to the present elective system twelve members went out and twelve came in every second year. Supposing that a collision had taken place between the two branches of the Legislature, and that it was desirable to bring the Council more in accord with the representatives of the people, under this system, the same members might be returned, not because of the soundness of their political opinions on the topic which had brought about the collision, perhaps without the slightest reference to it, but from their position and their exertions. One might come back because he was a wealthy man and had a social position which gave him a large influence, another because he was an able canvasser and well versed in election tactics, and others from causes equally removed from the political question upon which the two Houses of Parliament were in antagonism. But suppose the twelve seats were at the disposal of the Government, and that an irreconcilable difference had existed between the two Houses, would they not have the opportunity of redress at once and thoroughly by bringing in twelve members who would harmonize better in opinion with them and the country? Undoubtedly. Well, within eight years the changes among the life-members had been as follows:—When the House was made elective, there were 40 such members in it; two years afterwards, at the call of the House, the number was found reduced to 31; two years after

that again to 26; in two years more, to 24; and to-day to 21, of which 21, one honorable member was now seriously indisposed. In eight years, then, the number had been diminished by half. Then changes nearly as great had occurred among the elected members. There had been 24 removals and changes by death and otherwise among these 48; and it should be remembered, that as the elected members came in by twelves, two years apart, the average time had been only four years. This was sufficient to show the opportunity which, even among younger men than the life-members, the Government would have of keeping the House in accord with the true interests of the country, or of overcoming any unfortunate misunderstanding between the two branches. [The honorable member here went minutely into a statement of the changes effected by death, acceptance of office, and defeat at elections, among this class of members, which, however, we do not deem it necessary to specify.] These changes had certainly altered, to some extent, the complexion of the House, and the future would, no doubt, be like the past in this respect. The Conference had taken all these things into consideration, and wisely concluded, as he believed, that while the chances of collision were much less under the nominative system, the opportunity of restoring harmonious action was infinitely more prompt and effective, and that there was no such danger of collisions between the two branches of the General Legislature, as to make it a bar to the principle of nomination, which principle, in their judgment, offered the compensating advantage he had endeavored, in the earlier part of his observations, to point out. He sincerely hoped the House would concur in the views he had expressed, and would accept the measure now before them, as one which he believed calculated to promote the best interests of this country and the other provinces, and to hand down to posterity a constitution analogous, as nearly as might be, to that of the empire under whose protection we had the happiness to live—a Constitution calculated further, as he was fully convinced, to perpetuate the connection between these colonies and that mighty nation, to the mutual benefit of both. (Hear, hear, and applause.)

HON. MR. VIDAL here inquired from the honorable member why it was that the selection of Legislative Councillors from Lower Canada, in the Confederation scheme, was to be left to the Local Government of that section of the province, while no such provision existed with

respect to Upper Canada or the Lower Provinces.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL said it was out of deference to the interests of the British Canadians of Lower Canada, who had some fear that they might not be sufficiently protected otherwise.

HON. MR. RYAN objected to this mode of selection, as calculated to perpetuate differences of nationality and creed, and thought it would be better to leave the selection unconditionally to the Crown.

[After this a number of questions were put to Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL upon various points of detail, and a cross fire was kept up from both sides of the House, which made it next to impossible to keep track of the proceedings.]

Among the questions asked was one as to whether the local governments should be constituted before the Constitution of the Confederation became law. The resolution concerning this point seemed involved and contradictory, as it supposed some part of the plan to be in force, which depended upon the action of local governments not themselves in existence.]

HON. MR. CAMPBELL promised to give an explanation at the next sitting of the House.

HON. MR. SANBORN then addressed the House for a few minutes, it being then nearly six o'clock. He did not declare himself directly opposed to the scheme as a whole, but believed that the abandonment of the elective principle in respect of the Legislative Council was a step backward and an unwise one. He quoted as a proof the opinion of the Premier of the Government expressed two years ago, and thought it not a little strange he should so readily have changed his views—

Cries of six o'clock.

Further debate was then postponed until the morrow, and the House immediately afterwards adjourned.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

MONDAY, February 6, 1865.

ATTORNEY GENERAL MACDONALD moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She may be graciously pleased to cause a measure to be submitted to the Imperial Parliament, for the purpose of uniting the Colonies of Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, and Prince Edward Island,

in one Government, with provisions based on certain Resolutions, which were adopted at a Conference of Delegates from the said Colonies, held at the city of Quebec, on the 10th October, 1864."* He said:—Mr. Speaker, in fulfilment of the promise made by the Government to Parliament at its last session, I have moved this resolution. I have had the honor of being charged, on behalf of the Government, to submit a scheme for the Confederation of all the British North American Provinces—a scheme which has been received, I am glad to say, with general, if not universal, approbation in Canada. The scheme, as propounded through the press, has received almost no opposition. While there may be occasionally, here and there, expressions of dissent from some of the details, yet the scheme as a whole has met with almost universal approval, and the Government has the greatest satisfaction in presenting it to this House. This subject, which now absorbs the attention of the people of Canada, and of the whole of British North America, is not a new one. For years it has more or less attracted the attention of every statesman and politician in these provinces, and has been looked upon by many far-seeing politicians as being eventually the means of deciding and settling very many of the vexed questions which have retarded the prosperity of the colonies as a whole, and particularly the prosperity of Canada. The subject was pressed upon the public attention by a great many writers and politicians; but I believe the attention of the Legislature was first formally called to it by my honorable friend the Minister of Finance. Some years ago, in an elaborate speech, my hon. friend, while an independent member of Parliament, before being connected with any Government, pressed his views on the Legislature at great length and with his usual force. But the subject was not taken up by any party as a branch of their policy, until the formation of the CARTIER-MACDONALD Administration in 1858, when the Confederation of the colonies was announced as one of the measures which they pledged themselves to attempt, if possible, to bring to a satisfactory conclusion. In pursuance of that promise, the letter or despatch, which has been so much and so freely commented upon in the press and in this House, was addressed by three of the members of that Administration to the Colonial Office. The

* For Resolutions, see Legislative Council, page 1.

subject, however, though looked upon with favor by the country, and though there were no distinct expressions of opposition to it from any party, did not begin to assume its present proportions until last session. Then, men of all parties and all shades of politics became alarmed at the aspect of affairs. They found that such was the opposition between the two sections of the province, such was the danger of impending anarchy, in consequence of the irreconcilable differences of opinion, with respect to representation by population, between Upper and Lower Canada, that unless some solution of the difficulty was arrived at, we would suffer under a succession of weak governments,—weak in numerical support, weak in force, and weak in power of doing good. All were alarmed at this state of affairs. We had election after election,—we had ministry after ministry,—with the same result. Parties were so equally balanced, that the vote of one member might decide the fate of the Administration, and the course of legislation for a year or a series of years. This condition of things was well calculated to arouse the earnest consideration of every lover of his country, and I am happy to say it had that effect. None were more impressed by this momentous state of affairs, and the grave apprehensions that existed of a state of anarchy destroying our credit, destroying our prosperity, destroying our progress, than were the members of this present House; and the leading statesmen on both sides seemed to have come to the common conclusion, that some step must be taken to relieve the country from the dead-lock and impending anarchy that hung over us.—With that view, my colleague, the President of the Council, made a motion founded on the despatch addressed to the Colonial Minister, to which I have referred, and a committee was struck, composed of gentlemen of both sides of the House, of all shades of political opinion, without any reference to whether they were supporters of the Administration of the day or belonged to the Opposition, for the purpose of taking into calm and full deliberation the evils which threatened the future of Canada. That motion of my honorable friend resulted most happily. The committee, by a wise provision,—and in order that each member of the committee might have an opportunity of expressing his opinions without being in any way compromised before the public, or with his party, in

regard either to his political friends or to his political foes,—agreed that the discussion should be freely entered upon without reference to the political antecedents of any of them, and that they should sit with closed doors, so that they might be able to approach the subject frankly and in a spirit of compromise. The committee included most of the leading members of the House,—I had the honor myself to be one of the number,—and the result was that there was found an ardent desire—a creditable desire, I must say,—displayed by all the members of the committee to approach the subject honestly, and to attempt to work out some solution which might relieve Canada from the evils under which she labored. The report of that committee was laid before the House, and then came the political action of the leading men of the two parties in this House, which ended in the formation of the present Government. The principle upon which that Government was formed has been announced, and is known to all. It was formed for the very purpose of carrying out the object which has now received to a certain degree its completion, by the resolutions I have had the honor to place in your hands. As has been stated, it was not without a great deal of difficulty and reluctance that that Government was formed. The gentlemen who compose this Government had for many years been engaged in political hostilities to such an extent that it affected even their social relations. But the crisis was great, the danger was imminent, and the gentlemen who now form the present Administration found it to be their duty to lay aside all personal feelings, to sacrifice in some degree their position, and even to run the risk of having their motives impugned, for the sake of arriving at some conclusion that would be satisfactory to the country in general. The present resolutions were the result. And, as I said before, I am proud to believe that the country has sanctioned, as I trust that the representatives of the people in this House will sanction, the scheme which is now submitted for the future government of British North America. (Cheers.) Everything seemed to favor the project, and everything seemed to shew that the present was the time, if ever, when this great union between all Her Majesty's subjects dwelling in British North America, should be carried out. (Hear, hear.) When the Government was formed, it was felt that the difficulties in the way of effecting a union between all the British North Amer-

ican Colonies were great—so great as almost, in the opinion of many, to make it hopeless. And with that view it was the policy of the Government, if they could not succeed in procuring a union between all the British North American Colonies, to attempt to free the country from the dead-lock in which we were placed in Upper and Lower Canada, in consequence of the difference of opinion between the two sections, by having a severance to a certain extent of the present union between the two provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, and the substitution of a Federal Union between them. Most of us, however, I may say, all of us, were agreed—and I believe every thinking man will agree—as to the expediency of effecting a union between all the provinces, and the superiority of such a design, if it were only practicable, over the smaller scheme of having a Federal Union between Upper and Lower Canada alone. By a happy concurrence of events, the time came when that proposition could be made with a hope of success. By a fortunate coincidence the desire for union existed in the Lower Provinces, and a feeling of the necessity of strengthening themselves by collecting together the scattered colonies on the sea-board, had induced them to form a convention of their own for the purpose of effecting a union of the Maritime Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, the legislatures of those colonies having formally authorized their respective governments to send a delegation to Prince Edward Island for the purpose of attempting to form a union of some kind. Whether the union should be federal or legislative was not then indicated, but a union of some kind was sought for the purpose of making of themselves one people instead of three. We, ascertaining that they were about to take such a step, and knowing that if we allowed the occasion to pass, if they did indeed break up all their present political organizations and form a new one, it could not be expected that they would again readily destroy the new organization which they had formed,—the union of the three provinces on the sea-board,—and form another with Canada. Knowing this, we availed ourselves of the opportunity, and asked if they would receive a deputation from Canada, who would go to meet them at Charlottetown, for the purpose of laying before them the advantages of a larger and more extensive union, by the junction of all the provinces in one great government under our common Sovereign. They

at once kindly consented to receive and hear us. They did receive us cordially and generously, and asked us to lay our views before them. We did so at some length, and so satisfactory to them were the reasons we gave; so clearly, in their opinion, did we shew the advantages of the greater union over the lesser, that they at once set aside their own project, and joined heart and hand with us in entering into the larger scheme, and trying to form, as far as they and we could, a great nation and a strong government. (Cheers.) Encouraged by this arrangement, which, however, was altogether unofficial and unauthorized, we returned to Quebec, and then the Government of Canada invited the several governments of the sister colonies to send a deputation here from each of them for the purpose of considering the question, with something like authority from their respective governments. The result was, that when we met here on the 10th of October, on the first day on which we assembled, after the full and free discussions which had taken place at Charlottetown, the first resolution now before this House was passed unanimously, being received with acclamation as, in the opinion of every one who heard it, a proposition which ought to receive, and would receive, the sanction of each government and each people. The resolution is, "That the best interests and present and future prosperity of British North America will be promoted by a Federal Union under the Crown of Great Britain, provided such union can be effected on principles just to the several provinces." It seemed to all the statesmen assembled—and there are great statesmen in the Lower Provinces, men who would do honor to any government and to any legislature of any free country enjoying representative institutions—it was clear to them all that the best interests and present and future prosperity of British North America would be promoted by a Federal Union under the Crown of Great Britain. And it seems to me, as to them, and I think it will so appear to the people of this country, that, if we wish to be a great people; if we wish to form—using the expression which was sneered at the other evening—a great nationality, commanding the respect of the world, able to hold our own against all opponents, and to defend those institutions we prize: if we wish to have one system of government, and to establish a commercial union, with unrestricted free trade, between people of the five provinces, belonging, as they do, to the same nation, obeying

the same Sovereign, owning the same allegiance, and being, for the most part, of the same blood and lineage : if we wish to be able to afford to each other the means of mutual defence and support against aggression and attack—this can only be obtained by a union of some kind between the scattered and weak boundaries composing the British North American Provinces. (Cheers). The very mention of the scheme is fitted to bring with it its own approbation. Supposing that in the spring of the year 1865, half a million of people were coming from the United Kingdom to make Canada their home, although they brought only their strong arms and willing hearts ; though they brought neither skill nor experience nor wealth, would we not receive them with open arms, and hail their presence in Canada as an important addition to our strength ? But when, by the proposed union, we not only get nearly a million of people to join us—when they contribute not only their numbers, their physical strength, and their desire to benefit their position, but when we know that they consist of old-established communities, having a large amount of realized wealth,—composed of people possessed of skill, education and experience in the ways of the New World—people who are as much Canadians, I may say, as we are—people who are imbued with the same feelings of loyalty to the Queen, and the same desire for the continuance of the connection with the Mother Country as we are, and at the same time, have a like feeling of ardent attachment for this, our common country, for which they and we would alike fight and shed our blood, if necessary. When all this is considered, argument is needless to prove the advantage of such a union. (Hear, hear.) There were only three modes,—if I may return for a moment to the difficulties with which Canada was surrounded,—only three modes that were at all suggested, by which the dead lock in our affairs, the anarchy we dreaded, and the evils which retarded our prosperity, could be met or averted. One was the dissolution of the union between Upper and Lower Canada, leaving them as they were before the union of 1841. I believe that that proposition, by itself had no supporters. It was felt by every one that, although it was a course that would do away with the sectional difficulties which existed,—though it would remove the pressure on the part of the people of Upper Canada for the representation based upon

population,—and the jealousy of the people of Lower Canada lest their institutions should be attacked and prejudiced by that principle in our representation ; yet it was felt by every thinking man in the province that it would be a retrograde step, which would throw back the country to nearly the same position as it occupied before the union,—that it would lower the credit enjoyed by United Canada,—that it would be the breaking up of the connection which had existed for nearly a quarter of a century, and, under which, although it had not been completely successful, and had not allayed altogether the local jealousies that had their root in circumstances which arose before the union, our province, as a whole, had nevertheless prospered and increased. It was felt that a dissolution of the union would have destroyed all the credit that we had gained by being a united province, and would have left us two weak and ineffective governments, instead of one powerful and united people. (Hear, hear.) The next mode suggested, was the granting of representation by population. Now, we all know the manner in which that question was and is regarded by Lower Canada ; that while in Upper Canada the desire and cry for it was daily augmenting, the resistance to it in Lower Canada was proportionably increasing in strength. Still, if some such means of relieving us from the sectional jealousies which existed between the two Canadas, if some such solution of the difficulties as Confederation had not been found, the representation by population must eventually have been carried ; no matter though it might have been felt in Lower Canada, as being a breach of the Treaty of Union, no matter how much it might have been felt by the Lower Canadians that it would sacrifice their local interests, it is certain that in the progress of events representation by population would have been carried ; and, had it been carried—I speak here my own individual sentiments—I do not think it would have been for the interest of Upper Canada. For though Upper Canada would have felt that it had received what it claimed as a right, and had succeeded in establishing its right, yet it would have left the Lower Province with a sullen feeling of injury and injustice. The Lower Canadians would not have worked cheerfully under such a change of system, but would have ceased to be what they are now—a nationality, with representatives

in Parliament, governed by general principles, and dividing according to their political opinions—and would have been in great danger of becoming a faction, forgetful of national obligations, and only actuated by a desire to defend their own sectional interests, their own laws, and their own institutions. (Hear, hear.) The third and only means of solution for our difficulties was the junction of the provinces either in a Federal or a Legislative Union. Now, as regards the comparative advantages of a Legislative and a Federal Union, I have never hesitated to state my own opinions. I have again and again stated in the House, that, if practicable, I thought a Legislative Union would be preferable. (Hear, hear.) I have always contended that if we could agree to have one government and one parliament, legislating for the whole of these peoples, it would be the best, the cheapest, the most vigorous, and the strongest system of government we could adopt. (Hear, hear.) But, on looking at the subject in the Conference, and discussing the matter as we did, most unreservedly, and with a desire to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion, we found that such a system was impracticable. In the first place, it would not meet the assent of the people of Lower Canada, because they felt that in their peculiar position—being in a minority, with a different language, nationality and religion from the majority,—in case of a junction with the other provinces, their institutions and their laws might be assailed, and their ancestral associations, on which they prided themselves, attacked and prejudiced; it was found that any proposition which involved the absorption of the individuality of Lower Canada—if I may use the expression—would not be received with favor by her people. We found too, that though their people speak the same language and enjoy the same system of law as the people of Upper Canada, a system founded on the common law of England, there was as great a disinclination on the part of the various Maritime Provinces to lose their individuality, as separate political organizations, as we observed in the case of Lower Canada herself. (Hear, hear.) Therefore, we were forced to the conclusion that we must either abandon the idea of Union altogether, or devise a system of union in which the separate provincial organizations would be in some degree preserved. So that those who were, like myself, in favor of a Legislative Union, were obliged to modify

their views and accept the project of a Federal Union as the only scheme practicable, even for the Maritime Provinces. Because, although the law of those provinces is founded on the common law of England, yet every one of them has a large amount of law of its own—colonial law framed by itself, and affecting every relation of life, such as the laws of property, municipal and assessment laws; laws relating to the liberty of the subject, and to all the great interests contemplated in legislation; we found, in short, that the statutory law of the different provinces was so varied and diversified that it was almost impossible to weld them into a Legislative Union at once. Why, sir, if you only consider the innumerable subjects of legislation peculiar to new countries, and that every one of those five colonies had particular laws of its own, to which its people have been accustomed and are attached, you will see the difficulty of effecting and working a Legislative Union, and bringing about an assimilation of the local as well as general laws of the whole of the provinces. (Hear, hear.) We in Upper Canada understand from the nature and operation of our peculiar municipal law, of which we know the value, the difficulty of framing a general system of legislation on local matters which would meet the wishes and fulfil the requirements of the several provinces. Even the laws considered the least important, respecting private rights in timber, roads, fencing, and innumerable other matters, small in themselves, but in the aggregate of great interest to the agricultural class, who form the great body of the people, are regarded as of great value by the portion of the community affected by them. And when we consider that every one of the colonies has a body of law of this kind, and that it will take years before those laws can be assimilated, it was felt that at first, at all events, any united legislation would be almost impossible. I am happy to state—and indeed it appears on the face of the resolutions themselves—that as regards the Lower Provinces, a great desire was evinced for the final assimilation of our laws. One of the resolutions provides that an attempt shall be made to assimilate the laws of the Maritime Provinces and those of Upper Canada, for the purpose of eventually establishing one body of statutory law, founded on the common law of England, the parent of the laws of all those provinces. One great ob-

jection made to a Federal Union was the expense of an increased number of legislatures. I will not enter at any length into that subject, because my honorable friends, the Finance Minister and the President of the Council, who are infinitely more competent than myself to deal with matters of this kind—matters of account—will, I think, be able to show that the expenses under a Federal Union will not be greater than those under the existing system of separate governments and legislatures. Here, where we have a joint legislature for Upper and Lower Canada, which deals not only with subjects of a general interest common to all Canada, but with all matters of private right and of sectional interest, and with that class of measures known as “private bills,” we find that one of the greatest sources of expense to the country is the cost of legislation. We find, from the admixture of subjects of a general, with those of a private character in legislation, that they mutually interfere with each other; whereas, if the attention of the Legislature was confined to measures of one kind or the other alone, the session of Parliament would not be so protracted and therefore not so expensive as at present. In the proposed Constitution all matters of general interest are to be dealt with by the General Legislature; while the local legislatures will deal with matters of local interest, which do not affect the Confederation as a whole, but are of the greatest importance to their particular sections. By such a division of labor the sittings of the General Legislature would not be so protracted as even those of Canada alone. And so with the local legislatures, their attention being confined to subjects pertaining to their own sections, their sessions would be shorter and less expensive. Then, when we consider the enormous saving that will be effected in the administration of affairs by one General Government—when we reflect that each of the five colonies have a government of its own with a complete establishment of public departments and all the machinery required for the transaction of the business of the country—that each have a separate executive, judicial and militia system—that each province has a separate ministry, including a Minister of Militia, with a complete Adjutant General’s Department—that each have a Finance Minister with a full Customs and Excise staff—that each Colony has as large and complete an adminis-

trative organization, with as many Executive officers as the General Government will have—we can well understand the enormous saving that will result from a union of all the colonies, from their having but one head and one central system. We, in Canada, already know something of the advantages and disadvantages of a Federal Union. Although we have nominally a Legislative Union in Canada—although we sit in one Parliament, supposed constitutionally to represent the people without regard to sections or localities, yet we know, as a matter of fact, that since the union in 1841, we have had a Federal Union; that in matters affecting Upper Canada solely, members from that section claimed and generally exercised the right of exclusive legislation, while members from Lower Canada legislated in matters affecting only their own section. We have had a Federal Union in fact, though a Legislative Union in name; and in the hot contests of late years, if on any occasion a measure affecting any one section were interfered with by the members from the other—if, for instance, a measure locally affecting Upper Canada were carried or defeated against the wishes of its majority, by one from Lower Canada,—my honorable friend the President of the Council, and his friends denounced with all their energy and ability such legislation as an infringement of the rights of the Upper Province. (Hear, hear, and cheers). Just in the same way, if any act concerning Lower Canada were pressed into law against the wishes of the majority of her representatives, by those from Upper Canada, the Lower Canadians would rise as one man and protest against such a violation of their peculiar rights. (Hear, hear.) The relations between England and Scotland are very similar to that which obtains between the Canadas. The union between them, in matters of legislation, is of a federal character, because the Act of Union between the two countries provides that the Scottish law cannot be altered, except for the manifest advantage of the people of Scotland. This stipulation has been held to be so obligatory on the Legislature of Great Britain, that no measure affecting the law of Scotland is passed unless it receives the sanction of a majority of the Scottish members in Parliament. No matter how important it may be for the interests of the empire as a whole to alter the laws of Scotland—no

matter how much it may interfere with the symmetry of the general law of the United Kingdom, that law is not altered, except with the consent of the Scottish people, as expressed by their representatives in Parliament. (Hear, hear.) Thus, we have, in Great Britain, to a limited extent, an example of the working and effects of a Federal Union, as we might expect to witness them in our own Confederation. The whole scheme of Confederation, as propounded by the Conference, as agreed to and sanctioned by the Canadian Government, and as now presented for the consideration of the people, and the Legislature, bears upon its face the marks of compromise. Of necessity there must have been a great deal of mutual concession. When we think of the representatives of five colonies, all supposed to have different interests, meeting together, charged with the duty of protecting those interests and of pressing the views of their own localities and sections, it must be admitted that had we not met in a spirit of conciliation, and with an anxious desire to promote this union; if we had not been impressed with the idea contained in the words of the resolution—"That the best interests and present and future prosperity of British North America would be promoted by a Federal Union under the Crown of Great Britain,"—all our efforts might have proved to be of no avail. If we had not felt that, after coming to this conclusion, we were bound to set aside our private opinions on matters of detail, if we had not felt ourselves bound to look at what was practicable, not obstinately rejecting the opinions of others nor adhering to our own; if we had not met, I say, in a spirit of conciliation, and with an anxious, overruling desire to form one people under one government, we never would have succeeded. With these views, we press the question on this House and the country. I say to this House, if you do not believe that the union of the colonies is for the advantage of the country, that the joining of these five peoples into one nation, under one sovereign, is for the benefit of all, then reject the scheme. Reject it if you do not believe it to be for the present advantage and future prosperity of yourselves and your children. But if, after a calm and full consideration of this scheme, it is believed, as a whole, to be for the advantage of this province—if the House and country believe this union to be one which will ensure for us British laws, British connection, and British

freedom—and increase and develop the social, political and material prosperity of the country, then I implore this House and the country to lay aside all prejudices, and accept the scheme which we offer. I ask this House to meet the question in the same spirit in which the delegates met it. I ask each member of this House to lay aside his own opinions as to particular details, and to accept the scheme as a whole if he think it beneficial as a whole. As I stated in the preliminary discussion, we must consider this scheme in the light of a treaty. By a happy coincidence of circumstances, just when an Administration had been formed in Canada for the purpose of attempting a solution of the difficulties under which we laboured, at the same time the Lower Provinces, actuated by a similar feeling, appointed a Conference with a view to a union among themselves, without being cognizant of the position the government was taking in Canada. If it had not been for this fortunate coincidence of events, never, perhaps, for a long series of years would we have been able to bring this scheme to a practical conclusion. But we did succeed. We made the arrangement, agreed upon the scheme, and the deputations from the several governments represented at the Conference went back pledged to lay it before their governments, and to ask the legislatures and people of their respective provinces to assent to it. I trust the scheme will be assented to as a whole. I am sure this House will not seek to alter it in its unimportant details; and, if altered in any important provisions, the result must be that the whole will be set aside, and we must begin *de novo*. If any important changes are made, every one of the colonies will feel itself absolved from the implied obligation to deal with it as a Treaty, each province will feel itself at liberty to amend it *ad libitum* so as to suit its own views and interests; in fact, the whole of our labours will have been for nought, and we will have to renew our negotiations with all the colonies for the purpose of establishing some new scheme. I hope the House will not adopt any such a course as will postpone, perhaps for ever, or at all events for a long period, all chances of union. All the statesmen and public men who have written or spoken on the subject admit the advantages of a union, if it were practicable: and now when it is proved to be practicable, if we do not embrace this opportunity the present favorable time will pass away, and we may never

have it again. Because, just so surely as this scheme is defeated, will be revived the original proposition for a union of the Maritime Provinces, irrespective of Canada; they will not remain as they are now, powerless, scattered, helpless communities; they will form themselves into a power, which, though not so strong as if united with Canada, will, nevertheless, be a powerful and considerable community, and it will be then too late for us to attempt to strengthen ourselves by this scheme, which, in the words of the resolution, "is for the best interests, and present and future prosperity of British North America." If we are not blind to our present position, we must see the hazardous situation in which all the great interests of Canada stand in respect to the United States. I am no alarmist. I do not believe in the prospect of immediate war. I believe that the common sense of the two nations will prevent a war; still we cannot trust to probabilities. The Government and Legislature would be wanting in their duty to the people if they ran any risk. We know that the United States at this moment are engaged in a war of enormous dimensions—that the occasion of a war with Great Britain has again and again arisen, and may at any time in the future again arise. We cannot foresee what may be the result; we cannot say but that the two nations may drift into a war as other nations have done before. It would then be too late when war had commenced to think of measures for strengthening ourselves, or to begin negotiations for a union with the sister provinces. At this moment, in consequence of the ill-feeling which has arisen between England and the United States—a feeling of which Canada was not the cause—in consequence of the irritation which now exists, owing to the unhappy state of affairs on this continent, the Reciprocity Treaty, it seems probable, is about to be brought to an end—our trade is hampered by the passport system, and at any moment we may be deprived of permission to carry our goods through United States channels—the bonded goods system may be done away with, and the winter trade through the United States put an end to. Our merchants may be obliged to return to the old system of bringing in during the summer months the supplies for the whole year. Ourselves already threatened, our trade interrupted, our intercourse, political and commercial, destroyed, if we do not take warning now when we have the op-

portunity, and while one avenue is threatened to be closed, open another by taking advantage of the present arrangement and the desire of the Lower Provinces to draw closer the alliance between us, we may suffer commercial and political disadvantages it may take long for us to overcome. The Conference having come to the conclusion that a legislative union, pure and simple, was impracticable, our next attempt was to form a government upon federal principles, which would give to the General Government the strength of a legislative and administrative union, while at the same time it preserved that liberty of action for the different sections which is allowed by a Federal Union. And I am strong in the belief—that we have hit upon the happy medium in those resolutions, and that we have formed a scheme of government which unites the advantages of both, giving us the strength of a legislative union and the sectional freedom of a federal union, with protection to local interests. In doing so we had the advantage of the experience of the United States. It is the fashion now to enlarge on the defects of the Constitution of the United States, but I am not one of those who look upon it as a failure. (Hear, hear.) I think and believe that it is one of the most skillful works which human intelligence ever created; is one of the most perfect organizations that ever governed a free people. To say that it has some defects is but to say that it is not the work of Omniscience, but of human intellects. We are happily situated in having had the opportunity of watching its operation, seeing its working from its infancy till now. It was in the main formed on the model of the Constitution of Great Britain, adapted to the circumstances of a new country, and was perhaps the only practicable system that could have been adopted under the circumstances existing at the time of its formation. We can now take advantage of the experience of the last seventy-eight years, during which that Constitution has existed, and I am strongly of the belief that we have, in a great measure, avoided in this system which we propose for the adoption of the people of Canada, the defects which time and events have shown to exist in the American Constitution. In the first place, by a resolution which meets with the universal approval of the people of this country, we have provided that for all time to come, so far as we can legislate for the future, we

shall have as the head of the executive power, the Sovereign of Great Britain. (Hear, hear.) No one can look into futurity and say what will be the destiny of this country. Changes come over nations and peoples in the course of ages. But, so far as we can legislate, we provide that, for all time to come, the Sovereign of Great Britain shall be the Sovereign of British North America. By adhering to the monarchical principle, we avoid one defect inherent in the Constitution of the United States. By the election of the President by a majority and for a short period, he never is the sovereign and chief of the nation. He is never looked up to by the whole people as the head and front of the nation. He is at best but the successful leader of a party. This defect is all the greater on account of the practice of re-election. During his first term of office, he is employed in taking steps to secure his own re-election, and for his party a continuance of power. We avoid this by adhering to the monarchical principle—the Sovereign whom you respect and love. I believe that it is of the utmost importance to have that principle recognized, so that we shall have a Sovereign who is placed above the region of party—to whom all parties look up—who is not elevated by the action of one party nor depressed by the action of another, who is the common head and sovereign of all. (Hear, hear and cheers.) In the Constitution we propose to continue the system of Responsible Government, which has existed in this province since 1841, and which has long obtained in the Mother Country. This is a feature of our Constitution as we have it now, and as we shall have it in the Federation, in which, I think, we avoid one of the great defects in the Constitution of the United States. There the President, during his term of office, is in a great measure a despot, a one-man power, with the command of the naval and military forces—with an immense amount of patronage as head of the Executive, and with the veto power as a branch of the legislature, perfectly uncontrolled by responsible advisers, his cabinet being departmental officers merely, whom he is not obliged by the Constitution to consult with, unless he chooses to do so. With us the Sovereign, or in this country the Representative of the Sovereign, can act only on the advice of his ministers, those ministers being responsible to the people through Parliament. Prior to the formation of the Amer-

ican Union, as we all know, the different states which entered into it were separate colonies. They had no connection with each other further than that of having a common sovereign, just as with us at present. Their constitutions and their laws were different. They might and did legislate against each other, and when they revolted against the Mother Country they acted as separate sovereignties, and carried on the war by a kind of treaty of alliance against the common enemy. Ever since the union was formed the difficulty of what is called "State Rights" has existed, and this had much to do in bringing on the present unhappy war in the United States. They commenced, in fact, at the wrong end. They declared by their Constitution that each state was a sovereignty in itself, and that all the powers incident to a sovereignty belonged to each state, except those powers which, by the Constitution, were conferred upon the General Government and Congress. Here we have adopted a different system. We have strengthened the General Government. We have given the General Legislature all the great subjects of legislation. We have conferred on them, not only specifically and in detail, all the powers which are incident to sovereignty, but we have expressly declared that all subjects of general interest not distinctly and exclusively conferred upon the local governments and local legislatures, shall be conferred upon the General Government and Legislature.—We have thus avoided that great source of weakness which has been the cause of the disruption of the United States. We have avoided all conflict of jurisdiction and authority, and if this Constitution is carried out, as it will be in full detail in the Imperial Act to be passed if the colonies adopt the scheme, we will have in fact, as I said before, all the advantages of a legislative union under one administration, with, at the same time the guarantees for local institutions and for local laws, which are insisted upon by so many in the provinces now, I hope, to be united. I think it is well that, in framing our Constitution—although my honorable friend the member for Hochelaga (Hon. Mr. DORRIN) sneered at it the other day, in the discussion on the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne—our first act should have been to recognize the sovereignty of Her Majesty. (Hear, hear.) I believe that, while England has no desire to lose her colonies, but wishes to retain them, while I am satisfied that the

public mind of England would deeply regret the loss of these provinces—yet, if the people of British North America after full deliberation had stated that they considered it was for their interest, for the advantage of the future of British North America to sever the tie, such is the generosity of the people of England, that, whatever their desire to keep these colonies, they would not seek to compel us to remain unwilling subjects of the British Crown. If therefore, at the Conference, we had arrived at the conclusion, that it was for the interest of these provinces that a severance should take place, I am sure that Her Majesty and the Imperial Parliament would have sanctioned that severance. We accordingly felt that there was a propriety in giving a distinct declaration of opinion on that point, and that, in framing the Constitution, its first sentence should declare, that “The Executive authority or government shall be vested in the Sovereign of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and be administered according to the well understood principles of the British Constitution, by the Sovereign personally, or by the Representative of the Sovereign duly authorised.” That resolution met with the unanimous assent of the Conference. The desire to remain connected with Great Britain and to retain our allegiance to Her Majesty was unanimous. Not a single suggestion was made, that it could, by any possibility, be for the interest of the colonies, or of any section or portion of them, that there should be a severance of our connection. Although we knew it to be possible that Canada, from her position, might be exposed to all the horrors of war, by reason of causes of hostility arising between Great Britain and the United States—causes over which we had no control, and which we had no hand in bringing about—yet there was a unanimous feeling of willingness to run all the hazards of war, if war must come, rather than lose the connection between the Mother Country and these colonies. (Cheers.) We provide that “the Executive authority shall be administered by the Sovereign personally, or by the Representative of the Sovereign duly authorised.” It is too much to expect that the Queen should vouchsafe us her personal governance or presence, except to pay us, as the heir apparent of the Throne, our future Sovereign has already paid us, the graceful compliment of a visit. The Executive authority must therefore be ad-

ministered by Her Majesty's Representative. We place no restriction on Her Majesty's prerogative in the selection of her representative. As it is now, so it will be if this Constitution is adopted. The Sovereign has unrestricted freedom of choice. Whether in making her selection she may send us one of her own family, a Royal Prince, as a Viceroy to rule over us, or one of the great statesmen of England to represent her, we know not. We leave that to Her Majesty in all confidence. But we may be permitted to hope, that when the union takes place, and we become the great country which British North America is certain to be, it will be an object worthy the ambition of the statesmen of England to be charged with presiding over our destinies. (Hear, hear.) Let me now invite the attention of the House to the provisions in the Constitution respecting the legislative power. The sixth resolution says, “There shall be a general legislature or parliament for the federated provinces, composed of a Legislative Council and a House of Commons.” This resolution has been cavilled at in the English press as if it excluded the Sovereign as a portion of the legislature. In one sense, that stricture was just—because in strict constitutional language, the legislature of England consists of King, Lords and Commons. But, on the other hand, in ordinary parlance we speak of “the King and his Parliament,” or “the King summoning his Parliament,” the three estates—Lords spiritual, temporal Lords, and the House of Commons, and I observe that such a writer as Hallam occasionally uses the word Parliament in that restricted sense. At best it is merely a verbal criticism. The legislature of British North America will be composed of King, Lords, and Commons. The Legislative Council will stand in the same relation to the Lower House, as the House of Lords to the House of Commons in England, having the same power of initiating all matters of legislation, except the granting of money. As regards the Lower House, it may not appear to matter much, whether it is called the House of Commons or House of Assembly. It will bear whatever name the Parliament of England may choose to give it, but “The House of Commons” is the name we should prefer, as shewing that it represents the Commons of

Canada, in the same way that the English House of Commons represents the Commons of England, with the same privileges, the same parliamentary usage, and the same parliamentary authority. In settling the constitution of the Lower House, that which peculiarly represents the people, it was agreed that the principle of representation based on population should be adopted, and the mode of applying that principle is fully developed in these resolutions. When I speak of representation by population, the House will of course understand, that universal suffrage is not in any way sanctioned, or admitted by these resolutions, as the basis on which the constitution of the popular branch should rest. In order to protect local interests, and to prevent sectional jealousies, it was found requisite that the three great divisions into which British North America is separated, should be represented in the Upper House on the principle of equality. There are three great sections, having different interests, in this proposed Confederation. We have Western Canada, an agricultural country far away from the sea, and having the largest population who have agricultural interests principally to guard. We have Lower Canada, with other and separate interests, and especially with institutions and laws which she jealously guards against absorption by any larger, more numerous, or stronger power. And we have the Maritime Provinces, having also different sectional interests of their own, having, from their position, classes and interests which we do not know in Western Canada. Accordingly, in the Upper House, —the controlling and regulating, but not the initiating, branch (for we know that here as in England, to the Lower House will practically belong the initiation of matters of great public interest), in the House which has the sober second-thought in legislation—it is provided that each of those great sections shall be represented equally by 24 members. The only exception to that condition of equality is in the case of Newfoundland, which has an interest of its own, lying, as it does, at the mouth of the great river St. Lawrence, and more connected, perhaps, with Canada than with the Lower Provinces. It has, comparatively speaking, no common interest with the other Maritime Provinces, but has sectional interests and sectional claims of its own to be protected. It, therefore has been dealt with separately, and

is to have a separate representation in the Upper House, thus varying from the equality established between the other sections.—As may be well conceived, great difference of opinion at first existed as to the constitution of the Legislative Council. In Canada the elective principle prevailed; in the Lower Provinces, with the exception of Prince Edward Island, the nominative principle was the rule. We found a general disinclination on the part of the Lower Provinces to adopt the elective principle; indeed, I do not think there was a dissenting voice in the Conference against the adoption of the nominative principle, except from Prince Edward Island. The delegates from New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, as one man, were in favor of nomination by the Crown. And nomination by the Crown is of course the system which is most in accordance with the British Constitution. We resolved then, that the constitution of the Upper House should be in accordance with the British system as nearly as circumstances would allow. An hereditary Upper House is impracticable in this young country. Here we have none of the elements for the formation of a landlord aristocracy—no men of large territorial positions—no class separated from the mass of the people. An hereditary body is altogether unsuited to our state of society, and would soon dwindle into nothing. The only mode of adapting the English system to the Upper House, is by conferring the power of appointment on the Crown (as the English peers are appointed), but that the appointments should be for life. The arguments for an elective Council are numerous and strong; and I ought to say so, as one of the Administration responsible for introducing the elective principle into Canada. (Hear, hear.) I hold that this principle has not been a failure in Canada; but there were causes—which we did not take into consideration at the time—why it did not so fully succeed in Canada as we had expected. One great cause was the enormous extent of the constituencies and the immense labor which consequently devolved on those who sought the suffrages of the people for election to the Council. For the same reason the expense—(laughter)—the legitimate expense was so enormous that men of standing in the country, eminently fitted for such a position, were prevented from coming forward. At first, I admit, men of the first standing did come forward, but we

have seen that in every succeeding election in both Canadas there has been an increasing disinclination, on the part of men of standing and political experience and weight in the country, to become candidates; while, on the other hand, all the young men, the active politicians, those who have resolved to embrace the life of a statesman, have sought entrance to the House of Assembly. The nominative system in this country, was to a great extent successful, before the introduction of responsible government. Then the Canadas were to a great extent Crown colonies, and the upper branch of the legislature consisted of gentlemen chosen from among the chief judicial and ecclesiastical dignitaries, the heads of departments, and other men of the first position in the country. Those bodies commanded great respect from the character, standing, and weight of the individuals composing them, but they had little sympathy with the people or their representatives, and collisions with the Lower House frequently occurred, especially in Lower Canada. When responsible government was introduced, it became necessary for the Governor of the day to have a body of advisers who had the confidence of the House of Assembly which could make or unmake ministers as it chose. The Lower House in effect pointed out who should be nominated to the Upper House; for the ministry, being dependent altogether on the lower branch of the legislature for support, selected members for the Upper House from among their political friends at the dictation of the House of Assembly. The Council was becoming less and less a substantial check on the legislation of the Assembly; but under the system now proposed, such will not be the case. No ministry can in future do what they have done in Canada before,—they cannot, with the view of carrying any measure, or of strengthening the party, attempt to overrule the independent opinion of the Upper House, by filling it with a number of its partisans and political supporters. The provision in the Constitution, that the Legislative Council shall consist of a limited number of members—that each of the great sections shall appoint twenty-four members and no more, will prevent the Upper House from being swamped from time to time by the ministry of the day, for the purpose of carrying out their own schemes or pleasing their partisans. The fact of the government being

prevented from exceeding a limited number will preserve the independence of the Upper House, and make it, in reality, a separate and distinct chamber, having a legitimate and controlling influence in the legislation of the country. The objection has been taken that in consequence of the Crown being deprived of the right of unlimited appointment, there is a chance of a dead lock arising between the two branches of the legislature; a chance that the Upper House being altogether independent of the Sovereign, of the Lower House, and of the advisers of the Crown, may act independently, and so independently as to produce a dead lock. I do not anticipate any such result. In the first place we know that in England it does not arise. There would be no use of an Upper House, if it did not exercise, when it thought proper, the right of opposing or amending or postponing the legislation of the Lower House. It would be of no value whatever were it a mere chamber for registering the decrees of the Lower House. It must be an independent House, having a free action of its own, for it is only valuable as being a regulating body, calmly considering the legislation initiated by the popular branch, and preventing any hasty or ill considered legislation which may come from that body, but it will never set itself in opposition against the deliberate and understood wishes of the people. Even the House of Lords, which as an hereditary body, is far more independent than one appointed for life can be, whenever it ascertains what is the calm, deliberate will of the people of England, it yields, and never in modern times has there been, in fact or act, any attempt to overrule the decisions of that House by the appointment of new peers, excepting, perhaps, once in the reign of Queen Anne. It is true that in 1832 such an increase was threatened in consequence of the reiterated refusal of the House of Peers to pass the Reform Bill. I have no doubt the threat would have been carried into effect, if necessary; but every one, even the Ministry who advised that step, admitted that it would be a revolutionary act, a breach of the Constitution to do so, and it was because of the necessity of preventing the bloody revolution which hung over the land, if the Reform Bill had been longer refused to the people of England, that they consented to the bloodless revolution of overriding the independent

opinion of the House of Lords on that question. (Hear, hear.) Since that time it has never been attempted, and I am satisfied it will never be attempted again. Only a year or two ago the House of Lords rejected the Paper Duties Bill, and they acted quite constitutionally, according to the letter and as many think, according to the spirit of the Constitution in doing so. Yet when they found they had interfered with a subject which the people's house claimed as belonging of right to themselves, the very next session they abandoned their position, not because they were convinced they had done wrong, but because they had ascertained what was the deliberate voice of the representatives of the people on the subject. In

this country, we must remember, that the gentlemen who will be selected for the Legislative Council stand on a very different footing from the peers of England. They have not like them any ancestral associations or position derived from history. They have not that direct influence on the people themselves, or on the popular branch of the legislature, which the peers of England exercise, from their great wealth, their vast territorial possessions, their numerous tenantry, and that prestige with which the exalted position of their class for centuries has invested them. (Hear, hear.) The members of our Upper House will be like those of the Lower, men of the people, and from the people. The man put into the Upper House is as much a man of the people the day after, as the day before his elevation. Springing from the people, and one of them, he takes his seat in the Council with all the sympathies and feelings of a man of the people, and when he returns home, at the end of the session, he mingles with them on equal terms, and is influenced by the same feelings and associations, and events, as those which affect the mass around him. And is it, then, to be supposed that the members of the upper branch of the legislature will set themselves deliberately at work to oppose what they know to be the settled opinions and wishes of the people of the country? They will not do it. There is no fear of a dead lock between the two houses.

There is an infinitely greater chance of a dead lock between the two branches of the legislature, should the elective principle be adopted, than with a nominated chamber—chosen by the Crown, and having no mission from the people. The members of the

Upper Chamber would then come from the people as well as those of the Lower House, and should any difference ever arise between both branches, the former could say to the members of the popular branch—"We as much represent the feelings of the people as you do, and even more so; we are not elected from small localities and for a short period; you as a body were elected at a particular time, when the public mind was running in a particular channel; you were returned to Parliament, not so much representing the general views of the country, on general questions, as upon the particular subjects which happened to engage the minds of the people when they went to the polls. We have as much right, or a better right, than you to be considered as representing the deliberate will of the people on general questions, and therefore we will not give way." (Hear, hear.) There is, I repeat, a greater danger of an irreconcilable difference of opinion between the two branches of the legislature, if the upper be elective, than if it holds its commission from the Crown. Besides, it must be remembered that an Upper House, the members of which are to be appointed for life, would not have the same quality of permanence as the House of Lords; our members would die; strangers would succeed them, whereas son succeeded father in the House of Lords. Thus the changes in the membership and state of opinion in our Upper House would always be more rapid than in the House of Lords. To show how speedily changes have occurred in the Upper House, as regards life members, I will call the attention of the House to the following facts:—At the call of the House, in February, 1856, forty-two life members responded; two years afterwards, in 1858, only thirty-five answered to their names; in 1862 there were only twenty-five life members left, and in 1864, but twenty-one. (Hear, hear.) This shows how speedily changes take place in the life membership. But remarkable as this change has been, it is not so great as that in regard to the elected members. Though the elective principle only came into force in 1856, and although only twelve men were elected that year, and twelve more every two years since, twenty-four changes have already taken place by the decease of members, by the acceptance of office, and by resignation. So it is quite clear that, should there be on any question a difference of opinion between the Upper and Lower

Houses, the government of the day being obliged to have the confidence of the majority in the popular branch—would, for the purpose of bringing the former into accord and sympathy with the latter, fill up any vacancies that might occur, with men of the same political feelings and sympathies with the Government, and consequently with those of the majority in the popular branch; and all the appointments of the Administration would be made with the object of maintaining the sympathy and harmony between the two houses. (Hear, hear.) There is this additional advantage to be expected from the limitation. To the Upper House is to be confided the protection of sectional interests; therefore is it that the three great divisions are there equally represented, for the purpose of defending such interests against the combinations of majorities in the Assembly. It will, therefore, become the interest of each section to be represented by its very best men, and the members of the Administration who belong to each section will see that such men are chosen, in case of a vacancy in their section. For the same reason each state of the American Union sends its two best men to represent its interests in the Senate. (Hear, hear.) It is provided in the Constitution that in the first selections for the Council, regard shall be had to those who now hold similar positions in the different colonies. This, it appears to me, is a wise provision. In all the provinces, except Prince Edward, there are gentlemen who hold commissions for the Upper House for life. In Canada, there are a number who hold under that commission; but the majority of them hold by a commission, not, perhaps, from a monarchical point of view so honorable, because the Queen is the fountain of honor,—but still, as holding their appointment from the people, they may be considered as standing on a par with those who have Her Majesty's commission. There can be no reason suggested why those who have had experience in legislation, whether they hold their positions by the election of the people or have received preferment from the Crown—there is no valid reason why those men should be passed over, and new men sought for to form the Legislative Council of the Confederation. It is, therefore, provided that the selection shall be made from those gentlemen who are now members of the upper branch of the Legislature in each of the colonies, for seats

in the Legislative Council of the General Legislature. The arrangement in this respect is somewhat similar to that by which Representative Peers are chosen from the Peers of Scotland and Ireland, to sit in the Parliament of the United Kingdom. In like manner, the members of the Legislative Council of the proposed Confederation will be first selected from the existing Legislative Councils of the various provinces. In the formation of the House of Commons, the principle of representation by population has been provided for in a manner equally ingenious and simple. The introduction of this principle presented at first the apparent difficulty of a constantly increasing body until, with the increasing population, it would become inconveniently and expensively large. But by adopting the representation of Lower Canada as a fixed standard—as the pivot on which the whole would turn—that province being the best suited for the purpose, on account of the comparatively permanent character of its population, and from its having neither the largest nor least number of inhabitants—we have been enabled to overcome the difficulty I have mentioned. We have introduced the system of representation by population without the danger of an inconvenient increase in the number of representatives on the recurrence of each decennial period. The whole thing is worked by a simple rule of three. For instance, we have in Upper Canada 1,400,000 of a population; in Lower Canada 1,100,000. Now, the proposition is simply this—if Lower Canada, with its population of 1,100,000, has a right to 65 members; how many members should Upper Canada have, with its larger population of 1,400,000? The same rule applies to the other provinces—the proportion is always observed and the principle of representation by population carried out, while, at the same time, there will not be decennially an inconvenient increase in the numbers of the Lower House. At the same time, there is a constitutional provision that hereafter, if deemed advisable, the total number of representatives may be increased from 194, the number fixed in the first instance. In that case, if an increase is made, Lower Canada is still to remain the pivot on which the whole calculation will turn. If Lower Canada, instead of sixty-five, shall have seventy members, then the calculation will be, if Lower Canada has seventy members, with such a population,

how many shall Upper Canada have with a larger population? I was in favor of a larger House than one hundred and ninety-four, but was overruled. I was perhaps singular in the opinion, but I thought it would be well to commence with a larger representation in the lower branch. The arguments against this were, that, in the first place, it would cause additional expense; in the next place, that in a new country like this, we could not get a sufficient number of qualified men to be representatives. My reply was that the number is rapidly increasing as we increase in education and wealth; that a larger field would be open to political ambition by having a larger body of representatives; that by having numerous and smaller constituencies, more people would be interested in the working of the union, and that there would be a wider field for selection for leaders of governments and leaders of parties. These are my individual sentiments,—which, perhaps, I have no right to express here—but I was overruled, and we fixed on the number of one hundred and ninety-four, which no one will say is large or extensive, when it is considered that our present number in Canada alone is one hundred and thirty. The difference between one hundred and thirty and one hundred and ninety-four is not great, considering the large increase that will be made to our population when Confederation is carried into effect. While the principle of representation by population is adopted with respect to the popular branch of the legislature, not a single member of the Conference, as I stated before, not a single one of the representatives of the government or of the opposition of any one of the Lower Provinces was in favor of universal suffrage. Every one felt that in this respect the principle of the British Constitution should be carried out, and that classes and property should be represented as well as numbers. Insuperable difficulties would have presented themselves if we had attempted to settle now the qualification for the elective franchise. We have different laws in each of the colonies fixing the qualification of electors for their own local legislatures; and we therefore adopted a similar clause to that which is contained in the Canada Union Act of 1841, viz., that all the laws which affected the qualification of members and of voters, which affected the appointment and conduct of returning officers and the proceedings at elections, as well as the trial of controverted

elections in the separate provinces, should obtain in the first election to the Confederate Parliament, so that every man who has now a vote in his own province should continue to have a vote in choosing a representative to the first Federal Parliament. And it was left to the Parliament of the Confederation, as one of their first duties, to consider and to settle by an act of their own the qualification for the elective franchise, which would apply to the whole Confederation. In considering the question of the duration of Parliament, we came to the conclusion to recommend a period of five years. I was in favor of a longer period. I thought that the duration of the local legislatures should not be shortened so as to be less than four years, as at present, and that the General Parliament should have as long a duration as that of the United Kingdom. I was willing to have gone to the extent of seven years; but a term of five years was preferred, and we had the example of the New Zealand carefully considered, not only locally, but by the Imperial Parliament, and which gave the provinces of those islands a general parliament with a duration of five years. But it was a matter of little importance whether five years or seven years was the term, the power of dissolution by the Crown having been reserved. I find, on looking at the duration of parliaments since the accession of George III. to the Throne, that excluding the present parliament, there have been seventeen parliaments, the average period of whose existence has been about three years and a half. That average is less than the average duration of the parliaments in Canada since the union, so that it was not a matter of much importance whether we fixed upon five or seven years as the period of duration of our General Parliament. A good deal of misapprehension has arisen from the accidental omission of some words from the 24th resolution. It was thought that by it the local legislatures were to have the power of arranging hereafter, and from time to time of readjusting the different constituencies and settling the size and boundaries of the various electoral districts. The meaning of the resolution is simply this, that for the first General Parliament, the arrangement of constituencies shall be made by the existing local legislatures; that in Canada, for instance, the present Canadian Parliament shall arrange what are to be the constituencies of Upper Canada, and to make such changes as may be necessary in arranging

for the seventeen additional members given to it by the Constitution ; and that it may also, if it sees fit, alter the boundaries of the existing constituencies of Lower Canada. In short, this Parliament shall settle what shall be the different constituencies electing members to the first Federal Parliament. And so the other provinces, the legislatures of which will fix the limits of their several constituencies in the session in which they adopt the new Constitution. Afterwards the local legislatures may alter their own electoral limits as they please, for their own local elections. But it would evidently be improper to leave to the Local Legislature the power to alter the constituencies sending members to the General Legislature after the General Legislature shall have been called into existence. Were this the case, a member of the General Legislature might at any time find himself ousted from his seat by an alteration of his constituency by the Local Legislature in his section. No, after the General Parliament meets, in order that it may have full control of its own legislation, and be assured of its position, it must have the full power of arranging and re-arranging the electoral limits of its constituencies as it pleases, such being one of the powers essentially necessary to such a Legislature. (Hear, hear.) I shall not detain the House by entering into a consideration at any length of the different powers conferred upon the General Parliament as contradistinguished from those reserved to the local legislatures; but any honorable member on examining the list of different subjects which are to be assigned to the General and Local Legislatures respectively, will see that all the great questions which affect the general interests of the Confederacy as a whole, are confided to the Federal Parliament, while the local interests and local laws of each section are preserved intact, and entrusted to the care of the local bodies. As a matter of course, the General Parliament must have the power of dealing with the public debt and property of the Confederation. Of course, too, it must have the regulation of trade and commerce, of customs and excise. The Federal Parliament must have the sovereign power of raising money from such sources and by such means as the representatives of the people will allow. It will be seen that the local legislatures have the control of all local works; and it is a matter of great importance,

and one of the chief advantages of the Federal Union and of local legislatures, that each province will have the power and means of developing its own resources and aiding its own progress after its own fashion and in its own way. Therefore all the local improvements, all local enterprises or undertakings of any kind, have been left to the care and management of the local legislatures of each province. (Cheers.) It is provided that all "lines of steam or other ships, railways, canals and other works, connecting any two or more of the provinces together or extending beyond the limits of any province," shall belong to the General Government, and be under the control of the General Legislature. In like manner "lines of steamships between the Federated Provinces and other countries, telegraph communication and the incorporation of telegraph companies, and all such works as shall, although lying within any province, be specially declared by the Acts authorizing them, to be for the general advantage," shall belong to the General Government. For instance, the Welland Canal, though lying wholly within one section, and the St. Lawrence Canals in two only, may be properly considered national works, and for the general benefit of the whole Federation. Again, the census, the ascertaining of our numbers and the extent of our resources, must, as a matter of general interest, belong to the General Government. So also with the defences of the country. One of the great advantages of Confederation is, that we shall have a united, a concerted, and uniform system of defence. (Hear.) We are at this moment with a different militia system in each colony—in some of the colonies with an utter want of any system of defence. We have a number of separate staff establishments, without any arrangement between the colonies as to the means, either of defence or offence. But, under the union, we will have one system of defence and one system of militia organization. In the event of the Lower Provinces being threatened, we can send the large militia forces of Upper Canada to their rescue. Should we have to fight on our lakes against a foreign foe, we will have the hardy seamen of the Lower Provinces coming to our assistance and manning our vessels. (Hear, hear.) We will have one system of defence and be one people, acting together alike in peace and in war. (Cheers.) The criminal

law too—the determination of what is a crime and what is not and how crime shall be punished—is left to the General Government. This is a matter almost of necessity. It is of great importance that we should have the same criminal law throughout these provinces—that what is a crime in one part of British America, should be a crime in every part—that there should be the same protection of life and property as in another. It is one of the defects in the United States system, that each separate state has or may have a criminal code of its own,—that what may be a capital offence in one state, may be a venial offence, punishable slightly, in another. But under our Constitution we shall have one body of criminal law, based on the criminal law of England, and operating equally throughout British America, so that a British American, belonging to what province he may, or going to any other part of the Confederation, knows what his rights are in that respect, and what his punishment will be if an offender against the criminal laws of the land. I think this is one of the most most marked instances in which we take advantage of the experience derived from our observations of the defects in the Constitution of the neighboring Republic. (Hear, hear.) The 33rd provision is of very great importance to the future well-being of these colonies. It commits to the General Parliament the “rendering uniform all or any of the laws relative to property and civil rights in Upper Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island, and rendering uniform the procedure of all or any of the courts in these provinces.” The great principles which govern the laws of all the provinces, with the single exception of Lower Canada, are the same, although there may be a divergence in details; and it is gratifying to find, on the part of the Lower Provinces, a general desire to join together with Upper Canada in this matter, and to procure, as soon as possible, an assimilation of the statutory laws and the procedure in the courts, of all these provinces. At present there is a good deal of diversity. In one of the colonies, for instance, they have no municipal system at all. In another, the municipal system is merely permissive, and has not been adopted to any extent. Although, therefore, a legislative union was found to be almost impracticable, it was understood, so far as we could influence the future, that the first act of the Confeder-

ate Government should be to procure an assimilation of the statutory law of all those provinces, which has, as its root and foundation, the common law of England. But to prevent local interests from being over-ridden, the same section makes provision, that, while power is given to the General Legislature to deal with this subject, no change in this respect should have the force and authority of law in any province until sanctioned by the Legislature of that province. (Hear, hear.) The General Legislature is to have power to establish a general Court of Appeal for the Federated Provinces. Although the Canadian Legislature has always had the power to establish a Court of Appeal, to which appeals may be made from the courts of Upper and Lower Canada, we have never availed ourselves of the power. Upper Canada has its own Court of Appeal, so has Lower Canada. And this system will continue until a General Court of Appeal shall be established by the General Legislature. The Constitution does not provide that such a court shall be established. There are many arguments for and against the establishment of such a court. But it was thought wise and expedient to put into the Constitution a power to the General Legislature, that, if after full consideration they think it advisable to establish a General Court of Appeal from all the Superior Courts of all the provinces, they may do so. (Hear, hear.) I shall not go over the other powers that are conferred on the General Parliament. Most of them refer to matters of financial and commercial interest, and I leave those subjects in other and better hands. Besides all the powers that are specifically given in the 37th and last item of this portion of the Constitution, confers on the General Legislature the general mass of sovereign legislation, the power to legislate on “all matters of a general character, not specially and exclusively reserved for the local governments and legislatures.” This is precisely the provision which is wanting in the Constitution of the United States. It is here that we find the weakness of the American system—the point where the American Constitution breaks down. (Hear, hear.) It is in itself a wise and necessary provision. We thereby strengthen the Central Parliament, and make the Confederation one people and one government, instead of five peoples and five governments, with merely a point of authority connecting us to a limited and insufficient extent.

With respect to the local governments, it is provided that each shall be governed by a chief executive officer, who shall be nominated by the General Government. As this is to be one united province, with the local governments and legislatures subordinate to the General Government and Legislature, it is obvious that the chief executive officer in each of the provinces must be subordinate as well. (The General Government assumes towards the local governments precisely the same position as the Imperial Government holds with respect to each of the colonies now;) so that as the Lieutenant Governor of each of the different provinces is now appointed directly by the Queen, and is directly responsible, and reports directly to Her, so will the executives of the local governments hereafter be subordinate to the Representative of the Queen, and be responsible and report to him. Objection has been taken that there is an infringement of the Royal prerogative in giving the pardoning power to the local governors, who are not appointed directly by the Crown, but only indirectly by the Chief Executive of the Confederation, who is appointed by the Crown. This provision was inserted in the Constitution on account of the practical difficulty which must arise if the power is confined to the Governor General. For example, if a question arose about the discharge of a prisoner convicted of a minor offence, say in Newfoundland, who might be in imminent danger of losing his life if he remained in confinement, the exercise of the pardoning power might come too late if it were necessary to wait for the action of the Governor General. It must be remembered that the pardoning power not only extends to capital cases, but to every case of conviction and sentence, no matter how trifling—even to the case of a fine in the nature of a sentence on a criminal conviction. It extends to innumerable cases, where, if the responsibility for its exercise were thrown on the General Executive, it could not be so satisfactorily discharged. Of course there must be, in each province, a legal adviser of the Executive, occupying the position of our Attorney General, as there is in every state of the American Union. This officer will be an officer of the Local Government; but, if the pardoning power is reserved for the Chief Executive, there must, in every case where the exercise of the pardoning power is sought, be a direct communication and report from the local law officer to the Governor

General. The practical inconvenience of this was felt to be so great, that it was thought well to propose the arrangement we did, without any desire to infringe upon the prerogatives of the Crown, for our whole action shows that the Conference, in every step they took, were actuated by a desire to guard jealously these prerogatives. (Hear, hear.) It is a subject, however, of Imperial interest, and if the Imperial Government and Imperial Parliament are not convinced by the arguments we will be able to press upon them for the continuation of that clause, then, of course, as the over-ruling power, they may set it aside. (Hear, hear.) There are numerous subjects which belong, of right, both to the Local and the General Parliaments. In all these cases it is provided, in order to prevent a conflict of authority, that where there is concurrent jurisdiction in the General and Local Parliaments, the same rule should apply as now applies in cases where there is concurrent jurisdiction in the Imperial and in the Provincial Parliaments, and that when the legislation of the one is adverse to or contradictory of the legislation of the other, in all such cases the action of the General Parliament must overrule, ex-necessitate, the action of the Local Legislature. (Hear, hear.) We have introduced also all those provisions which are necessary in order to the full working out of the British Constitution in these provinces. We provide that there shall be no money votes, unless those votes are introduced in the popular branch of the Legislature on the authority of the responsible advisers of the Crown—those with whom the responsibility rests of equalizing revenue and expenditure—that there can be no expenditure or authorization of expenditure by Address or in any other way unless initiated by the Crown on the advice of its responsible advisers. (Hear, hear.) As regards the financial features of the scheme, the arrangements made as to the present liabilities of the several provinces, and the future liabilities of the Confederation, on these and kindred matters, I have no doubt that my honorable friends, the Finance Minister and the President of the Council, will speak at full length, and that they will be able to shew you that this branch of the subject has received the fullest consideration. I feel I would be intruding myself unnecessarily on the House if, with my inferior knowledge of those subjects I were to detain you by venturing to speak of them, when I know that they will be so ably

and fully gone into by my two honorable friends. The last resolution of any importance is one which, although not affecting the substance of the Constitution, is of interest to us all. It is that "Her Majesty the Queen be solicited to determine the rank and name of the federated provinces." I do not know whether there will be any expression of opinion in this House on this subject—whether we are to be a vice-royalty, or whether we are still to retain our name and rank as a province. But I have no doubt Her Majesty will give the matter Her gracious consideration, that She will give us a name satisfactory to us all, and that the rank She will confer upon us will be a rank worthy of our position, of our resources, and of our future. (Cheers.) Let me again, before I sit down, impress upon this House the necessity of meeting this question in a spirit of compromise, with a disposition to judge the matter as a whole, to consider whether really it is for the benefit and advantage of the country to form a Confederation of all the provinces; and if honorable gentlemen, whatever may have been their preconceived ideas as to the merits of the details of this measure, whatever may still be their opinions as to these details, if they really believe that the scheme is one by which the prosperity of the country will be increased, and its future progress secured, I ask them to yield their own views, and to deal with the scheme according to its merits as one great whole. (Hear, hear.) One argument, but not a strong one, has been used against this Confederation, that it is an advance towards independence. Some are apprehensive that the very fact of our forming this union will hasten the time when we shall be severed from the mother country. I have no apprehension of that kind. I believe it will have the contrary effect. I believe that as we grow stronger, that, as it is felt in England we have become a people, able from our union, our strength, our population, and the development of our resources, to take our position among the nations of the world, she will be less willing to part with us than she would be now, when we are broken up into a number of insignificant colonies, subject to attack piece-meal without any concerted action or common organization of defence. I am strongly of opinion that year by year, as we grow in population and strength, England will more see the advantages of maintaining the alliance between British North America and herself. Does

any one imagine that, when our population instead of three and a-half, will be seven millions, as it will be ere many years pass, we would be one whit more willing than now to sever the connection with England? Would not those seven millions be just as anxious to maintain their allegiance to the Queen and their connection with the Mother Country, as we are now? Will the addition to our numbers of the people of the Lower Provinces, in any way lessen our desire to continue our connection with the Mother Country? I believe the people of Canada East and West to be truly loyal. But, if they can by possibility be exceeded in loyalty, it is by the inhabitants of the Maritime Provinces. Loyalty with them is an overruling passion. (Hear, hear.) In all parts of the Lower Provinces there is a rivalry between the opposing political parties as to which shall most strongly express and most effectively carry out the principle of loyalty to Her Majesty, and to the British Crown. (Hear, hear.) When this union takes place, we will be at the outset no inconsiderable people. We find ourselves with a population approaching four millions of souls. Such a population in Europe would make a second, or at least, a third rate power. And with a rapidly increasing population—for I am satisfied that under this union our population will increase in a still greater ratio than ever before—with increased credit—with a higher position in the eyes of Europe—with the increased security we can offer to immigrants, who would naturally prefer to seek a new home in what is known to them as a great country, than in any one little colony or another—with all this I am satisfied that, great as has been our increase in the last twenty-five years since the union between Upper and Lower Canada, our future progress, during the next quarter of a century, will be vastly greater. (Cheers.) And when, by means of this rapid increase, we become a nation of eight or nine millions of inhabitants, our alliance will be worthy of being sought by the great nations of the earth. (Hear, hear.) I am proud to believe that our desire for a permanent alliance will be reciprocated in England. I know that there is a party in England—but it is inconsiderable in numbers, though strong in intellect and power—which speaks of the desirability of getting rid of the colonies; but I believe such is not the feeling of the statesmen and the people of England. I believe

it will never be the deliberately expressed determination of the Government of Great Britain. (Hear, hear.) The colonies are now in a transition state. Gradually a different colonial system is being developed—and it will become, year by year, less a case of dependence on our part, and of overruling protection on the part of the Mother Country, and more a case of a healthy and cordial alliance. Instead of looking upon us as a merely dependent colony, England will have in us a friendly nation—a subordinate but still a powerful people—to stand by her in North America in peace or in war. (Cheers.) The people of Australia will be such another subordinate nation. And England will have this advantage, if her colonies progress under the new colonial system, as I believe they will, that, though at war with all the rest of the world, she will be able to look to the subordinate nations in alliance with her, and owing allegiance to the same Sovereign, who will assist in enabling her again to meet the whole world in arms, as she has done before. (Cheers.) And if, in the great Napoleonic war, with every port in Europe closed against her commerce, she was yet able to hold her own, how much more will that be the case when she has a colonial empire rapidly increasing in power, in wealth, in influence, and in position. (Hear, hear.) It is true that we stand in danger, as we have stood in danger again and again in Canada, of being plunged into war and suffering all its dreadful consequences, as the result of causes over which we have no control, by reason of their connection. This, however, did not intimidate us. At the very mention of the prospect of a war some time ago, how were the feelings of the people aroused from one extremity of British America to the other, and preparations made for meeting its worst consequences. Although the people of this country are fully aware of the horrors of war—should a war arise, unfortunately, between the United States and England, and we all pray it never may—they are still ready to encounter all perils of that kind, for the sake of the connection with England. There is not one adverse voice, not one adverse opinion on that point. We all feel the advantages we derive from our connection with England. So long as that alliance is maintained, we enjoy, under her protection, the privileges of constitutional liberty according to the British system. We will enjoy here that which is the

great test of constitutional freedom—we will have the rights of the minority respected. (Hear, hear.) In all countries the rights of the majority take care of themselves, but it is only in countries like England, enjoying constitutional liberty, and safe from the tyranny of a single despot or of an unbridled democracy, that the rights of minorities are regarded. So long, too, as we form a portion of the British Empire, we shall have the example of her free institutions, of the high standard of the character of her statesmen and public men, of the purity of her legislation, and the upright administration of her laws. In this younger country one great advantage of our connection with Great Britain, will be, that, under her auspices, inspired by her example, a portion of her empire, our public men will be actuated by principles similar to those which actuate the statesmen at home. These although not material, physical benefits, of which you can make an arithmetical calculation, are of such overwhelming advantage to our future interests and standing as a nation, that to obtain them is well worthy of any sacrifices we may be called upon to make, and the people of this country are ready to make them. (Cheers.) We should feel, also, sincerely grateful to beneficent Providence that we have had the opportunity vouchsafed us of calmly considering this great constitutional change, this peaceful revolution—that we have not been hurried into it, like the United States, by the exigencies of war—that we have not had a violent revolutionary period forced on us, as in other nations, by hostile action from without, or by domestic dissensions within. Here we are in peace and prosperity, under the fostering government of Great Britain—a dependent people, with a government having only a limited and delegated authority, and yet allowed, without restriction, and without jealousy on the part of the Mother Country, to legislate for ourselves, and peacefully and deliberately to consider and determine the future of Canada and of British North America. It is our happiness to know the expression of the will of our Gracious Sovereign, through Her Ministers, that we have her full sanction for our deliberations, that Her only solicitude is that we shall adopt a system which shall be really for our advantage, and that She promises to sanction whatever conclusion after full deliberation we may arrive at as to the best

mode of securing the well-being,—the present and future prosperity of British America.—(Cheers.) It is our privilege and happiness to be in such a position, and we cannot be too grateful for the blessings thus conferred upon us. (Hear, hear.) I must apologize for having detained you so long—for having gone perhaps too much into tedious details with reference to the questions bearing on the Constitution now submitted to this House.—(Cries of “no, no” and “go on.”)—In conclusion, I would again implore the House not to let this opportunity to pass. It is an opportunity that may never recur. At the risk of repeating myself, I would say, it was only by a happy concurrence of circumstances, that we were enabled to bring this great question to its present position. If we do not take advantage of the time, if we show ourselves unequal to the occasion, it may never return, and we shall hereafter bitterly and unavailingly regret having failed to embrace the happy opportunity now offered of founding a great nation under the fostering care of Great Britain, and our Sovereign Lady, Queen Victoria. (Loud cheers, amidst which the honorable gentleman resumed his seat).

The House, at eleven, P.M., adjourned.

— LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

TUESDAY, 7th February, 1865.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL said that yesterday he had promised to give to the House to-day an explanation of the provision contained in the 14th resolution relating to the selection of members for the Legislative Council of the General Legislature. This resolution read as follows:—

14. The first selection of the Members of the Legislative Council shall be made, except as regards Prince Edward Island, from the Legislative Councils of the various Provinces, so far as a sufficient number be found qualified and willing to serve; such Members shall be appointed by the Crown at the recommendation of the General Executive Government, upon the nomination of the respective Local Governments, and in such nomination due regard shall be had to the claims of the Members of the Legislative Council of the Opposition in each Province, so that all political parties may as nearly as possible be fairly represented.

And under it the first recommendation for the appointment of Legislative Councillors

from Canada would, should the Confederation scheme be adopted, come from the existing Government of this province. In making such recommendations, the spirit of the resolution would be carefully observed, and both sides in this House and as well life as elected members, be equally considered and fairly represented in the new Parliament.

HON. MR. FLINT begged to inquire whether the resolutions before the House were in all respects the same as those sent to the members.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL said they were not in one particular precisely as first printed, there being a clause in those before the House to allow New Brunswick to impose a duty on timber and logs, and Nova Scotia on coal, which was not found in the first; as for the other provinces, the imposition of such duties was reserved to the General Legislature. (Hear, hear, from Mr. CURRIE.)

HON. MR. CAMPBELL said he hoped that honorable members would rather aid in furthering the scheme than take pleasure in detecting the supposed causes of opposition. (Hear.)

HON. MR. CURRIE asked whether the difference between the two sets of resolutions was merely a misprint.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL could not say whether it was owing to a misprint or to an error in the manuscript.

HON. MR. CURRIE again asked whether the members of the Conference had not signed the instrument containing its resolutions?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL could only say that the resolutions now before the House truly and expressly represented the conclusions the Conference had arrived at. (Hear, hear.) Those conclusions had not been changed.

HON. MR. CURRIE then rose and said that the measure now before the House was the most important one ever submitted to a Colonial Legislature, and he hoped to be able to approach it with entire freedom from party spirit, and without the purpose of finding out unnecessary objections. He hoped he would, at all times, be able to judge of the measures presented with the fairness and candour of a Canadian and a British subject. At the outset he would, however, say, that the project now before the House had taken the country by surprise. The first time he had ever addressed the House he was reported to have spoken thus:—

That by a course of legislation alike moderate, prudent and upright, it will yet be the lot of some present to live and see the day when Canada will be the centre of a noble British North American Confederacy extending from the Atlantic to the

Pacific—a Confederacy not born in war, or baptised in blood, but a Confederacy united by the bonds of friendship, held together by the strong ties of friendly commerce and mutual interests, and cemented by a common allegiance to the throne of Great Britain.

From this quotation it would be seen that then he was in favor of a Confederation of the several British North American Provinces, but he little thought then that within two short years such a scheme would be submitted to Parliament. He was still in favor of Confederation—(hear)—but it must be a Confederation founded on a just and equitable basis, upon principles which would be alike advantageous to all parts and injurious to none. If any other kind of Confederation were agreed upon, it would contain within itself the seeds of decay and dissolution. The project had been elaborately presented to the House by the gallant knight at the head of the Government, and by his able colleague, the Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands, and what reasons had they alleged in favor of it? He confessed he had been quite surprised at some of the arguments of the former. That hon. gentleman had stated that if the scheme were rejected, whether we would or would not, Canada would be forced by violence into the American Union, or placed upon an inclined plane which would carry us there. Now when men occupying high positions like the hon. member, assumed the responsibility of giving utterance to such startling opinions, they ought to be prepared to support them with very cogent reasons.

HON. SIB E. P. TACHÉ—I am quite ready to give them.

HON. MR. CURRIE—If the case were as represented, it must be because we are quite defenceless, and that except in union with the Lower Provinces we were at the mercy of the United States. But what did the honorable member mean by the inclined plane? For his part he had not heard of any desire on the part of the people of this province to change their political institutions and turn from the glorious flag under which many of them had fought and bled. Had anything been heard from abroad, to the effect that unless we accepted this scheme, England would cast us off or let us slide down the inclined plane? (Laughter) Yet these were the sole, or at least the chief, reasons alleged by that honorable member. Let us then ask ourselves whether the scheme provided a remedy for the threatened evils. Would Canada indeed be so physically strengthened seaward and landward by this alliance,

that in the event of aggression on the part of the United States, we would be rendered quite safe? It was easy to say that union gave strength, but would this union really give us strength? He could understand that union with a people contiguous would do so, but union with provinces 1,500 miles apart at the extreme points, was a very different thing, and more likely to be a source of weakness. In his mind it was like tying a small twine at the end of a large rope and saying it strengthened the whole line. When the honorable member said that Canada would be supported by all the military power of the Lower Provinces, we should not run away with the idea that this meant anything. What were the facts? Upon looking at the census of those provinces he found that the male population between the ages of 21 and 50—the extreme limits at which men bore arms—was 128,457, of which number 63,289 were chiefly employed on the water, that is, in the coasting trade and the fisheries, leaving 65,000 to assist in the defence of Canada. (Hear, hear.) Now, suppose a draft of one-third of these was made for military exigencies—and one-third would be a large proportion—we would have less than 22,000 men available for the service. Why, that would not be enough to defend their own frontier from aggression. Without referring to the causes which had led to the formation of the present Government, or to the extraordinary conduct of some of the public men composing it, he must nevertheless allude to the express objects they professed to have in view in coming together. And the principal object was [a scheme of federation, but not the scheme now offered to the House. If he understood the matter at all, the Government was organized on the basis of a Confederation of Upper and Lower Canada first, in which Confederation the Lower Provinces might afterwards be admitted if they wished it.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—Not so.

HON. MR. CURRIE—He was not surprised at the dissent of the Honorable Commissioner of Crown Lands, for the leaders in both Houses had placed the larger object, that is, the organization of a general Confederation, as the primary one. But the basis of the organization had been reduced to writing, and he held in his hand the paper which recapitulated the conditions. They were as follows:—“The Government are prepared to pledge themselves to bring in a measure, next session, for the purpose of removing existing difficulties by introducing the Federal principle into Canada, coupled with such provision as will

permit the Maritime Provinces and the North-West Territory to be incorporated into the same system of Government."

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—The resolutions on the table fulfilled that promise.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Well, the honorable member's colleague, the Provincial Secretary, did not mention the Lower Provinces otherwise than incidentally at the great meeting in South Oxford, and the Intercolonial Railway not at all. If his position (Hon. Mr. CURRIE's) was correct, that the Confederation of Canada alone was the basis of the coalition, then they had not carried out their pledge, and he pronounced the scheme now propounded as the authorized production of a number of self-appointed delegates, and not the measure the country expected. Then he had been surprised to find that in the Conference Canada had so small a representation. He very willingly admitted that we had very able men there, but they were few compared with the whole number of the Conference, and did not fairly represent the population and wealth of the country. The Honorable Commissioner of Crown Lands had said, to be sure, that it did not make much difference as the votes were not taken by numbers but by the provinces; in other words, that Prince Edward Island, with its population of 80,000 souls, had as much to say as Canada with its millions.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—The two sections of Canada voted separately.

HON. MR. CURRIE—That was not much better, for it made Prince Edward Island equal to Upper Canada, with nearly 1,500,000 of population. But all this apart, he maintained the country was not prepared to pass judgment upon this momentous question. It was the greatest matter that had ever been presented for its consideration, and it should be the aim of all to have it perfectly understood and approved of before it was adopted. We should seek to frame a Constitution which would last for ages. If any portion of the country were seriously opposed to the project, and it were carried through in spite of them, a wrong would be inflicted which would perpetuate itself in all coming time. If passed against the sense of a majority of Upper or Lower Canada, the act might lead to an agitation such as had never been witnessed, and which might be fraught with the most disastrous consequences. To prove that the country was not prepared for this sudden change, he would ask how many public meetings had been held in Upper Canada for the purpose of discussing it? He had heard of but one, and

that not very influential, where both sides of the question were discussed. The people had in fact been waiting for the programme, and to this moment it had not been supplied—certainly not in all its details. In a matter of this momentous importance, upon which the well-being of millions in the future might so much depend, he sincerely trusted the country would not be hurried, but that full time for discussion would be given to enable it to arrive at a safe verdict. (Hear.) It was said that all the Governments interested were in favor of the project, and it was well known that there was to be a dissolution of Parliament in one of the provinces; if so, where was the necessity for haste in Canada, unless indeed it was for the purpose of unduly influencing the other provinces? When the union between Upper and Lower Canada was effected, there had been no such impatience of delay. The Imperial Government had brought in a bill, copies of which were sent out, and submitted to the Parliament of Upper Canada—Lower Canada then had no Parliament to consult, and in its case there was less need of delay than now—the bill was sent home again approved, though meetings were held in Lower Canada strongly opposed to the measure, and to this day it is said it was forced upon an unwilling people. (Hear, hear, from some of the French members.) If time was then allowed, why should not time be allowed now, when a much more important union was in question? (Hear, hear.) Had the views of such eminent men as Lord Ellenborough and Lord Durham been duly appreciated in 1839, this Parliament would not now be met for the purpose of dissolving a union which had been unprofitable to one section, and unsatisfactory to the other. (Hear, hear, derisively.) He would now take the liberty to quote the views of Lord Durham, to which he had just alluded. They were as follows:

I am averse to every plan that has been proposed for giving an equal number of members to the two Provinces, in order to obtain the temporary end of out-numbering the French, because I think the same object will be obtained without any violation of the principles of representation, and without any such appearance of injustice in the scheme, as would set public opinion both in England and America strongly against it; and because, when emigration shall have increased the English population in the Upper Province, the adoption of such a principle would operate to defeat this very purpose it is intended to serve. It appears to me that any such elective arrangement founded on the present Provincial Division

would tend to defeat the purpose of Union, and perpetrate the idea of disunion.

He cited these pregnant words to indicate the danger of resorting to temporary expedients for the purpose of overcoming grave difficulties. If hon. members desired to establish a union under which the provinces would grow in wealth, power and importance, they must endeavor to make it as nearly infallible as fallible men could. He had already remarked that there had been but little discussion in Upper Canada on this subject, and he felt it ill became him, representing, as he did, a large constituency, to vote approbation before the people understood what the vote involved. In the Lower Provinces the people and the press seemed alive to the subject, for the latter teemed with articles for and against, all tending to give information which our population had not received. But speaking of the Lower Provinces, he was really afraid that some public men down there were disposed to exaggerate the advantages of a union with Canada, just as some of ours seemed prone to magnify the riches of the Lower Provinces. If we were going into a partnership, which he hoped would last if entered into—(hear, hear,)—we should not attempt to deceive each other, for if the people found they had been deceived, the compact would be short-lived. To give honorable members some idea of the manner in which the subject was presented by leading men in the provinces, he would read them an extract from the speech of a Mr. LYNCH, at a large meeting in Halifax, as reproduced by one of the organs of the Government there.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—What organ?

HON. MR. CURRIE—They had so many organs they did not seem to know them all. (Laughter.) He would now read from the speech in question:—

But we are told by others that we had better have nothing to do with Canada, because she is bankrupt. Canada bankrupt! I wish we were all such bankrupts. She is overflowing with wealth. This is now rapidly developing itself, and must eventually place her among the first nations of the earth. I have travelled over and examined that great country, and it would take more than all the time allotted to me to tell you of her wealth and resources. Her rivers are among the largest in the world, and her lakes are mighty inland oceans. I never had any idea of their extent until I stood on the shore of Lake Erie, saw before me a large square rigged ship, and was told that such was the class of vessels that navigated those waters. Why, sir, 7,000,000 tons of shipping trade upon those mighty lakes. Again, look at the growth of the population. Sixty years ago it was 60,000, now it is 3,000,000.

Upper Canada doubled her population in ten years, and Toronto, in the beginning of this century the abode of the red man of the forest, is now one of the finest cities of British America, with a population of 40,000. The soil is of the richest description, indeed it is only too much so. In some places rich alluvial deposit is found to the depth of 50 feet, and in many instances lands have yielded their crops for years without the aid of a spadeful of manure. Canada has not only the greatest yield but the best wheat in America. It is a well-known fact that the people of the United States in exporting their best flour mix it to a large extent with Canadian wheat, and in order to give you an idea of the increased growth of it I would inform you that while in ten years the wheat crop increased in the States 50 per cent. (an immense increase), it in the same time in Canada increased 400 per cent. The average crop is equal to that of the best wheat growing countries in Europe, while some places have yielded the almost incredible quantity of 100 bushels to the acre. The yield of last year was 27,000.

He only wished that this honorable gentleman alone had been mistaken, but even the Hon. Mr. TILLEY, one of the most distinguished statesmen of New Brunswick, had made the statement that our tariff was in fact only an eleven per cent. tariff. But all the errors were not on that side, for they need but turn to a celebrated speech of one of our own leading men—a speech regarded almost as an important state paper—and there it was stated that the United Provinces would become the third maritime power in the world. (Hear, Hear.) England, it said, was first, then the United States, and the speaker doubted if France could take the third rank before us. Our sea-going tonnage would be five millions, and our lake tonnage seven millions. These were vast figures, and it almost bewildered the mind to conceive their magnificent proportions. (Laughter.) Now supposing all these vessels were 500 tons each, it would require 14,000 to make up the sum, but unfortunately the census showed that we had but 808 sailors to navigate them—rather a small number it must be admitted for 14,000 ships. (Great laughter.) The way the mistake—to use the mildest expression—was made, was simple enough. The vessels were entered at the Custom Houses every time they came in and left port, and as some of them came into port 200 times in the year, as at Toronto for instance, their tonnage was counted 200 times. It was easy in this way to run up our inland marine to seven millions of tons. But then if the products of Canada were as great as Mr. LYNCH represented, why of course we would require

all those ships to carry away all that wheat. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) He would be glad if he could tell as fine a story, but he could not do that and at the same time tell the truth. Then the Lower Provinces were told that our tariff averaged eleven per cent., but was it so? [The honorable member was here quoting from a speech of Hon. Mr. TILLEY, to which he had before alluded.]

HON. MR. ROSS—Read on.

HON. MR. CURRIE, reading on, immediately came to a paragraph explaining the 11 per cent. to mean the average of duties on the value of all imported goods, a large proportion of which were duty free.

HON. MR. ROSS—The statement was correct. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. CURRIE then proceeded to show the truth in regard to the duties on staples and articles in domestic use in Canada. He said if honorable gentlemen would turn to the Trade and Navigation returns for 1864, they would find that in the first half of that year we imported and paid the following duties on eight kinds of commodities:

	Value.	Duty.
Cottons.....	\$3,277,985	\$644,381
Woolens.....	2,537,669	499,084
Tea, lbs., 3,048,567.....	1,059,674	275,124
Iron and hardware.....	776,225	151,422
Linen.....	421,543	84,136
Hats and Caps.....	281,197	55,546
Sugar.....	779,907	376,189
Sugar, refined.....	9,980	6,260
Coffee, green.....	89,016	20,449
		<hr/>
		\$2,112,593

Thus hon. gentlemen would see we pay more than fifty per cent. on our sugar, nearly twenty-three per cent. on coffee, while upon tea we pay about twenty-six per cent. He was afraid that if the present condition of Canada was calmly considered we would be found going into the union in a state far different from the glowing representations of Hon. Mr. LYNCH. Let hon. members look at the trade of Canada for half of the year 1864, and they would find that the balance against us was \$9,999,000. Then there was the interest upon the public debt; interest upon loans to private individuals; bank dividends payable abroad, for much of the stock of our banks was held out of the province; the interest to loan companies and others; all to be added to the debit balance, and the picture of wealth conjured up would present a very different aspect. Indeed, he wondered how, with all these burdens, the country had borne up so well.—

8

In the next place, he objected to the manner in which the scheme had been brought down. Why, if the Government desired the House to vote favorably, did they not act and speak understandingly? Why did they not at once bring in the schemes for the local governments and the estimated cost of the Intercolonial Railway? He (Hon. Mr. CURRIE) did not object to the principle of Confederation. (Hear, hear.) No, and he believed there would be the most perfect unanimity on the subject, as there was among the delegates as to the principle of Confederation, but he asked to have, as part of the scheme, the cost of the railway, which seemed to be part and parcel of it. We knew little of this project, where it was to commence and where to end, or how many ends it was to have. We heard there was to be one branch from Truro to Pictou; and then it was said again that the road must pass through the valley of the St. John, and end in that city. Were we to accept the project without information? Were we to have a road to Halifax? to purchase the Grand Trunk to Rivière du Loup and the link from Truro to Halifax, all of them to enter and form part of the national railway? Notwithstanding the admitted talent of the delegates, he contended that a manifest injustice had been done to Canada, and especially to Upper Canada, in the distribution of the subsidies to the local governments. Hon. gentlemen must bear in mind that the subsidies change not with population, but remain fixed. They were as follows:—

Upper Canada.....	\$1,116,873 00
Lower Canada.....	889,248 00
Nova Scotia.....	264,000 00
New Brunswick.....	<hr/>
	\$201,600
	63,000
	<hr/>
	264,000 00
Prince Edward Island..	64,035
	89,043
	<hr/>
	153,728 00
Newfoundland.....	98,110
	270,890
	<hr/>
	869,000 00
	<hr/>
	\$3,556,849 00

If a person was proposing to enter into a partnership he would naturally inquire into the assets of the other members of the intended firm. We knew what our assets were. We had the finest canals in the world, which had cost many millions.

HON. MR. ROSS—And they pay.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Place tolls on the St. Lawrence Canals and you will see what they pay. There was one canal that did pay, the Welland. In 1861 this work alone earned

a net revenue of \$184,289 50, over and above the costs of repair and management; and if you add to that amount the tolls unwisely refunded, \$56,474 63, you have an amount equal to five per cent. on the total expenditure on the Welland Canal, as shown in the Report of the Commissioner of Public Works, up to the 1st January, 1862, and a margin of \$7,436 to the credit of this work. Then we had the St. Lawrence Canals, and if they did not pay it was because of the extravagance of the management and the system of toll on those works. (Hear.) It was reported that some people believed if we could only get Confederation we would have enough to pay for both the general and local governments, and so much more to spare that we would not know what to do with our money. What would be the revenue of the Confederation? Taking the year 1863 as the basis, we find the revenues of the proposed Confederation for that year, from customs and excise, to be as follows:

Canada.....	\$5,999,320 98
Newfoundland.....	\$496,890
Prince Edward Island..	153,520
Nova Scotia.....	861,989
New Brunswick.....	768,353
	<hr/>
	2,280,752 00
	<hr/>
	\$8,280,072 98

We will now consider the burdens to be assumed by the Confederation. Interest on the debt of Canada, \$3,812,514 01; interest on the debts of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, of \$15,000,000, say \$750,000; interest on the debt of Newfoundland, of \$946,000, and the debt of Prince Edward Island, of \$240,673—\$59,333. Add to this the interest on the cost of constructing the Intercolonial Railway, not less than \$1,000,000 yearly, supposing it were to cost us but \$20,000,000, and the amount to be spent yearly for defensive purposes, \$1,000,000. And assuming that civil government and the cost of legislation should be no more for the Confederation than for Canada, which is certainly a reasonable view, we have for civil government, \$430,572 47; for legislation, \$627,377 92; judges' salaries, Lower Canada, \$115,755 55; judges' salaries, Upper Canada, \$157,690 33; emigration and quarantine, \$57,406 32; ocean and river service, \$511,356 40; lighthouses and coasts, \$102,724 75; fisheries, \$22,758 41; cost of collecting revenue and excise in Canada, \$401,561 41; local subsidies to provinces, \$3,056,849. Thus shewing a balance against revenue of \$3,825,-

781 89; and if the canals are to be enlarged, as promised, an additional debt must be created of \$12,000,000 for such purpose,—another annual charge of \$600,000,—or a total balance against revenue of \$4,425,781 89. These gentlemen from the east were going to give us the Intercolonial Railway and enlarge our canals, but if to enlarge the canals, why were not the canals put in the Constitution?

HON. MR. DICKSON—They did not want to throw cold water upon it. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. CURRIE—Why not give a guarantee for their enlargement? He found that the desirable improvement would entail an expense of \$12,000,000. As to the local subsidy, he regarded it as a farce, or as honey spread out to catch flies. As to the argument that the rejection of the scheme would injure our credit, he would ask whether the bondholders would not much prefer our present financial condition to one of fifteen millions of increased indebtedness, with nothing of value to show for it. If the people of England knew that Confederation and the Intercolonial Railway meant an increase of fifty per cent. on our tariff, they would not be so anxious for it. As to the representation in the Confederated Legislative Council, it was proposed to give Upper Canada and Lower Canada twenty-four members each, and to the Lower Provinces twenty-eight. That is, the 780,000 souls in the Lower Provinces would have four members more than Upper Canada with its million and a half. This proved that though Canada had talented men in the Conference, they either forgot our interests or sat there powerless. When the Legislative Council of Canada was made elective, his honorable friend near him (Hon. Mr. CHRISTIE) had stood up for the right of Upper Canada, as the Delegates should have done in the Conference. On the second reading of the bill to change the constitution of the Legislative Council, on the 14th March, 1856,—

Mr. BROWN moved, seconded by Mr. FOLEY, That it be an instruction to the Committee to amend the bill, by providing that the members of the Legislative Council shall be elected for four years, one-half retiring every second year.

Mr. GOULD moved, seconded by Mr. WRIGHT, That it be an instruction to the Committee to amend the bill by providing that the constituencies shall be arranged according to population, without regard to the division line between Upper and Lower Canada.

This amendment was supported by the Hon. Messrs. AIKINS, BROWN, CAMERON, CHRISTIE, FOLEY, FREEMAN, WILSON, and many leading reformers in Upper Canada.

And on the third reading of the bill on the 27th March,—

Mr. HARTMAN moved, seconded by Mr. CHRISTIE, That the bill be recommitted to a Committee of the whole House, with a view to arrange the electoral divisions so as to embrace within each, as nearly as practicable, an equal population, and without regard to a division line between Upper and Lower Canada.

This amendment, although supported by Messrs. BROWN, CHRISTIE, and twenty other Upper Canada members, was not carried.

If representation by population were right in 1856, was it not equally right in 1865? But it might be said that the union was to be a federal one, whereas it was no such thing. It was neither federal nor legislative, but a mongrel between both. If the representation had been properly arranged, there would have been no necessity for honorable members vacating their seats. In that case, Upper Canada would have had 30, Lower Canada 24, and the Lower Provinces 18. Yesterday the Honorable Commissioner of Crown Lands had given reasons for abolishing the elective principle as applied to this House; but not over a year ago he had lauded the system, and he (Hon. Mr. CURRIE) had not heard the life members say a word in opposition. The system had got a fair trial of eight years, and had proved satisfactory, and would a few self-constituted delegates, with a dash of the pen, destroy that which had received the sanction of the country? He was never sent to this House to vote away its constitution—(hear, hear)—and before endorsing any such proposition he would wish to go to his constituents, and if they said yes, he would not oppose—(hear, hear)—but without that permission, he was not going to give a vote which might have the effect of giving him his seat for life. (Hear, hear.) He had heard of Lower Canada domination, but if this was the first taste of eastern domination, he wished no more of it. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—It was not a peculiarity of Canada, but the judgment of the whole Conference. (Hear.)

HON. MR. CURRIE—He then presumed it was not the proposition of the honorable member that the seat the people had given him should be given to the Crown; but it seemed he had passed under the domination of the Lower Provinces. (Laughter.) In 1849, the Legislature had made provision for the support of common schools in Canada, and had set aside one million acres of the best lands for that noble purpose. The lands, all

situate in Upper Canada, had been sold, and a fund of a million and a quarter accumulated, but with another stroke of the pen this, too, was to be scored out. In 1862, the Government of the day had brought down a bill to amend the Separate School Act of Upper Canada, and without expressing an opinion as to its merits, he might say it had produced a very strong feeling of indignation. A mass meeting was held in Toronto to condemn the bill, and the people were so exasperated that they had called upon certain members of the Government to resign. Other meetings were held, viz. :—

Meeting at Harrington, North Oxford, 25th March, 1863 :

Resolved,—That the Hon. W. MACDOUGALL has betrayed the interests of his constituents for the sake of office.

Meeting at East Nissouri, 6th April, 1863

Resolved,—That this meeting, while viewing the manner in which the Hon. WM. MACDOUGALL has betrayed the interests of his constituents in supporting Mr. SCOTT'S Separate School Bill, believes it to be his duty to resign his seat in the Provincial Parliament as member for the North Riding of Oxford.

He had read these resolutions to show the feeling which then prevailed, and he might have quoted articles to prove that the measure was regarded as a most iniquitous one. He would give one or two from the *Globe* :—

We can hardly believe that a government based on the double majority, will permit an alteration in our common school system in defiance of the vote of an Upper Canadian majority.

March 20th.—The prospects of Mr. SCOTT'S bill in the Upper House are not very bright. When it was brought up from the Assembly, nobody rose to move the first reading, and Sir ETIENNE TACHÉ, who, it will be remembered, introduced this last Upper Canada Separate School Bill, which passed into law, was about to assume this responsibility, when Mr. MCCREA, the newly elected Councillor for the Western Division, came to the rescue.

The SPEAKER then very improperly suggested Mr. AIKINS as the seconder, an office which the member for the Home Division promptly declined. No one else appearing, Mr. LETHBRIDGE, a French Canadian, seconded the motion. This is French domination with a vengeance. We are not astonished to find that there is a disposition to give the bill strong opposition, regardless of the consequences to the government.

April 11.—The bill passed the second reading in the Legislative Council, 11 to 13 from Upper Canada.

In spite of every temptation, Upper Canada stands true to her school system. The bill may pass as other infamies have passed our Legisla-

ture before, but it will not be by Upper Canada votes. If our school system is destroyed, Lower Canada must bear the shame of it.

April 21st.—Although the bill has passed both Houses, and no number of meetings can stay its progress, it is well for the people of Upper Canada to pronounce upon its merits. They are deeply hurt and mortified by this treatment they have received from Lower Canadians and traitors among their own representatives. A sense of personal wrong and injury exists which we have never witnessed in so great a degree before. The iron of Lower Canada domination seems to have touched the soul of the people and the wound rankles. The word contempt does not express the feeling which is manifested. There is a spice of bitterness about it which takes it out of that category.

But, notwithstanding these evidences of dissatisfaction, the act became law, and it remained for the present Government, by this scheme, to perpetuate the law. He was surprised that the Government, framed as it was, should become parties to such a scheme. They had not yet done with the school question. They proposed to protect the Protestant minority of Lower Canada, and a petition was on the table exhibiting what was desired. This was proof enough that the people were not satisfied; and whether or not the scheme of Confederation were adopted, the Government should bring in a measure to do the petitioners justice. Then from Upper Canada the Roman Catholics asked to be placed in a position precisely similar to that which the Protestants of Lower Canada were seeking, and if each of these minorities were suffering injustice, why should not their complaints be redressed before a Confederation took place? Let these measures prelude Confederation, and let not Parliament be asked to proceed blindfold. He was satisfied that if the Intercolonial Railway project were taken out of the scheme, we would not hear much about it afterwards. Some leading men in Halifax had said, "the Railway first, and Confederation next."

HON. MR. SANBORN—Hon. Mr. TILLEY had said that.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Then it would be better to try the Confederation without the railway. It would, after all, be much easier for the members from the Lower Provinces to come to Ottawa than it used to be for the members from Sandwich to go to Montreal at the time of the union. The Grand Trunk Railway had cost the province a vast sum, but then it had been of vast service to the country. But where is the company that would keep the Intercolonial Railway running for its earnings,

the road and the rolling stock being made over to them as a gift? Suppose a merchant from Montreal wants to go to England, which road will he prefer? Why, he would go by way of Portland. Would any produce be sent over such a road? How much wheat was there sent over the Grand Trunk, even in winter?

HON. MR. FERRIER—A great deal.

HON. MR. CURRIE—How much from Montreal? And why did we hear complaints from Huron and Bruce?

SEVERAL VOICES—They have no railway there. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. CURRIE—Was there not the Buffalo and Lake Huron Railway passing through Huron? It was our duty to hesitate and not to press on at railway speed, but to act like prudent men. We were sent here to place a check upon hasty legislation. But was there ever such hasty legislation as this? Yet as the Government were strong in Parliament, they might attempt to press the measure without the consent of the people. If they do, however, pursue such a course, they will perhaps receive a check in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, for in these provinces they had no intention to pass the measure without a free and full discussion.

HON. MR. ROSS—Why, if it was good for them as the hon. member said, they might be glad to do it.

HON. MR. MCCREA—If it was so unfavorable for CANADA it must be in the same degree favorable to the Lower Provinces.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Oh, that does not by any means follow; they are a frugal, industrious and intelligent people, and it may be considered inadvisable by them to join a people who, in the short term of ten years, by a course of extravagance and prodigality increased the expenses of their government nearly four hundred per cent., independent of the increase of the public debt. They might also call to mind the Grand Trunk swindles.

HON. MR. ROSS—When the hon. member said that there had been Grand Trunk swindles, he said what was not correct.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Perhaps he used a wrong term. He meant Grand Trunk frauds. Those people might hesitate about connecting themselves with a people that had almost brought themselves to the verge of national bankruptcy, and loaded themselves with such a heavy tariff, they might recall to mind the political dishonesty of our public men, men who had so maligned and blackened the public character of each other as to require a wider stage and a new audience to witness

their future acts. They would also observe that all formerly connected with the Grand Trunk were urging this scheme forward. He then accused the Government of bad faith in bringing down these resolutions, instead of a measure simply for the Canadas; that the reform party only committed themselves to the latter scheme when Mr. BROWN entered the Cabinet, but now it was only secondary. To bear this out he read the following resolution adopted by that party:—

Moved by Mr. HOPE MCKENZIE, and seconded by Mr. MCGIVERIK—That we approve of the course which has been pursued by Mr. BROWN in the negotiations with the Government, and that we approve of the project of a Federal union of the Canadas, with provision for its extension to the Maritime Provinces and the North-Western territory, as one based on which the constitutional difficulties now existing should be settled.

He was not personally opposed to Confederation in itself, but this measure was so defective that he could not support it, bearing, as it did, the seeds of decay apparent in its details. He heartily concurred in the views expressed recently at Halifax, by a distinguished Upper Canada Statesman—(MR. BROWN):—“On a survey of the whole case, I do think that there is no doubt as to the high advantages that would result from a union of all the colonies, provided that terms of union could be found just to all the contracting parties, and so framed as to secure harmony in the future administration of affairs. But it were wrong to conceal for a moment that the whole merit of the scheme of union may be completely marred by the character of its details.” He asked who would not say that the details of this measure did not so mar as to spoil the scheme. If we are to have a Confederation, let it be put upon a proper and permanent foundation, one that will be of advantage to this young and vigorous province, and he expressed the hope that only such a scheme would be sanctioned by Parliament. (Hear, hear, and applause.)

It being nearly six o'clock, HON. MR. ROSS moved to adjourn the debate till the morrow, which was carried.

The House then adjourned.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

TUESDAY, February 7, 1865.

ATTY. GEN. CARTIER rose to continue the debate on Confederation. He said that he approached this subject with a certain amount of diffidence, knowing it was not the first time he had had the honor of speaking upon it in the Lower Provinces and elsewhere. He felt that this was a momentous occasion, as for anything that he said on this grave question, he was responsible to his constituents and the country. Respecting this grave question, it had been said that the TACHE-MACDONALD Government had taken upon themselves the solution of a problem which was not at the time of its formation before the country, and had not even been mooted. Those saying so were ignorant of the parliamentary history of the past few years. He would briefly refer to the history of this great question, as far as it had been brought before the Parliament and country. When the CARTIER-MACDONALD Government was constructed, after the downfall of the BROWN-DORION Administration, a programme of the policy of the former was laid before Parliament. Among the subjects contained in this programme of 7th August, 1858, was one referred to in the following terms: “The late Government felt themselves bound to carry out the law of the land respecting the seat of Government, but, in the face of the recent vote on that subject, the Administration did not consider themselves warranted in incurring any expenditure for the public buildings, until Parliament has had an opportunity of considering the whole question in all its bearings; and the expediency of a Federal Union of the British North American Provinces will be anxiously considered, and communication with the Home Government and the Lower Provinces entered into forthwith on the subject; and the result of this communication will be submitted to Parliament at its next session. The Government will, during the recess, examine into the organization and working of the public departments, and carry out such administrative reforms as will be conducive to economy and efficiency.” Here was this scheme of a union of the provinces mentioned in the programme of the CARTIER-MACDONALD Government, in 1858. He merely quoted this passage to show that neither Parliament nor the country was now taken by surprise with regard to this scheme. (Hear, hear.) We had had general and special elections since 1858, and to pretend that

this subject, which had been so often canvassed, was new to the country, was to assert an untruth. At the close of that session, Sir EDMUND HEAD, in his Speech proroguing Parliament, made use of the following language:—"I propose, in the course of the recess, to communicate with Her Majesty's Government, and with the Governments of the sister colonies, on another matter of very great importance. I am desirous of inviting them to discuss with us the principles on which a bond of a federal character, uniting the Provinces of British North America, may perhaps hereafter be practicable." In accordance with that announcement of policy, a deputation was sent to England, composed of his then colleagues, Hons. Messrs. GALT and ROSS and himself. We pressed the matter before the Imperial Government, whom we asked to authorize a meeting of delegates from the British North American Governments, to consider this subject and report upon it, said report to be communicated to the Colonial Secretary. Of course we wanted, at that time, to act with the sanction and approval of the Imperial Government. We pressed the matter as strongly as we could before it. Of all the provinces that responded to the call of the Imperial Government, Newfoundland, he thought, was the only one which professed her readiness to appoint delegates when the opportune moment arrived. (Hear, hear.) Although the other provinces were not opposed to Confederation, still, as the question had not been brought conspicuously before their people, they did not like then to join in the measure and in the proceedings which the Canadian delegates had urged upon the Imperial Government in 1858. At this time the Canadian Delegates had a duty to perform towards the illustrious Administrator of the Government, Sir E. HEAD, to fulfil the promise he had made, on proroguing Parliament, by pressing the measure upon the attention of the Imperial Administration. The Canadian Government also kept its promise to report to the House the result of the mission to England, at the next session of Parliament. The hon. gentleman here read the despatch dated October, 1858, which was transmitted to the Imperial Government, setting forth the sectional difficulties which had arisen between Upper and Lower Canada, principally on account of the former's demand for increased representation in Parliament, on the ground of its much larger population. Every one who knew anything of his past public course was aware that he was opposed to the principle of representation by population

while Upper and Lower Canada were under one Government. He did not regret his opposition. If such a measure had been passed, what would have been the consequence? There would have been constant political warfare between Upper and Lower Canada. True it was that the members from Upper Canada, being in the majority, it might have been imagined they would have carried everything before them; but as far as justice to Lower Canada was concerned, such might not have been the case. The consequence of representation by population would have been that one territory would have governed another, and this fact would have presented itself session after session in the House, and day after day in the public prints. (Hear, hear.) The moment this principle had been conceded as the governing element, it would have initiated between the two provinces a warfare which would have been unremitting. (Hear, hear.) He wished that Upper Canada should understand him in this matter. He was accused of being opposed to Upper Canada's rights, because during fifteen or twenty years he had to oppose his honorable friend the President of the Council (Hon. MR. BROWN). His honorable colleague took the ground that representation should be arranged according to population in each section of the province. He (Hon. MR. CARTIER) had resisted that position, believing that the moment such a principle was applied, his honorable friend, who, no doubt, wanted to maintain the peaceful government of the country, would have been disappointed in his wish. It would have given rise to one of the bitterest struggles between the two provinces that ever took place between two nations. He did not mean to say that the majority from Upper Canada would have tyrannised over Lower Canada; but the idea that Upper Canada, as a territory, had the preponderance in the Government by a large number of representatives, would have been sufficient to generate that sectional strife to which he had alluded. In 1858 he first saw that representation by population, though unsuited for application as a governing principle as between the two provinces, would not involve the same objection if other partners were drawn in by a federation. In a struggle between two—one a weak, and the other a strong party—the weaker could not but be overcome; but if three parties were concerned, the stronger would not have the same advantage; as when it was seen by the third that there was too much strength on one side, the third would club with the weaker

combatant to resist the big fighter. (Cheers and laughter.) He did not oppose the principle of representation by population from an unwillingness to do justice to Upper Canada. He took this ground, however, that when justice was done to Upper Canada, it was his duty to see that no injustice was done to Lower Canada. He did not entertain the slightest apprehension that Lower Canada's rights were in the least jeopardized by the provision that in the General Legislature the French Canadians of Lower Canada would have a smaller number of representatives than all the other origins combined. It would be seen by the resolutions that in the questions which would be submitted to the General Parliament there could be no danger to the rights and privileges of either French Canadians, Scotchmen, Englishmen or Irishmen. Questions of commerce, of international communication, and all matters of general interest, would be discussed and determined in the General Legislature; but in the exercise of the functions of the General Government, no one could apprehend that anything could be enacted which would harm or do injustice to persons of any nationality. He did not intend to go into the details of the question of Confederation, but merely to bring before the House the most conspicuous arguments in order to induce members to accept the resolutions submitted by the Government. Confederation was, as it were, at this moment almost forced upon us. We could not shut our eyes to what was going on beyond the lines, where a great struggle was going on between two Confederacies, at one time forming but one Confederacy. We saw that a government, established not more than 80 years ago, had not been able to keep together the family of states which had broke up four or five years since. We could not deny that the struggle now in progress must necessarily influence our political existence. We did not know what would be the result of that great war—whether it would end in the establishment of two Confederacies or in one as before. However, we had to do with five colonies, inhabited by men of the same sympathies and interests, and in order to become a great nation they required only to be brought together under one General Government. The matter resolved itself into this, either we must obtain British North American Confederation or be absorbed in an American Confederation. (Hear, hear, and dissent.) Some entertained the opinion that it was unnecessary to have British North American Confederation to prevent absorption

into the vortex of American Confederation. Such parties were mistaken. We knew the policy of England towards us—that she was determined to help and support us in any struggle with our neighbors. The British Provinces, separated as at present, could not defend themselves alone, and the question resolved itself into this: shall the whole strength of the empire be concentrated into Prince Edward Island, or Canada, as the case may be, in case of a war with the United States—or shall the provinces be left to fight single-handed, disunited? We were not sufficiently united. We had our duties, with regard to England, to perform. In order to secure the exercise of her power in our defence we must help her ourselves. We could not do this satisfactorily or efficiently unless we had a Confederation. When all united, the enemy would know that, if he attacked any part of those provinces—Prince Edward Island or Canada—he would have to encounter the combined strength of the empire. Canada, separate, would be, although comparatively strong in population and wealth, in a dangerous position should a war ensue. When we had organized our good defensive force, and united for mutual protection, England would send freely here both men and treasure for our defence. (Cheers.) He had stated before audiences in the Lower Provinces that, as far as territory, population and wealth were concerned, Canada was stronger than any of the other provinces, but at the same time was wanting in one element necessary to national greatness—the maritime one; and that, owing to the large trade and commerce of Canada, extensive communication with Great Britain at all seasons was absolutely necessary. Twenty years ago our commerce for the year could be managed by communication with Great Britain in the summer months only. At present, however, this system was insufficient, and for winter communication with the sea-board we were left to the caprice of our American neighbors, through whose territory we must pass. He had also alluded to the bonding system, which if the Americans were to withdraw, Canada would be left in winter without any winter harbors. Canada, having two or three elements of national greatness—territory and population—wanted the maritime element; and as he had said,—the Lower Provinces had this element and a sea-board, but not not a back country or large population, which Canada possessed,—and for the mutual benefit and prosperity of all the provinces, all these elements ought to be united

together. Those who pretended that the British North American Provinces would be in as safe a position, remaining separate, while they belonged to the British Crown, as under Confederation, were under great misapprehension. Now was the time for us to form a great nation of the several provinces. Now was the time to look the matter in the face and adopt the only safe and prudent course open to us in the shape of Confederation. He maintained it was necessary for our own commercial interests, prosperity and efficient defence. That was what we had now to discuss, and not the manner in which Confederation was to be brought about, which would be discussed when the details of the scheme came up for consideration. At present the question was: Was Confederation of the British North American Provinces necessary in order to increase our strength and power and secure to us the continuance of the benefits of British connection? He had no doubt that the measure was necessary for those objects. It would be observed that the English speaking opponents of the scheme, in Lower Canada, pretended a fear of this element being absorbed by the French Canadian; while the opponents, composed of the latter origin—of men who might be called the old Papineau Tail—whose sole idea was annexation to the United States—said they were afraid of the extinction of French Canadian nationality in the great Confederation. The annexation party in Montreal, including the followers of Mr. JOHN DOUGALL, the proprietor of the *Witness*, opposed the scheme on the ground of supposed danger to the British of Lower Canada. The annexation party could not, however, be supposed to be sincere in their opposition to the scheme—except in so far as they desired to carry Canada into the American Union. The absorption of this province into the United States had long been contemplated, as would be seen from the 7th article in the original draft of the American Constitution, which he would read. It was as follows: "Art. 7. Canada, according to this Confederation and joining in the measures of the United States, shall be admitted into, and entitled to all the advantages of this union; and shall be equally bound to a strict observance of, and obedience to, these articles; as shall be also any other colony which shall be admitted into this Confederacy. The eleven votes in Congress shall be increased in proportion as the Confederacy is extended. But, except Canada, no other colony shall be admitted into the Confederacy

without the assent of eleven or more votes, as the case may require, by the Confederation being extended." By that article, no new state could go into the union except by the vote of the number of states required to admit a new partner. But, as regarded Canada, no such assent was required; on knocking at the door of the union, she would, as a matter of course, be admitted. (Hear, hear.) The honorable gentleman went on to say that the papers lately contained a report of a meeting at the *Institut Canadien* of Montreal, where it was resolved that it was for the interests of Lower Canada—in the interests of the French Canadians, were the province to become a part of the American Union.

HON. MR. DORION said that was not the case. The honorable gentleman had misquoted what had passed there.

HON. MR. CARTIER said he was right. If resolutions were not passed, sentiments were expressed to that effect. Then the organ of the Institute—*L'Ordre*, he thought—had set forth that the interests of Lower Canada would be better secured by annexation to the United States than entering into a Confederation with the British American Provinces. It was no wonder, then, that the French Canadian annexationists betrayed their purpose in opposition to British North American Confederation, and that their English-speaking colleagues pretended a fear of the rights of their class being jeopardized under Confederation. We knew their object in this—that they were aware that as soon as this project was adopted, there would be no avail in any cry of separation to form a part of the American Union. (Hear, hear.) There had been a good deal of fault-finding and complaint as to the proceedings of the delegates having been conducted with closed doors. Such a course was an absolute necessity. Every one could understand that if all the difficulties arising among the representatives of the five colonies, during the Conference, had gone every morning to the public, it would have been impossible for the delegates to continue to meet, or compromise any of the difficulties that might be expected to spring up. Besides, the proceedings of the American Congress of 1782 was held with closed doors, and their proceedings were not published while matters were progressing. With regard to this, he would quote from a letter of Col. MASON, a member of the Convention:—"All communications of the proceedings are forbidden during the sitting of this Convention; this, I think, was a necessary precaution to

prevent misrepresentations or mistakes; there being a material difference between the appearance of a subject in its first crude and indigested shape and after it shall have been properly matured and arranged." On the same principle the Conference at Quebec very properly sat with closed doors. (Hear, hear.) We wished, however, that the British Canadian public should know the result of our labors when concluded, and that result the Parliament and people of Canada had before their consideration, and it was for them to discuss its merits. We, on this side of the House—the members of the Government and their supporters—had come to the conclusion that Federation was desirable and necessary; and we were ready to hear the honorable gentlemen on the other side who necessarily, from their standing, were supposed to have devoted their attention to it and appreciated their position, stating what in their opinion would be sufficient in order to maintain ourselves as a British colony on this side of the Atlantic, and to increase in wealth and power. He was aware that some members of the House, and a number of people in Upper Canada, in Lower Canada and in the Lower Provinces, were of opinion that a Legislative Union ought to have taken place instead of a Federal Union. He would say, however, at the outset, that it was impossible to have one Government to deal with all the private and local interests of the several sections of the several provinces forming the combined whole. (Hear, hear.) The next question to be considered, therefore, by those who had set to work to discover a solution of the difficulties under which we had labored, was—what was the best and most practicable mode of bringing the provinces together, so that particular rights and interests should be properly guarded and protected? No other scheme presented itself but the Federation system, and that was the project which now recommended itself to the Parliament of Canada. Some parties—through the press and by other modes—pretended that it was impossible to carry out Federation, on account of the differences of races and religions. Those who took this view of the question were in error. It was just the reverse. It was precisely on account of the variety of races, local interests, &c., that the Federation system ought to be resorted to, and would be found to work well. (Hear, hear.) We were in the habit of seeing in some public journals, and hearing from some public men, that it was a great misfortune indeed there should be a difference of races in this colony

—that there should be the distinction of French Canadian from British Canadian. Now, he (Hon. Mr. CARTIER) desired on this point to vindicate the rights, the merits, the usefulness, so to speak, of those belonging to the French Canadian race. (Hear, hear.) In order to bring these merits and this usefulness more prominently before his hearers, it would be only necessary to allude to the efforts made by them to sustain British power on this continent, and to point out their adherence to British supremacy in trying times. We were all conversant with the history of the circumstances which had brought about the difficulties between England and her former American colonies in 1775. Lower Canada,—or rather he should say, the Province of Quebec, for the colony was not then known by the name of Canada, but was called the Province of Quebec,—contained the most dense population of any British colony in North America at that time. The accession of Lower Canada was of course an object of envy to the other American colonies, and strenuous efforts were made by those who had resolved to overthrow British power on this continent to induce Canada to ally herself to their cause. As early as 1775, the French Canadians were solemnly addressed in a proclamation by General WASHINGTON, who called upon them to abandon the flag of their new masters, inasmuch as they could not expect anything from those who differed from them in language, in religion, in race, and in sympathies. But what was the conduct of the French Canadian people under these circumstances—what was the attitude of the clergy and the seigniors? It was right in treating this chapter of our history, to render justice to whom justice was due, and it was truth to say that the seigniors, forming, as they did, the educated class of our population at that early epoch, had fully understood that the object and aim of those who appealed to them was the downfall of the monarchical system in America. (Hear, hear.) A few years only had elapsed at that time since the transfer of the country and its population from the Crown of France to the Crown of Great Britain; but even within that brief interval of time, they were enabled to appreciate the advantages of their new position, notwithstanding the fact that they were still struggling and complaining. The people, as well as the clergy and aristocracy, had understood that it was better for them to remain under the English and Protestant Crown of England, rather than to become republicans. (Hear, hear.) They were proof against the insidious offers of

GEORGE WASHINGTON; and not only so, but when the Americans came as invaders, they fought against the armed forces of ARNOLD, MONTGOMERY and others. (Cheers.) Attempts were made to excite hostility to Federation on the ground that, under the regime of a local legislature, the English Protestant minority would not be fairly dealt with. He thought the way in which the French Canadians had stood by British connection, when there were but few British in the province, was a proof that they would not attempt to deal unjustly now by the British minority, when their numbers were so much greater. On this point, appealing to the evidence of history, he would quote from the work which he had already quoted. At a time when there were, perhaps, hardly a few hundred English Protestant residents in Lower Canada, the address in the name of WASHINGTON, to which he had already briefly referred, was circulated throughout the country by ARNOLD's invading army. The hon. gentleman here read a number of extracts from General WASHINGTON's proclamation, addressed to the inhabitants of Canada. It made the most earnest appeals to the Lower Canadians to join the other colonies. "We rejoice," said General WASHINGTON, "that our enemies have been deceived with regard to you; they have persuaded themselves—they have even dared to say—that the Canadians were not capable of distinguishing between the blessings of liberty and the wretchedness of slavery; that gratifying the vanity of a little circle of nobility would blind the people of Canada. By such artifices they hoped to bend you to their views, but they have been deceived. * * * Come then, my brethren, unite with us in an indissoluble union; let us run together to the same goal. * * * Incited by these motives, and encouraged by the advice of many friends of liberty among you, the grand American Congress have sent an army into your province, under the command of General SCHUYLER—not to plunder but to protect you—to animate and bring forth into action those sentiments of freedom you have disclosed, and which the tools of despotism would extinguish through the whole creation. To co-operate with this design, and to frustrate those cruel and perfidious schemes, which would deluge our frontiers with the blood of women and children, I have despatched Colonel ARNOLD into your country, with a part of the army under my command. I have enjoined upon him, and I am certain that he will consider himself, and act as in the country of his patrons and best friends. Necessaries and

accommodations of every kind which you may furnish he will thankfully receive and render the full value. I invite you, therefore, as friends and brethren, to provide him with such supplies as your country affords; and I pledge myself not only for your safety and security, but for an ample compensation. Let no man desert his habitation—let no one flee as before an enemy. The cause of America and of liberty is the cause of every virtuous American citizen, whatever may be his religion or descent. The united colonies know no distinction but such as slavery, corruption and arbitrary dominion may create. Come then, ye generous citizens, range yourselves under the standard of general liberty—against which all the force of artifice and tyranny will never be able to prevail." It appeared by this address that the most tempting offers and promises had been made by the republican general; but they had failed, nevertheless, to accomplish the desired effect. This, however, was not the only trait of this nature in the history of the French Canadian people. There was another despatch, or rather proclamation, issued in 1778, by Baron D'ESTAING, commander of the French fleet, which was acting in aid of the American revolutionary party. The honorable gentleman read some extracts from this proclamation, as follows:—"I shall not ask the military companions of the Marquis of Lévis, those who shared his glory, who admired his talents and genius for war, who loved his cordiality and frankness, the principal characteristics of our nobility, whether there be other names in other nations among which they would be better pleased to place their own. Can the Canadians, who saw the brave MONTGALM fall in their defence—can they become the enemies of his nephews? Can they fight against their former leaders, and arm themselves against their kinamen? At the bare mention of their names, the weapons would fall out of their hands. I shall not observe to the ministers of the altars, that their evangelic efforts will require the special protection of Providence, to prevent faith being diminished by example, by worldly interest, and by sovereigns whom force has imposed upon them, and whose political indulgence will be lessened proportionably as those sovereigns shall have less to fear. I shall not observe that it is necessary for religion that those who preach it should form a body in the state; and that in Canada no other body would be more considered, or have more power to do good than that of the priests, taking a part in the Government, since their respectable conduct has merited the

confidence of the people. I shall not represent to that people, nor to all my countrymen in general, that a vast monarchy, having the same religion, the same manners, the same language, where they find kinsmen, old friends and brethren, must be an inexhaustible source of commerce and wealth, more easily acquired and better secured by their union with powerful neighbors, than with strangers of another hemisphere, among whom everything is different, and who, jealous and despotic sovereigns would, sooner or later, treat them as a conquered people, and doubtless much worse than their late countrymen, the Americans, who made them victorious. I shall not urge to a whole people that to join with the United States is to secure their own happiness, since a whole people, when they acquire the right of thinking and acting for themselves, must know their own interest. But I will declare, and I now formally declare in the name of His Majesty, who has authorized and commanded me to do it, that all his former subjects in North America, who shall no more acknowledge the supremacy of Great Britain, may depend upon his protection and support." D'ESTAING had appealed to their ancestry and their prejudices; he had invoked the names of LÉVIS and MONTCALM, and endeavored to influence their clergy; but the French Canadians understood their position too well. If they had their institutions, their language and their religion intact to-day, it was precisely because of their adherence to the British Crown. Had they yielded to the appeals of WASHINGTON and Baron D'ESTAING, it is probable that there would not have been now a vestige of British power on this continent. But, with the disappearance of British power, they too would have disappeared as French Canadians. (Hear, hear.) These historical facts taught that there should be a mutual feeling of gratitude from the French Canadians towards the British, and from the British towards the French Canadians, for our present position, that Canada is still a British colony. (Hear, hear.) He had had occasion, a moment ago, to refer to the French Canadian clergy in connection with D'ESTAING's address, and he would say this, to their honor and credit, that, if to-day Canada was a portion of the British Empire, it was due to the conservatism of the French Canadian clergy. (Cheers.) It was a pleasure to him thus to be able to quote from these old documents proofs of the honor, loyalty, and liberality of the French Canadian people. He (Hon. Mr. CARTER) was as devoid of prejudice as any honorable gentleman in this

House; but when he heard or read the statements occasionally made, that there was some danger that, under the Federation system, the French Canadians would have too much power, and that the power thus obtained would be used to the prejudice of the British and Protestant minority—the history of the past, in many instances, was the best reply to such attacks. (Hear, hear.) Baron D'ESTAING issued his tempting proclamation in 1778, and it was sent into Canada frequently afterwards, and circulated at the instigation of ROCHAMBEAU and LAFAYETTE; but our clergy and our aristocracy, the leaders of our people in these days, saw that it was not their interest to cast their lot with the democratic element—they knew the hollowness of democracy. (Hear, hear.) We found ourselves at the present day discussing the question of the Federation of the British North American Provinces, while the great Federation of the United States of America was broken up and divided against itself. There was, however, this important difference to be observed in considering the action of the two peoples. They had founded Federation for the purpose of carrying out and perpetuating democracy on this continent; but we, who had the benefit of being able to contemplate republicanism in action during a period of eighty years, saw its defects, and felt convinced that purely democratic institutions could not be conducive to the peace and prosperity of nations. We were not now discussing the great problem presented to our consideration, in order to propagate democratic principles. Our attempt was for the purpose of forming a Federation with a view of perpetuating the monarchical element. The distinction, therefore, between ourselves and our neighbors was just this:—In our Federation the monarchical principle would form the leading feature, while on the other side of the lines, judging by the past history and present condition of the country, the ruling power was the will of the mob, the rule of the populace. Every person who had conversed with the most intelligent American statesmen and writers must have learned that they all admitted that the governmental powers had become too extended, owing to the introduction of universal suffrage, and mob rule had consequently supplanted legitimate authority; and we now saw the sad spectacle of a country torn by civil war, and brethren fighting against brethren. The question for us to ask ourselves was this: Shall we be content to remain separate—shall we be content to maintain a mere provincial existence, when, by combining together,

we could become a great nation? It had never yet been the good fortune of any group of communities to secure national greatness with such facility. In past ages, warriors had struggled for years for the addition to their country of a single province. We had too, for instance, in our own days, the case of NAPOLEON III, who, after great expenditure of blood and treasure in the Italian difficulty, had acquired Savoy and Nice, by which he had obtained an addition of nearly one million inhabitants to France—only one million souls, and if any person were for a moment to make a calculation of the value of the provinces acquired on one side, and the great cost on the other, he would at once see the great disproportion between the one and the other, and so ascertain the fact that the territory acquired did not compensate the outlay. Here, in British North America, we had five different communities inhabiting five separate colonies. We had the same sympathies, and we all desired to live under the British Crown. We had our commercial interests besides. It was of no use whatever that New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland should have their several custom houses against our trade, or that we should have custom houses against the trade of those provinces. In ancient times, the manner in which a nation grew up was different from that of the present day. Then the first weak settlement increased into a village, which, by turns, became a town and a city, and the nucleus of a nation. It was not so in modern times. Nations were now formed by the agglomeration of communities having kindred interests and sympathies. Such was our case at the present moment. Objection had been taken to the scheme now under consideration, because of the words "new nationality." Now, when we were united together, if union were attained, we would form a political nationality with which neither the national origin, nor the religion of any individual, would interfere. It was lamented by some that we had this diversity of races, and hopes were expressed that this distinctive feature would cease. The idea of unity of races was utopian—it was impossible. Distinctions of this kind would always exist. Dissimilarity, in fact, appeared to be the order of the physical world and of the moral world, as well as in the political world. But with regard to the objection based on this fact, to the effect that a great nation could not be formed because Lower Canada was in great part French and Catholic, and Upper Canada was British and Protestant, and the Lower Provinces

were mixed, it was futile and worthless in the extreme. Look, for instance, at the United Kingdom, inhabited as it was by three great races. (Hear, hear.) Had the diversity of race impeded the glory, the progress, the wealth of England? Had they not rather each contributed their share to the greatness of the Empire? Of the glories of the senate, the field, and the ocean, of the successes of trade and commerce, how much was contributed by the combined talents, energy and courage of the three races together? (Cheers.) In our own Federation we should have Catholic and Protestant, English, French, Irish and Scotch, and each by his efforts and his success would increase the prosperity and glory of the new Confederacy. (Hear, hear.) He viewed the diversity of races in British North America in this way: we were of different races, not for the purpose of warring against each other, but in order to compete and emulate for the general welfare. (Cheers.) We could not do away with the distinctions of race. We could not legislate for the disappearance of the French Canadians from American soil, but British and French Canadians alike could appreciate and understand their position relative to each other. They were placed like great families beside each other, and their contact produced a healthy spirit of emulation. It was a benefit rather than otherwise that we had a diversity of races. Of course, the difficulty, it would be said, would be to deal fairly by the minority. In Upper Canada the Catholics would find themselves in a minority; in Lower Canada the Protestants would be in a minority, while the Lower Provinces were divided. Under such circumstances, would any one pretend that either the local or general governments would sanction any injustice. What would be the consequence, even supposing any such thing were attempted by any one of the local governments? It would be censured everywhere. Whether it came from Upper Canada or from Lower Canada, any attempt to deprive the minority of their rights would be at once thwarted. Under the Federation system, granting to the control of the General Government these large questions of general interest in which the differences of race or religion had no place, it could not be pretended that the rights of either race or religion could be invaded at all. We were to have a General Parliament to deal with the matters of defence, tariff, excise, public works, and these matters absorbed all individual interest. Now, he would ask those self-styled nationalists who accused him of bartaring fifty-eight

counties in Lower Canada to John Bull, and his honorable colleague beside him (Hon. Mr. BROWN)—he would ask them, under what supposition could they think it possible for any injustice to be done to the French Canadians by the General Government? (Hear, hear.) He came now to the subject of Local Governments. We could easily understand how a feeling against the Federation project was raised in the minds of a few of the British residents of Lower Canada by fears of such difficulties as those which occurred in the days of Mr. PAPINEAU, relative to the passing of laws relating to commercial matters. (Hear, hear.) These difficulties had been of a very inconvenient nature, Mr. PAPINEAU not being a commercial man, and not understanding the importance of these measures. He considered Mr. PAPINEAU was right in the struggle he maintained against the oligarchy at that time in power; but he had never approved of the course he took with reference to commercial matters, and in opposition to measures for the improvement of the country. But this precedent could not be urged as an objection to Federation, inasmuch as it would be for the General Government to deal with our commercial matters. There could be no reason for well-grounded fear that the minority could be made to suffer by means of any laws affecting the rights of property. If any such enactments were passed, they would fall upon the whole community. But even supposing such a thing did occur, there was a remedy provided under the proposed Constitution. The magnitude of the scheme now submitted was, perhaps, the reason why those who had not made themselves conversant with the question felt some apprehension in contemplating it; but, when we came to discuss it clause by clause, he would be ready to state that no interest would be harmed in any way if Federation took place. It was true that opposition was being offered in Montreal, by Mr. JOHN DOUGALL, of the *Witness*. (Hear, hear.) And, while referring to the opponents of Federation, he could not help adverting to the strange manner in which extremes met and worked in unison to oppose Federation. (Laughter.) For instance, we had the party who formerly composed what might be styled Mr. PAPINEAU'S Tail—the extreme democratic party—joined with Mr. DOUGALL'S Tail. (Hear, hear, cheers, and laughter.)

MR. PERRAULT—And members of the clergy oppose it. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. CARTIER said the honorable gentleman was mistaken. The clergy were

for it. But the honorable gentleman would have an opportunity of speaking afterwards. This scheme, he repeated, met with the approval of all moderate men. The extreme men, the socialists, democrats and annexationists were opposed to it. The French Canadian opponents of the project were, it appeared, afraid that their religious rights would suffer under the new arrangement. Fancy the celebrated *Institut Canadien*, of Montreal, under the lead of citizen BLANCHET, taking religion under their protection! (Laughter.) Mr. DOUGALL loudly proclaimed that the British Protestant minority would be entirely placed at the mercy of the French Canadians. He (Hon. Mr. CARTIER) thought the arguments of the young French gentlemen belonging to the national democratic party who cried out that their religion and nationality would be destroyed, ought in all reason to be sufficient to satisfy the scruples and calm the fears of Mr. DOUGALL. The *True Witness*, which was also one of the enemies of the scheme, said that if it were adopted the French Canadians were doomed; while his brother in violence, the *Witness*, said that the Protestants were doomed. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) At a meeting recently held in Montreal on the subject, he (Hon. Mr. CARTIER) observed that Mr. CHERRIER had enrolled himself among the enemies of the project. Well, this fine, quiet, old gentleman announced that he had come out of his political retirement for the purpose of opposing Federation. All he (Hon. Mr. CARTIER) could say was that he never knew Mr. CHERRIER was a strong politician. However, it appeared that he had come out once more on the political stage for the purpose of opposing this villainous scheme, which was intended to destroy the nationality and religion of the French Canadians—all brought about by that confounded CARTIER! (Laughter and cheers.) Allusion had been made to the opinion of the clergy. Well, he would say that the opinion of the clergy was for Confederation. (Hear, hear.) Those who were high in authority, as well as those who occupied more humble positions, were in favor of Federation, not only because they saw in it so much security for all they held dear, but because it was just to their Protestant fellow-subjects as well, because they were opposed to political bickering and strife. This opposition to a state of political dissension and trouble was the general feeling of the clergy, and because they saw in Confederation a solution of those difficulties which had existed for some time, due regard being had to just

rights, they were favorable to the project.—The fact, however, was that when we saw such extreme opponents as Mr. CLERK, of the *True Witness*, Mr. DOUGALL, of the *Witness*, and the young gentlemen of the *Institut Canadien* combined to resist Confederation, because each party argued it would produce the most widely different results—we might look upon this fact, he repeated, as one of the strongest arguments in favor of Confederation. (Hear.) We had, on the other hand, all the moderate men, all that was respectable and intelligent, including the clergy, favorable to Federation. (Hear, hear, and oh, oh.) He did not, of course, mean to say that there were not respectable opponents to the project—what he did mean, however, was that it met general approval from the classes referred to. He was opposed, he might as well state most distinctly, to the democratic system which obtained in the United States. In this country of British North America we should have a distinct form of government, the characteristic of which would be to possess the monarchical element. When we had Confederation secured, there was not the least doubt but that our Government would be more respectable—that it would have more prestige, and command more respect from our neighbours. (Hear, hear.) The great want under the American form—the point which they all admitted formed the great defect—was the absence of some respectable executive element. How was the head of the United States Government chosen? Candidates came forward, and of course each one was abused and villified as corrupt, ignorant, incapable and unworthy by the opposite party. One of them attained the presidential chair; but even while in that position he was not respected by those who had opposed his election, and who tried to make him appear the most corrupt and contemptible being in creation. Such a system could not produce an executive head who would command respect. Under the British system, ministers might be abused and assailed; but that abuse never reached the Sovereign. Whether we were made a kingdom or a viceroyalty—whatever name or grade was assigned to us—we would undoubtedly have additional prestige. He would now conclude his remarks by asking honorable gentlemen to consider well this scheme. It was his hope, his cherished hope, that it would be adopted by the House. The time was opportune, as his honorable colleague (Atty. Gen. MACDONALD) had so ably stated last evening; the opportunity might never offer itself again in such a facile

and propitious manner. We knew we had, in all our proceedings, the approbation of the Imperial Government. So if these resolutions were adopted by Canada, as he had no doubt they would, and by the other Colonial Legislatures, the Imperial Government would be called upon to pass a measure which would have for its effect to give a strong central or general government and local governments, which would at once secure and guard the persons, the properties and the civil and religious rights belonging to the population of each section. (Loud cheers.)

HON. MR. GALT said.—MR. SPEAKER, I trust the House will, on this occasion, extend to me the indulgence with which I have often previously been favored when I have addressed it on subjects relating to the commercial and financial interests of this province; for I am now required to follow the very able and eloquent speeches of the two Attorneys General, East and West, who have discussed, as none were more able than those gentlemen to discuss, the most important political and philosophical questions which are involved in the Confederation of the British North American colonies; and the material interests of the country upon which it is my province this night to dwell, though unquestionably those which are intended to be served through the political alterations we have to consider, are, nevertheless, likely to prove tedious to the House. Explanations respecting them are, however, imperatively called for when we are considering the question now at issue. (Hear.) There is one advantage which I feel that I enjoy on this occasion, and it is that this House is not called upon, in dealing with the commercial and financial interests involved in the proposed changes, to consider the form or mode of government by which such interests are to be promoted. It makes little difference to the consideration of this branch of the subject whether the Constitution of the new Government be that of a Legislative or Federal Union—the points with which I am about to deal, are those which concern the public at large, and bear no reference to what may be the creed, nationality or language of portions of the people. The subjects on which I propose to address the House are those connected with the trade, resources and financial condition of the several provinces of British North America, and certain questions present themselves for decision, upon a satisfactory answer to which the determination of the House upon the whole plan that is submitted should depend, I

will divide my remarks into five distinct heads:—

First.—Do the commercial and material interests of the several provinces point to their union as an advantageous measure?

Secondly.—Is their financial condition such as to permit of this union being carried into practical effect at this moment, with justice to them all?

Thirdly.—Are the measures proposed in the resolutions before the House fair to each and to all?

Fourthly.—Is there a reasonable prospect that the machinery through which these interests are proposed to be governed, will work smoothly and harmoniously?

Lastly.—Does the proposed system for the Government of the United Provinces appear likely to prove so expensive as to render it impossible for the people of Canada to consent to it?

In dealing with the first question, whether the material interests of the provinces will be promoted by their union, it may be well for me to offer to the House some few remarks as to the resources of British North America. Possessing as we do, in the far western part of Canada, perhaps the most fertile wheat-growing tracts on this continent,—in central and eastern Canada facilities for manufacturing such as cannot anywhere be surpassed,—and in the eastern or Maritime Provinces an abundance of that most useful of all minerals, coal, as well as the most magnificent and valuable fisheries in the world; extending as this country does for two thousand miles, traversed by the finest navigable river in the world, we may well look forward to our future with hopeful anticipation of seeing the realization, not merely of what we have hitherto thought would be the commerce of Canada, great as that might become, but to the possession of Atlantic ports, which we shall help to build to a position equal to that of the chief cities of the American Union. (Hear.) But it is not so much by the extent of a country that its power and real greatness are to be estimated, as by its containing within itself the elements of different interests, for it is in the diversity of employment that security is found against those sad reverses to which every country, depending mainly on one branch of industry, must always be liable. (Hear.) A most remarkable illustration of this has recently occurred in our own Mother Country. No one would have ventured to say, a few years ago, that England could have lost its immense cotton supply without having its system of

commercial industry almost entirely overthrown, and having its people sunk into the deepest misery. Yet we have seen, within the last few years, the cotton supply cut off. We have seen, it is true, a considerable portion of the people reduced to great want, but, at the same time, the wonderful diversity of employment which exists in the country opened new channels for the employment of the distressed operatives, and though there was great pressure for a time, it was only temporary in its operations; and at this moment, after a short pause, we see the industry of England greater than it was at the beginning of the American war. (Hear.) We may therefore rejoice that, in the proposed Union of the British North American Provinces, we shall obtain some security against those providential reverses to which, as long as we are dependent on one branch of industry as a purely agricultural country, we must always remain exposed. (Hear, hear.) The resources of these great colonies, and the extent to which the industry and intelligence of their inhabitants have developed them, are most significantly shewn in the Trade and Navigation Tables, which are in the possession of the public. I am afraid to weary the House by going at any length into statements relating to them, but I feel that in order to place the question of union fairly before the House and the country, I am called upon to glance, however briefly, at the position in which the trade and tonnage of each of the British North American Provinces at the present moment stands. The returns of the trade of Canada in 1863, taking exports and imports conjointly, shew an aggregate of \$87,795,000. Taking the census of 1861, this trade represents thirty-five dollars per head of the population. The value of the import and export trade of New Brunswick, for the same year, reaches \$16,729,680, amounting to sixty-six dollars per head of its population. The aggregate trade of Nova Scotia for the same period, amounted to \$18,622,359, or fifty-six dollars per head of its people. And in the case of Prince Edward Island, the import and export trade amounted to \$3,055,568, representing thirty-seven dollars per head of the population of that colony. The value of the total trade of Newfoundland was \$11,245,032, or eighty-six dollars per head. The whole of these figures represent an aggregate trade of all the provinces amounting to \$137,447,567. Notwithstanding the large population and the very large amount represented by the trade of Canada, when it is divided per head it falls considerably short

of the trade of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, being a little more than half per head of the former, and not more than two-thirds of that of Nova Scotia. All the statistics to which I have had access show that the commercial and financial position of our sister colonies is such as to enable them creditably to seek an alliance with any country on earth; and it cannot be said that, in seeking or consenting to an alliance with Canada, they have any local, or sectional, or selfish object in view. (Hear, hear.) Passing from trade, I will turn to another subject—the ship building and tonnage of those colonies—and will take the returns of 1863. In that year, the number of ships built in all those colonies was no less than 645, with a tonnage amounting to 219,763 tons. This statement of the enormous amount of tonnage built in one year is as good evidence as can be offered of the facilities we possess for becoming an important maritime power. The industry represented by those figures shows an export value of nearly nine million dollars! The sea-going tonnage of Canada, including that of the inland lakes, amounts to about nine million tons, a great portion of which, however, represents the tonnage of vessels performing coasting service, many of which frequently clear and arrive in the course of one day. It is gratifying to know that the trade between Canada and the States on the other side of the lakes is of a nature to give employment to a large portion of this lake tonnage—amounting to 6,907,000 tons—but it cannot be classed in the same category as the tonnage arriving at Quebec and Montreal, which in most cases can make only two or three trips per annum. The sea-going tonnage of Canada amounted to 2,133,000 tons; of New Brunswick, 1,386,000; of Nova Scotia, 1,432,000 tons. Consequently the amount of sea-going tonnage, subject only to a small deduction, was actually about five million tons, of which about 2,133,000 was that of vessels trading between the St. Lawrence and foreign ports. In making this statement it is due to the House that it should be made aware that some portion of this trade will not be represented after the contemplated union has taken place. At present, the internal commerce between these colonies appears in the returns of each as imports and exports, but I should be glad if I were able to make on this account a large deduction from the figures I have given. It is matter for regret on the part of all of us that the trade between these colonies—subject all to the same Sovereign, con-

nected with the same empire—has been so small. Intercolonial trade has been, indeed, of the most insignificant character; we have looked far more to our commercial relations with the neighbouring—though a foreign country,—than to the interchange of our own products, which would have retained the benefits of our trade within ourselves; hostile tariffs have interfered with the free interchange of the products of the labor of all the colonies, and one of the greatest and most immediate benefits to be derived from their union, will spring from the breaking down of these barriers and the opening up of the markets of all the provinces to the different industries of each. (Hear, hear.) In this manner we may hope to supply Newfoundland and the great fishing districts of the Gulf, with the agricultural productions of Western Canada; we may hope to obtain from Nova Scotia our supply of coal; and the manufacturing industry of Lower Canada may hope to find more extensive outlets in supplying many of those articles which are now purchased in foreign markets. For instance Newfoundland produces scarcely anything by agriculture, manufactures hardly an article of clothing, and a considerable trade may thus be expected to arise; while, instead of having payments made, as they are now, through Lombard street, they will be made through our own bankers in Montreal and elsewhere. If we require to find an example of the benefits of free commercial intercourse, we need not look beyond the effects that have followed from the working of the Reciprocity Treaty with the United States. In one short year from the time when that treaty came into operation, our trade in the natural productions of the two countries swelled from less than \$2,000,000 to upwards of \$20,000,000 per annum, and now, when we are threatened with an interruption of that trade—when we have reason to fear that the action of the United States will prove hostile to the continuance of free commercial relations with this country—when we know that the consideration of this question is not grounded on just views of the material advantages resulting to each country—but that the irritation connected with political events exercises a predominant influence over the minds of American statesmen, it is the duty of the House to provide, if possible, other outlets for our productions. If we have reason to fear that one door is about to be closed to our trade, it is the duty of the House to endeavor to open another; to provide against a coming evil of the kind feared by timely expansion in

another direction; to seek by free trade with our own fellow-colonists for a continued and uninterrupted commerce which will not be liable to be disturbed at the capricious will of any foreign country. (Hear, hear.) On this ground, therefore, we may well come to the conclusion that the union between these colonies is demanded alike on account of their extensive resources, and because of the peculiar position in which they stand relatively to each other, to Great Britain, and to the United States. All these are questions which fall within the province of the General Government, as proposed in the resolutions before the House, and whatever may be the doubts and fears of any one with respect to the details of the organisation by which it is proposed to work the new system of Confederation, no one can doubt that the great interests of trade and commerce will be best promoted and developed by being entrusted to one central power, which will wield them in the common interest. (Hear, hear.)

I now come, Mr. SPEAKER, to the consideration of the second, and perhaps I may say the third division of my subject also—whether the material condition of these provinces is such as to make the union practicable, and whether the details of the measures proposed are equitable to each and to all. In considering this point, it is necessary for us first to review the liabilities of each province, the reasons why they were incurred, the objects which have been sought. In doing so, the House will not fail to remark that the same policy has animated the legislatures of all the provinces, or perhaps I should speak more exactly in saying those of Canada, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. The public debt of all these provinces has, with some slight exceptions, been incurred for public improvements, intended to develop the resources of the country, to attract immigration and wealth to their respective shores, to cheapen the means whereby the products of their farms were to be taken to market, and to reduce the cost of freight of articles which enter largely into the consumption of their inhabitants. Nor will any one fail to observe the intimate connection which all these public works have with each other—a connection which singularly illustrates the natural union which exists between these several provinces. If we consider the public improvements of Canada, her great canals intended to bring the trade of the vast countries bordering on the lakes down to the Gulf of St. Lawrence; if we look at the railway system forced upon us in our compe-

tition with American channels of trade, stretching from the extreme west to the extreme east of the province; and if we then look at the public works that have been undertaken in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, we find that, practically, they form parts of one great whole. It is through the St. Lawrence that the people of the Lower Provinces will send their fish, oils and other exports to the west, and it is through our canals and river that they will import the necessaries they require from the west. Through these canals and the river St. Lawrence, and along the railway systems of all the provinces, when hereafter connected, a great trade will flow in one uninterrupted stream, enriching in its course not only the cities of Canada, but also swelling the tide of a new commerce we may hope to see called into being in the open Atlantic ports of St. John and Halifax. (Hear, hear.) I will now proceed, sir, briefly to lay before the House a statement of the present engagements of the several provinces, beginning with Canada. I find that our whole debt, exclusive of the Common School Fund, which does not form a portion of our engagements relatively to the Lower Provinces, amounts to \$67,263,995. The debt of Nova Scotia is \$4,858,547, and that of New Brunswick \$5,702,991; and I may notice, with reference to the debts of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, that in the case of Nova Scotia a portion of their liabilities, to the amount of nearly half a million of dollars, consists of treasury notes, while the policy has been pursued both in that province and in New Brunswick of retaining in the hands of the Government the Savings Bank deposits of the people, which form, therefore, a part of the liabilities I have named to the extent of \$1,167,000. It must, therefore, be observed that the rate of interest on the debts of these two colonies is not, on the whole amount, higher than that which the bulk of the Canadian debt now bears. Newfoundland has only incurred liabilities to the extent of \$946,000, bearing interest at five per cent., while Prince Edward Island owes \$240,673. The total liabilities of those provinces are, therefore, \$11,748,211, against the interest on which may be placed the net revenues of the railways which are the property of those provinces, and which produced last year a net amount of about \$100,000. In addition to the existing liabilities of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, there are certain further engagements they have incurred for the extension of their railway system requiring future provision to the extent, in the case of Nova Scotia, of

\$3,000,000, and in that of New Brunswick of \$1,300,000. It must be evident to the House that, in entering into such a partnership as is proposed, some common basis must be arrived at on which each province must enter into the Confederation. Taking all the engagements, present and future, of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, it was found that, relatively to their populations, they amounted to about \$25 per head, and this amount, as applied to Canada, would entitle us to enter the union with a debt of \$62,500,000. Some difficulty might have occurred in reducing our debt to this amount had it not been apparent, on examination, that a considerable portion of it was connected with local advances, such as the Municipal Loan Fund, which does not properly belong to the same category as debt contracted in connection with our system of public improvements, and the management of which is intended to be confided to the General Government, but rather partakes of a local character, and should more properly be left in the hands of the local legislatures. It will therefore be found provided in the resolutions, that in assuming for itself, apart from the General Government, the surplus of debt of about five millions (\$5,000,000), the Province of Canada became entitled to withdraw from the general assets all those items which were of a local character, and for which a portion of its debt had been incurred. Had not this means been adopted, it would have been necessary to permit all the Lower Provinces to increase their obligations beyond those for which their legislatures have hitherto had to provide, and bring in larger debts to the Confederation than they will now do, and a most unnecessary and prodigal expenditure of public money would have been the consequence. It was wise, then, to confine the liabilities of the General Government simply to those debts which had been incurred for purposes of general improvement, and to provide locally, in this country, for the assumption of the surplus, together with the assets which had been created by it.

HON. MR. DORION—Do the \$67,263,995, stated as the debt of Canada, include the original seigniorial indemnity given to Upper and Lower Canada, under the Act of 1854?

HON. MR. GALT—Yes; that amount does include the indemnity, and among the arrangements contemplated by the Government, assuming that Confederation does take place, they will submit, for the consideration of this House, a project for the assumption by Lower Canada of the seigniorial indemnity provided

by the Act of 1859, whereby it will be rendered unnecessary to give an equivalent indemnity to Upper Canada, thus saving upwards of three millions of dollars. (Hear, hear.) I would desire again, Mr. SPEAKER, to refer to the position of the Lower Provinces, and to call the attention of the House to the fact that both in the case of Newfoundland and in that of Prince Edward Island, their liabilities are very much less in proportion to the population than those of the three larger provinces; and in order to permit of their entering into the union upon fair terms, it was necessary to provide that they should be allowed to receive from the general exchequer a sum equal to the interest upon the amount of debt which they had not been obliged to contract. By this means provision was in fact made for the maintenance of their local governments, while at the same time a cause of future complaint was removed. (Hear, hear.) It now becomes my duty to submit to the House a statement of the resources which the several provinces propose to bring into the common stock, and I may add that for the purpose of this statement being more readily verified, the financial returns of 1863 have been taken as the standard. From these returns it would appear that the income and expenditure of the several provinces stood in that year as follows: Nova Scotia, with a population of 338,857, had an income of \$1,185,629, her outlay being \$1,072,274; New Brunswick, with a population of 252,047, had an income of \$894,836, and an outlay of \$884,613; Newfoundland, with a population of 130,000, had an income of \$480,000, the outlay being \$479,420; Prince Edward Island, with a population of 80,000, had an income of \$197,384, the outlay being \$171,718. The total revenue of all these colonies amounted to \$2,763,004, and the total expenditure to \$2,608,025—the united surplus over expenditure for 1863 being \$154,979. It will be observed that as regards these provinces their income and expenditure are such that they will enter the Confederation with a financial position in no respect inferior to that of Canada. If an objection were made with respect to any province in regard to its financial position, it would be against Canada. The Lower Provinces have been and are now in a position to meet, from their taxation, all their expenses, and cannot be regarded as bringing any burthen to the people of Canada. It is not necessary for me to say anything in reference to the financial position of Canada in 1863, but it must be gratifying to the House to know that the de-

ficiency which unfortunately existed during that year was removed in 1864, and that, therefore, we are not obliged now to propose to enter the Confederation in an inferior position, in this respect, to that of our sister colonies. (Hear, hear.) The revenues of each of these provinces are, as the House is well aware, collected under different systems of taxation, suited to the local industry and the wants of their several populations. It is, therefore, manifest that one of the first duties of the General Legislature will be to consider the modes by which the burden of taxation can be most easily borne by the industry of the whole country, and to assimilate the several sources of revenue which are now in existence in such manner as will least interfere with the profitable exercise of the industry of the people. It would be entirely out of place for me, sir, to attempt on this occasion to indicate what the policy of the General Government may be, but one thing must be evident to all, and that is, that where the taxation is about equal per head, the adjustment of it cannot be attended with any injustice to the people of any of the several provinces. Reductions may be made in our customs, on the one hand; and, perhaps, on the other, some portions of our commerce may be relieved from the exactions to which they are now subjected. Apart from the advantages which will manifestly flow from the free trade which will hereafter exist between us, it must be clear to every member of the House that the credit of each and all the provinces will be greatly advanced by a union of their resources. A larger fund will be available as security to the public creditor, larger industries will be subjected to the action of the Legislature for the maintenance of public credit, and we will also see removed some of those apprehensions which have latterly affected the public credit of this country. (Hear, hear.) It must be evident, for it is proved by the fluctuating quotations of the securities of these provinces in London that the apprehension of war with the United States—which has, unfortunately, affected the prices of Canadian bonds—has not to the same extent effected those of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, which are less exposed to hostile attack; and we may therefore hope that the union, while it affords us greater resources, will, at the same time, carry with it a greater sense of security. (Hear, hear.) I must now enquire whether the proposed system of general and local governments, as regards the interests to which I have already alluded, is likely to work beneficially;

and this brings me to the consideration of the question of the means that will be at the disposal of the general and local governments. It must be admitted that having the power of taxation in their own hands, it will be the fault of the General Legislature if any embarrassment is felt in meeting the expenditure of the General Government. Before, however, passing to the consideration of the means at the disposal of the local governments, I would take this opportunity of replying to the honorable member for Hochelaga, in reference to the export duty on timber in New Brunswick, and the royalty in Nova Scotia on the produce of the mines. This has arisen from the circumstance that in the former province it was found both expensive and inconvenient to attempt to levy their timber dues in the forest, and they therefore adopted the plan of causing them to be paid in the form of an export duty upon the clearances of vessels at the custom house. If, therefore, provision had not been made for securing to New Brunswick the payment of these dues, that province would have been deprived of the large amount which its territorial timber contributes to the revenue, and the General Legislature would have been required to increase the proposed grant to that province by an amount equal to those dues—somewhere about \$90,000 per annum. In the case of Nova Scotia—not possessing any public lands or timber to any extent—her territorial revenue is almost wholly derived from her mines, and collected in the form of royalty. Her representatives at the Conference pointed out that if the policy of the General Government should be to impose an export duty on her coal, it would virtually oblige her either to relinquish the royalty, which now forms a large source of her revenue, or submit to be placed in a most disadvantageous position in competing in the American markets with the coal of that country. For these reasons an exception was made in the case of both of these provinces, such as has been alluded to by the honorable member. (Hear, hear.) In the case of Newfoundland, an arrangement has been made whereby the whole of the territorial rights of that colony have been ceded to the General Government, and I will take the opportunity, when adverting to the means of supporting the Local Government of that colony, to explain the manner and the consideration for which these rights were so ceded. (Hear.) I now propose, sir, to refer to the means which will be at the disposal of the several local governments to enable them to administer

the various matters of public policy which it is proposed to entrust to them, and it is evident that unless ample provision is made in the arrangements, great danger will arise that the machinery whereby the local wants of the people are intended to be met will speedily become impaired, causing complaint on the part of the inhabitants of the respective localities, and involving considerable danger to the whole machinery of government. (Hear, hear.) In the case of Canada it will be remembered that the sum of nearly five millions of the public debt has to be borne by Upper and Lower Canada. It will hereafter be for the House to decide how this sum shall be apportioned, but the probability is that the Government will recommend that it shall be divided on the basis of population. (Hear, hear.) It must be remembered that Canada will have at its disposal a large amount of the local assets, including especially the sums due to the municipal loan fund, which will produce an income for the support of their local institutions. As a matter of account between Upper and Lower Canada and the General Government, they will be charged with the interest on their respective proportions of the five millions against the subsidy which it is proposed shall be given to them, while they themselves will collect from the municipalities and other local sources all the revenue and amounts which now enter into the general revenue of the Province of Canada. The question of the sub-division of the local assets of Canada is not, however, before the House. What we have now to consider is whether the bargain as between Canada as a whole and the Lower Provinces ought to be assented to. If it be assented to the question will arise, how shall we deal with the local matters between Upper and Lower Canada? and a proposition will be brought down which I hope and believe will satisfy both sections, and do them substantial justice.

HON. MR. DORION—Will Lower Canada be charged with the municipal loan fund, the seigniorial indemnity, and the educational indemnity?

HON. MR. GALT—I must repeat that, no matter what views the Government may have on the distribution of the liabilities as between Upper and Lower Canada, they will be susceptible of alteration in any way the House may see fit, this being a matter solely of local arrangement, and in no respect involving the agreement entered into with the other provinces; but I must point out that, as regards the original seigniorial indemnity and the mu-

nicipal loan, they are both included in the sixty-seven millions already stated as the liabilities of Canada, and cannot, therefore, form any additional charge against Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) Indeed, as regards the Municipal Loan Fund, instead of being stated as a liability, it appears that the sums due under it are, in connection with the question as I now view it, to be regarded in the light of assets, because we are considering now the sums received as assets by Lower Canada. The Municipal Loan Fund being one of them, the sums due to it under the existing provincial arrangements will become payable as an asset to that section of the province. (Hear.) It will be observed that in the plan proposed there are certain sources of local revenue reserved to the Local Governments, arising from territorial domain, lands, mines, &c. In the case of Canada, a large sum will be received from these resources, but it may be that some of them, such as the Municipal Loan Fund, will become exhausted in course of time. We may, however, place just confidence in the development of our resources, and repose in the belief that we shall find in our territorial domain, our valuable mines and our fertile lands, additional sources of revenue far beyond the requirements of the public service. If, nevertheless, the local revenues become inadequate, it will be necessary for the local governments to have resort to direct taxation; and I do not hesitate to say that one of the wisest provisions in the proposed Constitution, and that which affords the surest guarantee that the people will take a healthy interest in their own affairs and see that no extravagance is committed by those placed in power over them, is to be found in the fact that those who are called upon to administer public affairs will feel, when they resort to direct taxation, that a solemn responsibility rests upon them, and that that responsibility will be exacted by the people in the most peremptory manner. (Hear, hear.) If the men in power find that they are required, by means of direct taxation, to procure the funds necessary to administer the local affairs, for which abundant provision is made in the scheme, they will pause before they enter upon any career of extravagance. Indeed, I do not hesitate to say, that if the public men of these provinces were sufficiently educated to understand their own interests in the true light of the principles of political economy, it would be found better now to substitute direct taxation for some of the indirect modes by which taxation has been imposed upon the industry

of the people. (Hear, hear.) I do not, however, believe that at this moment it is possible, nor do I think the people of this country would support any government in adopting this measure unless it were forced upon them by the pressure of an overwhelming necessity—the necessity of providing, by extraordinary means, against dangers by which the peace, happiness and prosperity of the country may be threatened, in fact, by some of those great disturbing causes which are frequently the beginning of the most important financial changes. (Hear, hear.) The local revenue of Upper Canada during the last four years has averaged the sum of \$739,000, and that of Lower Canada, \$557,239; together they amount to nearly \$1,300,000, independent of the eighty cents per head which it is proposed to allow the local governments out of the general exchequer, for the purpose of meeting their local expenditures. These local expenditures include such items as the administration of justice, the support of education, grants to literary and scientific societies, hospitals and charities, and such other matters as cannot be regarded as devolving upon the General Government. The whole charge, exclusive of the expenses of local government and legislation, on an average of the last four years, has in Lower Canada amounted to \$937,000, and in Upper Canada to \$1,024,622 per annum. In addition to these sums, will have now to be added such amounts as may be required to meet the cost of the Civil Government of the country and of the Legislation for local purposes. It may be difficult to form any reliable estimate of the sums required for this purpose, but when the House considers that, according to the statements given of the expenditure during the last four years, there will be available in the whole Province of Canada the sum of no less than \$1,043,015, it must, I think, be admitted that if those charged with the administration of local affairs in Upper and Lower Canada exceed this amount they will be guilty of a degree of profligacy and extravagance for which a speedy remedy will be found by the people. (Hear, hear.) With reference to the Lower Provinces, the delegates from them to the Conference were asked what reductions they could make in the existing cost of the government of their several colonies, and the figures I am about to give will be found most satisfactory, as showing their disposition to reduce their requirements to the lowest possible sum. In the case of Nova Scotia, the estimate of outlay in 1864 for

objects of a local character required an expenditure of no less than \$667,000. Some portion of this expenditure was for services that did not require again to be performed, but it is gratifying to observe that they have undertaken to perform the whole service in future for \$371,000. (Hear, hear.) In the case of New Brunswick, in 1864 the estimated expenditure was \$404,000, which they have undertaken to reduce to \$353,000, and at the same time they have further undertaken within ten years to make an additional reduction of \$63,000, thus reducing the whole expenditure in the future to \$290,000. (Hear, hear.) Prince Edward Island, with an expenditure of \$124,000, proposes to perform the same local duties that formerly required \$170,000; and, in Newfoundland an outlay of \$479,000 has been similarly reduced to \$350,000. (Cheers.) The House must now, sir, consider the means whereby these local expenditures have to be met. I have already explained that, in the case of Canada, and also in that of the Lower Provinces, certain sources of revenue are set aside as being of a purely local character and available to meet the local expenditure; but I have been obliged in my explanations with regard to Canada to advert to the fact that it is contemplated to give a subsidy of 80 cents per head to each of the Provinces. In transferring to the General Government all the large sources of revenue, and in placing in their hand with a single exception, that of direct taxation, all the means whereby the industry of the people may be made to contribute to the wants of the state, it must be evident to every one that some portion of the resources thus placed at the disposal of the General Government must in some form or other be available to supply the hiatus that would otherwise take place between the sources of local revenue and the demands of local expenditure. The members of the Conference considered this question with the most earnest desire to reduce to the lowest possible limits the sum that was thus required, and I think the figures that I have already given to the House afford the best possible evidence that no disposition existed, at any rate on the part of our friends from the Lower Provinces, to take from the public exchequer one shilling more than the necessities of their respective communities absolutely demanded. (Hear, hear.) In the case of Canada, perhaps it will be said that a smaller sum would have met our immediate wants, but it was felt that it would be impossible to justify any distinction being drawn between subjects of the same

country. And if in Canada we receive perhaps a somewhat larger amount than we absolutely require, it ought rather to be a subject of gratification to this House that it will possess the means of giving greater encouragement to our educational system, and greater development to those interests which are peculiarly entrusted to the charge of the local governments, and this, too, without making any greater demand than is at this time made upon the resources of the people. (Hear, hear.) A subsidy of 80 cents per head was provided, based upon the population according to the census of 1861. The amount, if taken upon the basis of the present population, would undoubtedly be considerably less; and it must be observed that the agreement does not contemplate any future extension of this amount. It is hoped that being in itself fixed and permanent in its character, the local governments will see the importance—I may say the necessity—of their exercising a rigid and proper control over the expenditure of their several provinces. We thus obtain one of the greatest securities that can be offered to us that those influences which, in such a Legislature as we now possess in Canada, are brought to bear for the purpose of swelling the public expenditure, will not exist in the local legislatures, but will meet with such a resistance, from the mere fact of the inability of the local governments to obey them, as to produce a very considerable saving in the general expense of the whole country. (Hear, hear.) I have now, MR. SPEAKER, only to advert to the last question which I have stated is necessary to be decided on the present occasion; and that is, whether under the proposed Confederation such additional expenses will be incurred as to render it undesirable. In considering this point, I must state that in my opinion the question of expense alone is by no means a fair criterion by which to judge of the advantages of a measure such as that now before the House. If it be looked at in its most restricted sense, the only point in which additional expense can be incurred, must be that of the simple cost of governing the country. In no other way that I am able to see, can there be additional expense charged upon the people; and looking at it in this point of view, we may well doubt whether the aggregate charge will be greater for the General Government, caring for the general interests of the whole, and for the local governments, attending merely to the local business of each section,—we may well doubt, I say, whether that expense will be

greater, in any considerable degree, than that which is required for our Government under the present system. (Hear, hear.) On the one hand we shall be free from the empty parade of small Courts entailed by our present system on each of these provinces, keeping up a pretence of regal show when the reality is wanting; we shall have the legislation of the General Government restricted to those great questions which may properly occupy the attention of the first men in the country; we shall not have our time frittered away in considering the merits of petty local bills, and therefore we may reasonably hope that the expenses of the General Legislature will be considerably less than even those of the Legislature of Canada at the present moment,—while, on the other hand, the local legislatures having to deal rather with municipal than great general questions, will be able to dispose of them in a manner more satisfactory to the people, and at infinitely less expense than now. I believe, therefore, the simple cost of the Government of the country will not be in reality any greater under the new than under the old system; but there are other items of expenditure for great public objects, the absence of which from the estimates of any country is an indication rather of weakness and of dependence than a subject that ought to form a source of satisfaction. If such items are not now found in the public expenditure, either of Canada or the Lower Provinces, it is the best proof that could be given that our position is one of inferiority, and that we do not possess either the power or the means to undertake such works as make such items necessary. Let me give one or two points as examples of my meaning; and first I will instance the great question of defence—(hear, hear)—the absence of items of expenditure for which can only be an indication that we are lacking in one of the chief elements of national greatness, that we do not properly value the institutions under which we live, and that we are not willing to make the sacrifices that every free people must make if they are desirous of preserving them. The same argument applies to public works, in connection with which it might be said that great advantage would arise from large expenditure; but with limited resources and an undeveloped territory it might be impossible for any small country to undertake the necessary outlay. Many works of this kind are not directly productive of revenue, although indirectly of the utmost advantage, and if the resources of a country generally cannot

be applied to that outlay, the absence of such expenditure ought to be a subject of regret in the community, and not of rejoicing. (Hear, hear.) In this view let us look at the immense extent of territory that stretches away west of Upper Canada. The reason why we have not been able to assume possession of that territory and open it up to the industry of the youth of this country who, in consequence of the want of some such field for the employment of their energies, have been obliged to go off to the States in thousands, especially to those states possessing the boundless resources of the great North-West, is because there sources of Canada—great as they have been, considering the disadvantages under which she has labored—have been inadequate for the development of this great district. Now, one of the resolutions of the scheme before the House refers to this same question, and I believe that one of the first acts of the General Government of the United Provinces will be to enter into public obligations for the purpose of opening up and developing that vast region, and of making it a source of strength instead of a burden to us and to the Mother Country also. (Hear, hear.) Looking, however, to the whole question of expense, I must say that if the benefits of Confederation are to be weighed against the loss of three or four hundred thousand dollars, the House had better carefully consider whether the people of this country will not accept the former at such comparatively trifling cost—whether they will not feel that a union with a million of their fellow colonists is worth much more to them than any small pecuniary question of this kind that may arise. (Hear, hear.) I trust the House will not permit the question to be judged of in a small, contracted manner. I trust it will keep in view the desire the country manifests for the utmost possible development of its resources. Let us endeavor by this measure to afford a better opening than we now possess for the industry and intelligence of the people. Let us seek by this scheme to give them higher and worthier objects of ambition. Let us not reject the scheme with the bright prospect it offers of a nobler future for our youth, and grander objects for the emulation of our public men. Let us not refuse it on small questions of detail, but judge it on its general merits. Let us not lose sight of the great advantages which union offers because there may be some small matters which, as individuals, we may not like. Let us trust that this machinery, however faulty

it may be, will yet under Providence open up for this country a happy career; while at the same time the House must not forget that it will for ever remove the great and crying evils and dissensions which have existed in Canada for the last ten years, and which have threatened to plunge the country into the most disastrous and lamentable state of discord and confusion. (Cheers.) Surely this last fact alone will commend the project to the House. It should induce the Legislature and the people to make every allowance for the men who have been engaged in the work, and lead them to approach the result of their labors as now submitted, not in a hypercritical spirit so that the public mind may be led astray on mere matters of detail. Let the House frankly and kindly look at it as a great measure brought down for the purpose of relieving the country from distress and depression, and give it that consideration which is due, not to the arguments of the Government, feeble as they may be in view of the great interests involved, but to the fact that the country desires and cries for, at the hands of the House, some measure whereby its internal prosperity, peace and happiness may be developed and maintained. (Loud cheers.)

On motion of Hon. Mr. BROWN, the debate was then adjourned.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

WEDNESDAY, February 8, 1865.

HON. MR. ROSS continued the debate as follows:—Honorable gentlemen will remember that I yesterday moved the adjournment with the intention of replying to the remarks of the hon. member from Niagara Division (Hon. MR. CURRIE), who engaged the attention of the House during most of its sitting. From its commencement to its conclusion, the speech of that honorable gentleman was of a most remarkable character. At its very outset he took the opportunity of quoting some parts of the first speech he made in this chamber, two years ago, in which he strongly approved of the principle of a Confederation between Canada and the Lower Provinces, and in some portions of his yesterday's speech he reiterated in a very decided manner his approval of such a scheme. But other parts of his speech were of such a character that if any of the promoters of Confederation had been at first inclined to number him among the friends of

Intercolonial Union, they might afterwards have said "save us from our friends." (Hear.) He took the very singular course of first decrying the credit of the Lower Provinces, and then decrying that of Canada itself, endeavoring to show first that we were making a very bad bargain in uniting our destiny with such poor provinces as they were, and afterwards that such was our state of bankruptcy that they would be very foolish indeed in joining their fate with ours. (Laughter.) It would, indeed, be almost a sufficient answer to the honorable member to take his speech in separate paragraphs and to place certain of them opposite to others as the reply, for a more illogical and inconsequential address I hardly ever heard. Nor was he content with dealing in what he thought was irony or sarcasm, but ventured to attack important statements of fact made by the public men of this and the other provinces. Now, if we are to have a Confederation at all, I think we should be careful what language we use with respect to such men, and what statements we place before the public. If language such as the hon. member permitted himself to use be encouraged, it will be impossible to secure the good feeling and harmony which are indispensably necessary to the well-working of the contemplated union. I am, however, satisfied that the sober sense of the House will condemn such language, not only when it comes from the hon. member for Niagara, but when falling from any other hon. member. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member commenced his attacks upon the public men of the provinces by quoting from a speech of Mr. LYNCH, recently delivered at Halifax, and did his best to turn it into ridicule, as well as to excite contemptuous laughter at the expense of that gentleman. Now the statements Mr. LYNCH made are facts, not foolish inventions, as the hon. member pretended. That gentleman spoke by the book, and relied for his information upon the official report of one of our public departments, and if the hon. member will turn to the census of 1852, he will find, at page 32, a table comparing the produce of Canada and the United States, from which it appears that, while that of the latter increased 48 per cent., that of Canada increased 400 per cent. during the previous decade. This is what Mr. LYNCH stated, and what the hon. member for Niagara asserted to be untrue.

HON. MR. CURRIE—That was between the years 1841 and 1851, while the remarks of Mr. LYNCH had reference to the subsequent decade,

HON. MR. ROSS—It is not so; Mr. LYNCH spoke of an increase of ten years; he read from our official records in proof, and read correctly. The hon. member probably derived his information from some newspaper, and the error he has committed should teach him to be more cautious how he assails public men on such evidence. (Hear, hear.) He then turned from Mr. LYNCH to the Premier of New Brunswick, a gentleman of the highest character and ability, who is so strong in the esteem and confidence of the people of that province that it seems impossible to displace him. Now I maintain that, to say the least it is in extremely bad taste to attack high-placed public men, especially those of other countries, and more especially those of the sister colonies, as the hon. member has done.

HON. MR. CURRIE—I did not attack them.

HON. MR. ROSS—The hon. member has attacked their veracity; he has denied the correctness of the statements they made openly as public men. The Hon. Mr. TILLEY quoted the figures of our own Minister of Finance, and the hon. member represented him as not speaking the truth, but as, in effect, attempting to deceive those whom he addressed.

HON. MR. CURRIE—I beg to know when the Finance Minister of Canada stated that the average duties collected in Canada were 11 per cent. The figures—

HON. MR. ROSS—The honorable member will find it in the Finance Minister's speech, and while I do not think it proper in him to interrupt me for the purpose of going into calculations just at this moment, I maintain that by taking all the imports, including those free of duty, the honorable member will find that the rate stated is exactly correct. The imports in 1863 amounted to \$45,964,493, and the duty collected was \$5,169,173, which is just 11 per cent. of the whole. I repeat, honorable gentlemen, that, instead of making such attacks on great public men, I conceive it to be more properly our duty to defend them. (Hear.) Having thus disposed of the remarks the honorable member made on the veracity of Mr. LYNCH and Hon. Mr. TILLEY, I will now advert to that portion of his remarks in which he endeavored to show that Hon. Mr. GALT's statements were incorrect. He referred to the figures respecting the tonnage of the proposed Confederation, as quoted by Hon. Mr. GALT, and pooh-poohed his remarks in a way which was no doubt intended to be very amusing. The Minister of Finance declared that when the Union was effected, we should be, he be-

lieved, the third largest country in the world, as regards the tonnage of our commercial marine, though possibly France might be about on an equality with us. England, he said, was the first, the United States the second, and either France or the contemplated Confederation would be the third; and this is true. I will read the statement of that honorable gentleman:—

The sea-going tonnage of Canada, including that of the inland lakes, amounts to about nine million tons, a great portion of which, however, represents the tonnage of vessels performing the coasting service, many of which frequently clear and arrive in the course of one day. It is gratifying to know that the trade between Canada and the States on the other side of the lakes is of a nature to give employment to a large portion of this lake tonnage—amounting to 6,907,000 tons. I cannot class that in the same category as the tonnage arriving at Quebec and Montreal which, in most cases, can only make two or three trips per annum. The sea-going tonnage of Canada amounts to 2,133,000 tons; of New Brunswick, 1,386,000 tons; of Nova Scotia, 1,432,000 tons. Consequently the amount of sea-going tonnage, subject only to a small deduction, is actually about five million tons.

The way the honorable Minister of Finance made up his statement was exactly similar to that in which the same kind of statistical statements were made up in England, the United States, and other great maritime countries, the object being to show the actual amount of tonnage employed during each year in the carrying trade. It does not matter whether a vessel is engaged in long or short voyages; if it be employed merely as a ferry, the fact of its being so employed in carrying goods inwards or outwards is a proof that its tonnage capacity is required by the trade of the countries to and from which it plies. (Hear.) But the honorable member made it appear untrue that the statement of the honorable the Minister of Finance with respect to the tonnage employed on the Canadian lakes was put forth for the purpose of misleading the public and inducing them erroneously to believe that the Confederation will have a prominent place among the great maritime nations by reason of the tonnage employed in its trade. Mr. GALT's statement was that the sea-going tonnage of the proposed Confederation would be the third largest employed in the trade of the world, and the statistics regarding the tonnage of the inland waters of Canada were superadded to those of the sea-going tonnage of the Union. The two statements were made perfectly distinct, in every

table and every speech emanating from the Minister of Finance or his department. It is thus the honorable member has availed himself of his position for the purpose of trying to throw dirt upon our leading statesmen—of endeavoring to asperse the characters of our most distinguished public men, and I repeat, for I cannot too strongly urge it upon the House, that we ought to discountenance such attempts, for we should consider the character of our public men as public property, not to be lightly attacked and damaged. If we are to enter into this scheme, we should at least do so unassailed by our own people, and with as good a public reputation as we deserve. (Hear, hear.) The honorable member next proceeded to read extracts from old *Globes* and other newspapers, in which, with the characteristic features and bitter feelings of the times in which they were written, certain things were stated not specially commendatory of some of the Canadian ministers now concerned in the preparation of the Confederation scheme. I am not here to defend these gentlemen—the Hon. Messrs. BROWN and McDUGALL, his own party leaders, whom he attacked—nor do I intend to make remarks upon past events, but this I will say, that the parties alluded to have entered upon their present work with the sincere intention, I believe, of putting an end to the grave difficulties which have so long distracted the country. This they have done with the full concurrence and approbation of their political friends, whose advice they sought before entering the Administration; and I think that, under the circumstances, instead of being reproached and held up to public censure, they ought to be treated with confidence and generosity. I have hitherto always listened to the honorable member with pleasure, even when I could not agree with him, and even in certain parts of the speech to which I am now referring, the honorable member exhibited considerable ability; but I do think, considering it as a whole, that a more illogical, self-contradictory, and generally objectionable address has seldom been made in the Canadian Legislature. Upon reviewing the general effect of this remarkable effort, I can only compare it with the performances of the Parrott guns discharged against Fort Fisher, six of which, we have been told, slightly wounded two of the enemy, but killed and disabled about fifty of the men who served them. I take it that Hon. Messrs. TILLEY and LYNCH have got off with very slight wounds indeed, and that

any damage done is to the honorable member's own friends. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) I will now come more closely to the subject under debate, the proposed Confederation of Canada and the other British North American colonies, and in doing so I feel I am dealing with a matter in which is bound up the happiness and prosperity of the country, not for the present only, but for a long course of years to come. I only wish the honorable member for the Niagara Division had read the debates which preceded the establishment of the American Constitution after the United States had gained their independence. I especially advert to the debates in the Councils of Virginia, which at that time, by reason of its wealth and population, bore a similar relation to the other colonies to that which Canada now bears to the Lower Provinces. If he had read the speeches of the MADISONS, the MARSHALLS, the RANDOLPHS, the HENRYs, the LEES and others, he would have found no passage in keeping with the sentiments he uttered yesterday. Those great patriots evidently met under a deep sense of the responsibilities of their work, and instead of bringing into the debates the small village feelings and animosities tending to embarrass and to destroy harmony, they acted like great men, true and noble men as they were, and applied themselves to their task with the purpose of bringing it to a successful issue. The confederation which they first established, in the year 1781, did not work well. It remained poor, without respect abroad, or prosperity at home, and so in 1789 they abandoned that condition of existence and adopted the Constitution which lasted until the commencement of the present unfortunate war, and now governs the North. In speaking of the Constitution prepared by our delegates, the honorable member for Niagara said it was neither one thing nor another, it was neither legislative nor federative, but a mongrel non-descript scheme between the two; a Constitution for which there was no precedent in all the world's history. Such, at least, was the effect of the words he used. It happens, however, to be a fact, that in opposition to the profound and enlightened opinion of the honorable member, the work of the delegates has received the approbation of some of the most eminent statesmen of England, as well as that of the most distinguished and able writers for the press of that country, which is at any rate some small consolation. I will say that if the delegates who met at Quebec and prepared that instrument were incompetent for the task, I do not know where others can be found to

do it better; and, after all, I think that, notwithstanding the remarks of the honorable member, the disinterested testimonies to the value of the work done, coming from the quarters I have indicated, will be considered in Canada as having some weight. (Hear, hear.) But since the honorable member regards this as a mongrel constitution, unworthy of acceptance, ought he not to have been ready to suggest something better? Should he not as a patriot have given the country the benefit of his superior wisdom? It is of no use to look for a better form to the constitution of the ancient republics which have passed away, their having ceased to exist being of itself proof enough of their not being adapted to our wants. The honorable member might perhaps have cited the Swiss and Dutch republics, or the constitutions of the United States of 1781 and 1789, and if he had, the House would perhaps have been able to compare them with that now proposed, and arrive at some definite conclusion which might after all have been that ours, as now proposed, is that which promises best to secure freedom to those who are to live under it, and stability for the political condition of our country. With respect to the Swiss Confederation, however well it may be considered to have worked, it is a fact that within our own time a civil war has existed among the cantons, and that republic has been upon the brink of destruction. As regards the Dutch republic, it is a matter of history how it fell. During the whole of its struggle against PHILIP II., the provinces comprising it never had that centralized power which is necessary to the stability of a government, especially one assailed by enemies from without, for two provinces, Guelderland and Overysse, contributed nothing all that contest through—each standing upon its state rights—while among the remaining five, by far the largest proportion was contributed by the one Province of Holland. The natural result was that the republic fell, and became a monarchy. The same evil lay at the root of the American Constitution of 1781, and after it had been adopted, so ill concerted and disunited were the efforts of the thirteen states, that the arrangement would not work at all, so that General WASHINGTON was obliged to ask for and actually obtained dictatorial powers, to enable him to carry on the contest against Great Britain. The difficulties between the North and the South which now prevail, arose wholly upon the question of state rights, and had provisions existed in the Constitution of the American

Union, similar to those which it is proposed to introduce into ours, the probability is the States would have remained united. (Hear, hear.) But the hon. member said further that the scheme has taken the country by surprise. Now, I really beg to ask whether there is any foundation for such a statement? I most deliberately say that there is not. It must be well known to hon. members that the late Chief Justice SEWELL, who enjoyed the friendship of the Duke of KENT, the father of Her Majesty the Queen, so far back as 1814, addressed a letter to the noble Duke, recommending an union, for this fact is adverted to in Lord DURHAM's report on the affairs of the British North American Provinces. Some ten or twelve years before even that, the Hon. Mr. UNIAOKE, of Nova Scotia, had made a similar suggestion, and from time to time, since then, the importance and desirability of the project has been openly advocated by leading public men in all the colonies. Amongst others, I may mention Archdeacon STRACHAN, the present venerable and Right Reverend Bishop of Toronto, whose enlightened opinions upon great public questions, have always commanded the utmost respect, and who, writing to Mr. CHARLES BULWER, the able Secretary of Lord DURHAM, in 1838, expressed himself as follows:—

I have only to add that it will be a pleasure to me to contribute everything in my power to the prosperous issue of Lord DURHAM's Administration; and if Mr. PITT considered the Constitution which he conferred upon the Canadas one of the glories of his life, what glory must redound to the statesmen who give a free Constitution to the British North American colonies, and by consolidating them into one territory or kingdom, exalts them to a nation acting in unity, and under the protection of the British Government; and thus not only ensuring their happiness, but preventing for ever the sad consequences that might arise from a rival power getting possession of their shores.

Then it was formally presented and recommended in Lord DURHAM's remarkable report on Canada and British North America generally, so often quoted as a high authority, and only yesterday by the honorable member himself. Well, what did that distinguished nobleman say on the subject. He said:—

How inseparably connected I found the interests of Your Majesty's Provinces in North America, to what degree I met with common disorders, requiring common remedies, is an important topic, which it will be my duty to discuss very fully before closing this report.

Again—On my first arrival in Canada, I was

strongly inclined to the project of a Federal union, and it was with such a plan in view that I discussed a general measure for the government of the colonies with the deputations from the Lower Provinces, and with various leading individuals and public bodies in both the Canadas.

But I had still more strongly impressed on me the great advantage of an united government, and I was gratified by finding the leading minds of the various colonies strongly and generally inclined to a scheme that would elevate their countries into something like a national existence.

Lord DURHAM, after expressing his opinion in the report as on the whole in favor of the Legislative Union, and referring to the influence of the United States as surrounding us on every side, goes on to say:—

If we wish to prevent the extension of this influence, it can only be done by raising up for the North American Colonist some nationality of his own, by elevating these small and unimportant communities into a society having some objects of a national importance, and by thus giving their inhabitants a country which they will be unwilling to see absorbed even into one more powerful.

An union for common defence against foreign enemies is the natural bond of connection that holds together the great communities of the world, and between no parts of any kingdom or state is the necessity for such an union more obvious than between the whole of these colonies.

The whole of this branch of this remarkable report on the subject of an union of the British American Provinces should be read by every man in the several provinces, the arguments in its favor are so able and so unanswerable. (Hear, hear.) I will honestly say, as many others have said before me, that if it could have been attained, I would have preferred a Legislative Union, but it is well understood that Lower Canada would never have agreed to it.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—Nor the Lower Provinces.

HON. MR. ROSS—Nor, as my honorable and gallant friend the Premier states, would the Lower Provinces have consented to it. He may well be supposed to know, for he was in the Conference, presiding over its deliberations, and had the very best opportunity of ascertaining the opinions of the delegates. (Hear.) But coming down to later times—the times so well described by the hon. Premier in his excellent speech—when difficulties between Upper and Lower Canada began to thicken, the Hon. Mr. GALT brought up the scheme of Colonial Federation as the best mode of overcoming those difficulties, and made a most able speech on the subject in his place in Parliament. Subsequently, in

1858, that honorable minister entered the Government with the express understanding that the question would be dealt with. It is well known that he carried his point so far, that the subject was alluded to at the close of the session of 1858, in the Speech of Sir E. HEAD, the Governor General, and communication with the Imperial Government for permission to negotiate with the Lower Provinces on the subject was then undertaken. Shortly after this, three members of the Government, viz., Hon. Messrs. CARTIER, GALT, and myself, went to England, and on the 25th of October, 1858, we laid our request before the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Sir E. B. LYTON, but difficulties, not of our creation, intervened and caused delay—Lord DERBY'S Government was defeated, and the matter continued in abeyance. To say, in the face of the facts I have stated, that the project is unknown and has taken the country by surprise, is to say what is not the case. Even last year it was distinctly referred to in His Excellency's Speech at the close of the Session, and Hon. Messrs. BROWN, McDUGALL and MOWAT entered the Government with the express understanding that negotiations were to ensue to bring about the proposed Federation. Hon. Messrs. BROWN and MOWAT went back to their constituents and were re-elected by acclamation, and although Hon. Mr. McDUGALL was defeated, he too was subsequently elected for another constituency by acclamation. These gentlemen, instead of being decried and assailed for the part they have acted, should be honored for their patriotism. There has been no such thing as surprise. The resolutions were sent to all the members of the Legislature shortly after they were fully settled upon, and even before that the plan was published in all the newspapers of the province, and I am at a loss to know how it could have been made more public. It is true the Opposition have not held public meetings to consider or object to the scheme, but the reason of this is, that the majority in its favor is so enormously large that they did not venture to do so. (Hear.) The next piece of disingenuousness on the part of the honorable member was in stating the military power of the Lower Provinces at 65,000 fighting men, or in limiting to that number the men competent for military service—

HON. MR. CURRIE—No; I said 128,000, of whom 65,000 only were available, the rest being engaged on the water.

HON. MR. ROSS—Why did not the honorable member candidly state their census population, which at this time cannot be much short of a million souls?

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—With the permission of the honorable member I will state the result of my experience in this matter. I have been for some time attached to the Adjutant General's office, where I had the opportunity of examining the particularly correct returns of the Militia for Lower Canada, and it always appears that out of a given population of both sexes the one-fifth part shows the exact number of men, between the ages of 18 and 60, fit for military duty. This is the case all the world over. The law is as uniform as that which determines the relative numbers of the two sexes; in all Christian countries the males being 21 and a fraction to 20 females, while in countries where polygamy exists the case is exactly reversed, the females being 21 and a fraction, and the males 20. I have verified the fact that one-fifth of our population shows the correct number of militia-men, and if the honorable member (Hon. Mr. CURRIE) will apply to the Adjutant General he will find it was so.

HON. MR. CURRIE—I have taken the figures as furnished by a colleague of the honorable member.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—Then my colleague must be in contradiction with myself. The number of militia-men in Upper Canada, by the last census, was 280,000, which, multiplied by 5, gives the population, with a few to spare.

HON. MR. ROSS—I think it is now unnecessary for me to say anything else on this subject, as the honorable member has been fully answered by my honorable friend the Premier. All that I need add is that according to the rule now stated, the million of souls in the Lower Provinces would produce 200,000 instead of 65,000 men, all capable of bearing arms, those employed on the water being as liable to serve as those employed on the land. I trust we shall never require to muster our fighting men from any part of the proposed Confederation; but the best preventative of danger is preparedness to meet it. (Hear.) The honorable member next came to the question of the Intercolonial Railway, which after all seems to be his great peculiar horror—the great pillar which overshadows and oppresses him. Well, I will turn again to Lord DURHAM'S report, in which the following passage, remarkably apposite to the subject, appears:—

The completion of any satisfactory communication between Halifax and Quebec would, in fact, produce relations between these provinces that would render a general union absolutely necessary. Several surveys proved that a railway would be perfectly practicable the whole way. . . . The formation of a railroad from Halifax to Quebec would entirely alter some of the distinguishing characteristics of the Canadas. Instead of being shut out from all direct intercourse with England during half the year, they would possess a far more certain and speedy communication throughout the winter than they now possess in summer.

This passage greatly impressed the public men of the day—the LAFONTAINE-BALDWIN Administration—in which Mr. HINCKS and the honorable Premier each had a place. It was under them that the railway legislation of the province received its first impulse, and last session I remember to have had occasion to quote the preamble of an act passed in 1851, which recites:—

That, whereas it is of the highest importance to the progress and welfare of this province, that a Main Trunk line of railway should be made throughout the length thereof, and from the eastern frontier thereof through the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia to the city and port of Halifax; and it is therefore expedient that every effort should be made to ensure the construction of such railway.

The second clause of the act

Authorizes the Government, for the time being, to negotiate with the Imperial Government and New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, for the construction of the line, and to bargain therefor; the funds to be obtained under Imperial guarantee.

This act, honorable gentlemen, is still in force, and from the time of its passing there has always been an anxiety among the public men of Canada to accomplish the construction of a railway to Halifax. All our governments, without exception, have felt in the same way, and the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Administration took steps towards such an end. But the difficulties which followed stopped further progress, and, in fact, had almost stopped legislation altogether. Now, however, the Hon. Mr. BROWN himself has made the construction of this railway a part of the proposed Constitution, and has said, at a great meeting in Toronto, that if the project contained half-a-dozen intercolonial railways he would go for them all. (Hear, hear.) I feel morally certain that if the subject were fairly discussed in every town in Upper Canada, nine-tenths of the people would go heartily for it. Indeed, the railway is absolutely necessary and we cannot do without it. Upper Canada alone, not to speak

of Lower Canada at all, requires it, and so well is this understood in the Lower Provinces that an opponent of the Hon. Mr. TILLEY—Hon. Mr. SMITH—has lately said it was quite unnecessary for New Brunswick to spend any money on the work, as Upper Canada must build it for its own sake. As to the cost of this road, which has been so greatly exaggerated, Mr. BRYDGES, who must be supposed to know something about the matter, has offered, on behalf of an English company, to undertake the construction of the line for £3,500,000 sterling. Everybody knows how much that is, and when reciprocity is gone, Upper Canada will do well to build the road on its own account, if all the other provinces refuse. They will however not refuse, for the line is equally necessary for Lower Canada and the other provinces, and it is a great advantage to all parties that it should be so. New Brunswick requires it to open up its rich interior country which contains, as I have learned from advance reports of subordinate surveying engineers, some of the finest lands in the world. Halifax wants it, in order to bring freight to her great seaport when those of Quebec and Montreal are closed. It should have been commenced three years ago, and if it had it would now be built, and we should have heard nothing about the abolition of the Reciprocity Treaty. (Hear, hear.) The honorable member then asked why, since there was to be a dissolution and an appeal to the people of New Brunswick on the subject, there should not be one in Canada? The answer to that has already been given. The term of Parliament would have expired in that province on the 1st of June, and as the members would then have had to go to their constituents to give an account of their conduct during the previous four years, it was thought better to anticipate the time of its dissolution by three or four months. In Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, however, where the elections were more recent, there are to be no elections. I will add that this mode of appealing to the people is not British but American, as under the British system the representatives of the people in Parliament are presumed to be competent to decide all the public questions submitted to them. When the unions between England and Scotland, and between England and Ireland were effected, there were no appeals to the people, it being assumed that the people's chosen representatives were quite competent to judge of the measures. (Hear, hear.) Yet the members who have recently gone to the country have found public opinion to be de-

cidedly in favor of the project. One honorable member (Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON) who represents 130,000 souls, has told the House that he has held meetings all over the vast Division for which he sits, and that in every case he has explained the subject to them without finding a single person to oppose it. (Hear.) The honorable member for Niagara also said, that the project has been unfairly brought down. Now, I contend that it was brought down in the only way in which it could be submitted to us or to the people. Such a censure as this is beyond my comprehension, and it has certainly not been shewn to my satisfaction, nor I should imagine, to that if any body else, in what the unfairness consists. (Hear.) Next the honorable member attacked the financial terms of the scheme, and rolled up a mass of figures which I strongly suspected the honorable member himself did not understand. (Hear, and laughter.) The Minister of Finance fully and lucidly stated the case last evening, and I will read part of his speech to show how satisfactorily the matter was explained. Hon. Mr. GALT said:

With reference to the trade of this country, he had taken the returns of 1863. The returns of the trade of Canada, in that year, taking exports and imports conjointly, showed an aggregate of \$87,795,000. Taking the census of 1861, this trade represented thirty-five dollars per head of the population. The value of the import and export trade of New Brunswick, for the same year, reached \$16,729,680, amounting to sixty-six dollars per head of its population. The aggregate trade of Nova Scotia, for the same period, amounted to \$18,622,359, or fifty-six dollars per head of its people. And in the case of Prince Edward Island, the import and export trade amounted to \$3,055,668, representing thirty-seven dollars per head of the population of that colony. The value of the total trade of Newfoundland was \$1,245,032, or eighty-six dollars per head. The whole of these figures represented an aggregate trade of all the provinces, amounting to \$137,447,567. (Hear, hear.)

With respect to the revenue and expenditure of the provinces, I find a succinct statement in the speech delivered by Mr. GALT, at Sherbrooke, as follows:—

	Revenue.	Expenditure.
Nova Scotia	\$1,185,629	\$1,072,274
New Brunswick	899,991	884,613
Newfoundland (1862.)..	480,000	479,420
Prince Edward Island..	197,384	171,718
Canada.....	9,760,316	10,742,807
Total, 1863.....	\$12,523,320	13,350,832
Total, 1864.....	14,223,320	13,350,832
Estimated Surplus, 1864.....		\$872,488

The Hon. Minister of Finance made some admirable remarks, at Sherbrooke, with reference to the indebtedness of the colonies, where he gave to a public meeting the following table:

Nova Scotia.....(1863).....	\$ 4,858,547
New Brunswick..... "	5,702,991
Newfoundland.....(1862).....	946,000
Prince Edward Island	240,673
Total, Maritime Provinces....	\$11,748,211
Canada, (1863).....	67,263,994
Grand Total.....	\$79,012,205

Reasoning from these figures, Mr. GALT stated that the debt of Canada amounts at the present time to about \$27 per head, and that to enter into an equitable arrangement with the other provinces where the debts were about \$25 per head either ours had to be reduced or theirs increased; that is, when made chargeable to the Confederation—and as the former is the preferable course, the surplus or excess of ours over \$25 per head has to be locally assumed by Canada. He also explained that the debts of Prince Edward Island and of Newfoundland being less than \$25 per head, an allowance had to be made to them to place them on an equal footing with the rest of the colonies. I will add, for the information of the honorable member for Niagara, the following official figures, which are instructive as showing that the people of the Maritime Provinces are a people who contribute, under their present tariffs, a considerable sum to their respective treasuries:

DUTY ON IMPORTS PER HEAD (1863).	
Newfoundland	\$3.53
Nova Scotia	2.46
New Brunswick.....	2.81
Prince Edward Island.....	1.69
Canada	1.85

Looking at all these facts together, the conclusion appears to me irresistible that the arrangement proposed is in every respect an equitable one, and that it has been made with a view to give to each province as nearly as possible what is right and fair, as far as what is right could be discovered. No honorable member could wish that Canada should have undue advantages over the other parties to the compact. The spirit in which the deliberations of the Conference were conducted was the correct one, and had its members tried to overreach each other—had they not been impressed with the necessity of mutual concessions for the common good—no result could ever have been arrived at. (Hear, hear.) The next point the honorable member touched was the

assets of the Lower Provinces, and he asked very emphatically what they had to bring into the partnership. He said we had our valuable canals, but what had they? Well, they have their own railways, built with provincial money. New Brunswick has 200 miles, equal in value to eight millions of dollars; and Nova Scotia 150 miles or thereabouts, equal to about six millions of dollars—though I am not sure of the exact extent.

HON. MR. CURRIE—What do they pay?

HON. MR. ROSS—What do our canals pay? That, however, is not the question; our canals are assets and valuable assets too, even though they do not pay much directly, for they cheapen transport to an extraordinary extent. I remember the time when the freight of a barrel of flour from Toronto to Montreal cost one dollar, and now it is 10d; and one cwt. of merchandize brought back also cost one dollar then, but now only 1s. It is in this way that great public works are valuable to a country. As to the earnings of the Lower Province railways, the net profits—not the gross receipts—are stated, I believe, at \$140,000; \$70,000 in New Brunswick, and \$70,000 in Nova Scotia, which, at any rate, is something. The Welland Canal, of which the honorable gentleman spoke so much, did not pay even the interest on its cost; and if the canal on the American side of the Niagara is constructed, as we learn from the American press it is to be, the chief source of its revenue will be cut off, and so far from being the best of the canals in a paying point of view, it will be the worst of all those connected with the St. Lawrence navigation. Let me not be understood, however, as depreciating the value of the Welland Canal. None is more ready than I am to admit that its construction was wise, and that it has proved and will continue to prove beneficial in the highest degree. (Hear.) The honorable member, living as he does on the very banks of the Welland Canal, very naturally asked how the canals are to be enlarged? Well, they will be the property of the General Government, and when the trade requires it, that Government will, no doubt, appropriate money for the work. (Hear.) As to local taxation, all the provinces will be put upon the same footing, and nothing can be fairer. If Upper Canada, which it is asserted is so much wealthier than the other portions of the Confederation, requires more than the eighty cents per head allowed to all the provinces, its greater wealth will cause it feel the taxation so much the less. (Hear.) The honorable member next attacked the pro-

posed constitution of the Legislative Council, and insisted not only that it should have remained elective, but that the principle of representation according to population should also have prevailed. But who ever heard that in a Federal Constitution the Upper House should be arranged on that principle? If that view be the sound one, the better way would be to have but one House, for the only effect of having two Houses, both elected on the basis of population, would be that one would constantly be combating the other, and the wheels of government would unavoidably be brought to a stand-still. In such a case the more powerful members of the Confederacy would be wholly unrestrained, and would completely overwhelm the weaker. This was fully considered on the adoption of a Constitution for the United States, according to which it is well known that the smaller States are represented in the Senate by the same number of senators as the larger ones—there being two members for each. The same principle has been adopted in arranging the terms of this proposed union, and for the same reason; viz., to protect the weaker parties to the compact. (Hear.) The next point referred to by the honorable member related to the Common Schools and the fund proposed to be created by the Act of 1849, but as the honorable member has been informed, one of its provisions, that relating to this fund, has never been carried out; with respect to the other, my honorable friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands has already explained that the million of acres have been set apart and a fund year by year created, while Parliament has annually set apart about \$100,000 for the support of the schools. Upper Canada then has suffered no injustice in this. (Hear.) The honorable member at last concluded his remarks by drawing a sorry picture of the condition of Canada. According to him, it was about bankrupt when a number of self-appointed delegates met and devised this scheme for its further embarrassment. So far from this being the case, it is a matter of history that the Government was formed expressly for the purpose of considering and framing this very scheme, and getting rid of the dead-locks which have so injuriously affected the legislation of the country. It appeared that by the time the honorable member came to this part of his speech he became so excited that he hardly knew what he was saying. (Hear, hear.) I will conclude by reading an extract from a remarkable speech delivered by His Honor the Speaker (the Honorable U. J.

TESSIER) at a public meeting held in Quebec in 1858, when the three delegates were in England pressing for Confederation. It is as follows:—

In 1849 and 1852 there were passed acts of our Provincial Parliament to give some kind of guarantee for the construction of this (the Intercolonial) Railway. As a member of the Canadian Legislature, I pledge my best support to help this enterprise, and as to the Canadian nationality, distinct from the English or French nationality, composed of the best qualities of both, to which allusion has been made, I share in this sentiment, and I hope to see growing a Canadian Empire in North America, formed by a Federal Union of all the colonies connected and linked together by this Intercolonial Railway, that may hold a position able to counterbalance the grasping power of the United States on this continent.

I refer to this able speech to show the enlightened views which that honorable member held on the subject, in common with many other distinguished public men. I have now done with the speech of the honorable member for Niagara, and will only say further that I hope the important subject before the House will be fully and completely discussed, so that the fine merits of the scheme may be thoroughly understood. I know it will be discussed calmly, with mutual forbearance and kindness, and with the excellent dispositions which honorable gentlemen usually bring to the consideration of the matters submitted for their judgment. (Hear, hear, and applause.) I feel satisfied that after such discussion the House will complete its share of this great work by assenting to the resolutions submitted for its approval. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. ALEXANDER said—I am sure that the members of the Government desire that this great question should be freely and fully discussed—I am sure they will be glad to see any members of this House frankly state wherein they conceived any of its details to be defective—I am sure that the suggestions by the honorable gentlemen who represent the divisions of Victoria and Wellington will be duly weighed by the present Administration, as any other suggestions made in the spirit to accomplish good. But some members in both branches of the Legislature appear to be opposed to the Confederation scheme *in toto*.—They hold that the constitutional changes proposed are unwise, and are fraught with great evil. The honorable member for Niagara Division (Hon. Mr. CURRIE) appears to be of that number, from the very strong appeal which he has made to this House against the whole measure, and I desire to reply to some

of the arguments which he pressed, no doubt with very great force and ability, upon our attention. He objects to the whole manner in which the Convention was formed; he has no faith whatever in the result of their deliberations. He maintains, in the boldest manner, that the proposed union will be found disadvantageous and burdensome to all the provinces uniting. He produced figures, prepared beforehand, to show that our burdens will be increased to the extent of at least \$3,000,000 per annum—an increase which will be found oppressive to the industry of the province of Canada. I cannot understand from what source he has obtained his figures to arrive at such a conclusion. There is no difficulty in our being able to form a reliable idea as to the future financial position of the proposed federal and local governments. If we make an estimate of the whole revenue of those provinces from their financial returns, taking the basis of 1863, we find that there will be a net revenue, available for the purposes of the General Government, after paying the subsidy of eighty cents per head to the local governments, amounting to the sum of \$9,643,108, while we are justified in assuming that the ordinary expenditure of the General Government will not exceed \$9,000,000. But, of course, there are always certain grants which are not classed under ordinary expenditure, and we shall have to provide for the Intercolonial Railway, and the widening and deepening of the St. Lawrence canals; and suppose that we allow the very liberal item of \$25,000,000 for those great objects, it will be admitted on all sides that we shall be enabled to obtain this amount under the Imperial Guarantee at four per cent., thus throwing upon the federal treasury the additional annual burden or charge of \$1,000,000, which we may, with perfect right, say will be met in the following manner. It can be clearly shewn that it rests entirely with ourselves, whether we cannot meet all the claims of ordinary expenditure and interest on the federal debt with the amount, already named, of \$9,643,108; while I am sure that most commercial men will allow that, with the power which we shall have of imposing uniform tariff and excise duties throughout the whole united territory of these united provinces, we shall raise sufficient additional revenue to meet this large item. But as I have, on a former occasion, said, we must inaugurate the dawn of our infant national career with the utmost care and prudence. All jobbery and lavish expenditure must be carefully avoided; and if we do so, I venture to

prophecy that the anticipations of my honorable friend from Niagara will never be realized. I venture to say, in the face of all his forebodings of increased burdens and debt, that we shall find our position greatly improved. He appeared in the delivery of his able and powerful speech, very desirous to make out the strongest possible case, raking up even the public condemnation of the Provincial Secretary at the famous Harrington meeting. I was one of those who voted against Mr. SCOTT'S Separate School Bill, valuing, in common with the earnest electors at Harrington, our noble school system of Upper Canada, which carries the blessings of education throughout the width and breadth of the land; but the people generally are not prepared to reject the proposed Confederation, because of the position of that question, although there are individual electors who have strong convictions on the subject. My honorable friend also dwells upon the amount which will require to be appropriated for the militia. He appears to think that soldiers can be formed by magical influence in a day, and to effect a small saving he would elect to leave this magnificent territory, with its valuable homesteads, exposed to be swept at any moment by a ruthless aggressor; or should not mind that our Canadian people should run the risk of being subjected to share the liability of three thousand millions of debt, in addition to their own burdens. The great body of the people of Upper Canada have great faith in the expansion and growth of a young country such as this. (Hear, hear.) They do not forget the remarkable fact, that after experiencing a large deficiency in the revenue of the country for several years, with also, in addition, two very indifferent harvests, we are in a position to announce a considerable surplus of revenue at this moment; and we look forward to this consolidation of other great interests, full of hope, that it will give us a higher standing in the world—that it will give a great impetus to the growth of our population, our commerce and our revenue; and if the expenditure to be made on those great public improvements should swell the debt, we shall find ourselves in a condition of such prosperity that it will fall lightly upon us. There are so many conspiring circumstances to make us regard this great scheme with favor, the offspring, as it is presented to us, of the large experience and matured judgment of the political leaders of all these provinces. (Hear, hear.) We may venture to accept it and give it a fair trial as the best solution of the difficulties we have ex-

perienced in working out our present Legislative Union. It is very true that we have all opposed until now the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, because we have had grave doubts as to the commercial value of that work, and the prospect of its being self-sustaining; but it certainly cannot be denied that the unfriendly attitude assumed towards us by the neighboring republic in respect to the trade relations between the two countries, makes it more prudential for us thus to secure a winter road to the great highway of the world's commerce—(hear, hear)—and it will certainly place us in a stronger position to negotiate fair and just terms in a renewal or modification of the Reciprocity Treaty. Whilst that public work is accepted as an indispensable part of the scheme, we are glad to be assured by the members of the Government, that the deepening and widening of the St. Lawrence canals will be carried out simultaneously. Good cannot fail to flow from the union if justice is thus done to all its component parts. As regards the question of finance, the proposition to assume the debts upon a certain basis on the one hand, and to impose a uniform tariff on the other, with certain reasonable stipulations, is perhaps the nearest approximation to dealing out common justice to all, which could be arrived at, with so many varied interests there represented. We know that our own delegates contended, as we now contend, that it would only have been fair and just that the future subsidy to be paid to each province of eighty cents per head should be based upon the census returns to be made every ten years. But this is not the moment to enlarge upon this point, or upon those details, to which, as I have before stated, the great body of my constituents take exception, and I will reserve myself, therefore, until we discuss the details *seriatim*. I would only, in conclusion, observe, that our most enlightened citizens see nothing but weakness and insecurity in our present fragmentary position, while they regard the proposed union as calculated in every way to give us importance, standing and strength—improve our credit—inspire a feeling of confidence in our future, and bring emigration to our shores. If we can look back with just pride to our giant growth during the last quarter of a century, so may we enter upon the extended relations now proposed full of hope, that with an accession of territory, population and power—commencing our career with a volume of trade exceeding \$137,000,000, with such boundless resources to develop, and a country capable of sus-

taining any extent of population, there is no barrier to our extension and material progress. (Hear, hear.) We must feel that such a field for human enterprise and such a position is calculated to give our people higher aspirations, and to make them cherish what may at the present moment be pronounced at this stage of our infancy but a dream; that just as the Russian Empire extends its powerful sway from the Black Sea to the polar regions, so may the people of British North America aspire to raise up a great Northern Power upon this continent, which shall be distinguished for the wisdom and stability of its institutions, which shall emulate the parent countries from which its races have sprung, in developing their manly virtues, and in diffusing the blessings of a higher civilization wherever its population may flow. (Cheers.)

HON. MR. VIDAL said he cordially agreed with the honorable gentleman who had spoken in desiring a union of the provinces, and with the Honorable Premier in believing that if such union could be arranged to the satisfaction of all the parties concerned, it ought to be effected. Without exactly committing himself to the opinion of the Honorable Premier that this country was upon an inclined plane which, if the proposed scheme of Confederation were rejected, would land us in the United States, he nevertheless thought that the arguments which he had advanced to demonstrate the necessity of some change which would secure our future exemption from the difficulties by which we were now beset were unanswered and unanswerable. Yet he was obliged to express his disapproval of the manner in which the scheme had been submitted to Parliament, as the course adopted entirely precluded the Legislature from suggesting any improvement or modification of its details. He felt, in common with all other honorable members, that the subject was one of vast importance; that we were not legislating for the mere purpose of escaping from unpleasant party political difficulties, but for the safety and prosperity of our country and the welfare of our children and descendants, and therefore could not agree with the honorable member for Brock (Hon. Mr. BLAIR), that immediate action was necessary and that any delay was dangerous. Notwithstanding all that had been said of this country being acquainted with the scheme and prepared to adopt it, he did not and could not believe that such was the case; in arranging its details no advice or assistance had been sought from the representatives of the people, and the people themselves were to have no

voice in the matter. The scheme was assumed to be perfect, and being perfect, must be adopted by the House without change or modification of any kind. It was said that nine-tenths of the people were in its favor; he believed that a very large majority approved of the general principle of union, but there were details of the plan which did not pass unchallenged. It was much to be regretted that the resolutions had not been introduced in such a way as would have permitted the House to place upon record its views in respect to any part of them which might be unacceptable, and to suggest to the Imperial authorities who might frame the bill, such amendments as it considered desirable. He thought the honorable member for Wellington (Hon. Mr. SANBORN) was in error in proposing the amendments of which he had given notice,—the resolutions before them were not, properly speaking, resolutions of the House, they must be regarded as a mere statement of certain agreements entered into by other parties and communicated to us for our information, and consequently could not in any way be altered or amended. Honorable members were thus placed in an anomalous position—invited to discuss the whole subject freely and their assistance requested, and at the same time informed that no change would be effected—that in fact the only assistance wanted was the voting for the adoption of the scheme as a whole. Whatever doubts may exist as to the change the proposed union might effect either for good or for ill, he thought there was no doubt that there would necessarily be a vast increase of expense in carrying on the Government: without mentioning specific sums, it must be obvious that Canada would have to maintain two local legislatures with all their appurtenances, in addition to her share of the expense of the Federal Legislature, which latter could scarcely be expected to be less than at present. With regard to the proposed change in the constitution of the Legislative Council, he was far from considering it a wise step; like the honorable member for Niagara (Hon. Mr. CURRIE), he had great regard for the right of the franchise as now enjoyed by the people, and felt that it would be improper to vote away that privilege of his constituents without their authority or assent. He had been sent here by them to assist in legislating under the Constitution we now have, and not to change it. It was admitted by all that the elective system had operated advantageously, and why then should it be abandoned?—why initiate a retrograde move-

ment unsought for by the country? Much had been said about the risk of collision between two elective Houses, that legislation might come to a dead-lock; now it was a remarkable fact that under the present system there had been no such difficulties, while both in England and in Canada, previous to the introduction of the elective system, they had occurred, and on several occasions the power of the Crown had been called in to overcome them by appointing additional members. What would be the position of the House under the new scheme? It would be the most irresponsible body in the world; and if a dead-lock should occur there would be no way of overcoming it, for the casualties of death, resignation or acceptance of office, which had been so strongly insisted upon as sufficiently numerous to enable the Government of the day to modify the character of the House, would not in his opinion be adequate to meet such an exigency. Such was apparently the view of the Colonial Secretary; and it would in all probability be found necessary to leave the Crown unfettered in the exercise of its prerogative of appointment. The honorable gentleman concluded by saying that he would not now comment upon any other details of the scheme, as he understood the resolutions were to be discussed *seriatim*, but he did not very clearly see the advantage of such a discussion when it was so distinctly stated that the only question for the House to determine was whether the scheme as now submitted, unchanged and unchangeable, should be rejected or adopted. (Hear, hear.)

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ said the scheme, it was true, must be taken as a whole, or rejected, since it was not the property of the Government of Canada alone, but of all the other provinces as well. But it did not therefore follow that honorable members who might dissent from some parts of it might not inscribe that dissent on the journals. If the amendments proposed were passed, the motion for an Address would not be pressed; but, if they did not carry, then the votes of the honorable members who had supported them would be on record. In former days, before the yeas and nays were taken, it was the practice for members who objected to any particular measure, in conformity with the practice of the House of Lords, to enter a protest on the journals exhibiting their reasons for dissent, and he knew of no rule which would prevent such a course from being pursued on the present occasion. It was quite in the power of honorable members, if they chose, to propose amendments, and so

secure the advantage of placing their views before the country.

Cries of "adjourn! adjourn!"

HON. MR. MOORE said, as there was an evident desire for an adjournment, he would not occupy the time of the House for more than a few minutes, his intention being merely to refer to a portion of the remarks made by the honorable gentleman (Hon. Mr. VIDAL) who had just sat down. Though he generally agreed in what had been said by that honorable member, there was one particular in which he (Hon. Mr. MOORE) thought he was in error. He (Hon. Mr. VIDAL) seemed to have become impressed with the idea that it was not competent for the House to amend the resolutions, but that they should either be adopted or rejected as a whole. It was true the Government had so laid it down, but he (Hon. Mr. MOORE) held that the question could be dealt with in the same manner as any other that might come before the House. His honorable friend was also of opinion that, if no suggestions or amendments were to be adopted, it was wasting time to discuss the scheme. In this respect he (Hon. Mr. MOORE) begged to differ with the honorable gentleman, holding that it was not only useful, but essentially necessary that the details of a measure fraught with such grave and momentous importance to the country should be thoroughly discussed. A calm and considerate discussion—and every latitude for discussion—were necessary, and he hoped the Government would not press the measure with any unseemly haste, for they not only owed it to the Legislature, but to the country, that ample opportunity for consideration of the project should be afforded to the people's representatives. He also considered it important that members should have an opportunity to confer with their constituents on the subject, in order to vote advisedly when the time came; and he trusted the Government would not press the matter, nor hinder the expression of views, even if those views extended to amendment in certain particulars. The honorable gentleman then sat down, repeating that he thought the House might deal with the question as with any other that might come before it.

The debate was then adjourned until the morrow.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

WEDNESDAY, *February 8, 1865.*

The Order of the Day for resuming the debate on the Resolution for a Union of the British North American Colonies, having been read,—

HON. GEORGE BROWN rose and said: Mr. SPEAKER, it is with no ordinary gratification I rise to address the House on this occasion. I cannot help feeling that the struggle of half a life-time for constitutional reform—the agitations in the country, and the fierce contests in this chamber—the strife and the discord and the abuse of many years,—are all compensated by the great scheme of reform which is now in your hands. (Cheers.) The Attorney General for Upper Canada, as well as the Attorney General for Lower Canada, in addressing the House last night, were anxious to have it understood that this scheme for uniting British America under one government, is something different from “representation by population,”—is something different from “joint authority,”—but is in fact the very scheme of the Government of which they were members in 1858. Now, sir, it is all very well that my honorable friends should receive credit for the large share they have contributed towards maturing the measure before the House; but I could not help reflecting while they spoke, that if this was their very scheme in 1858, they succeeded wonderfully in bottling it up from all the world except themselves—(hear, hear)—and I could not help regretting that we had to wait till 1864 until this mysterious plant of 1858 was forced to fruition. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) For myself, sir, I care not who gets the credit of this scheme,—I believe it contains the best features of all the suggestions that have been made in the last ten years for the settlement of our troubles; and the whole feeling in my mind now is one of joy and thankfulness that there were found men of position and influence in Canada who, at a moment of serious crisis, had nerve and patriotism enough to cast aside political partisanship, to banish personal considerations, and unite for the accomplishment of a measure so fraught with advantage to their common country. (Cheers.) It was a bold step in the then existing state of public feeling for many members of the House to vote for the Constitutional Committee moved for by me last session—it was a very bold step for many of the members of that committee to speak

and vote candidly upon it—it was a still bolder thing for many to place their names to the report that emanated from that committee,—but it was an infinitely bolder step for the gentlemen who now occupy these treasury benches, to brave the misconceptions and suspicions that would certainly attach to the act, and enter the same Government. And it is not to be denied that such a Coalition demanded no ordinary justification. But who does not feel that every one of us has to-day ample justification and reward for all we did in the document now under discussion? (Cheers.) But seven short months have passed away since the Coalition Government was formed, yet already are we submitting a scheme well-weighed and matured, for the erection of a future empire,—a scheme which has been received at home and abroad with almost universal approval.

HON. MR. HOLTON—(Ironically) hear! hear!!

HON. MR. BROWN—My hon. friend dissents from that, but is it possible truthfully to deny it? Has it not been approved and endorsed by the governments of five separate colonies?—Has it not received the all but unanimous approval of the press of Canada?—Has it not been heartily and unequivocally endorsed by the electors of Canada? (Cries of hear, hear, and no, no.) My honorable friend opposite cries “no, no,” but I say “yes, yes.” Since the Coalition was formed, and its policy of Federal union announced, there have been no fewer than twenty-five parliamentary elections—fourteen for members of the Upper House, and eleven for members of the Lower House. At the fourteen Upper House contests, but three candidates dared to show themselves before the people in opposition to the Government scheme; and of these, two were rejected, and one—only one—succeeded in finding a seat. (Hear, hear.) At the eleven contests for the Lower House, but one candidate on either side of politics ventured to oppose the scheme, and I hope that even he will yet cast his vote in favor of Confederation. (Hear, hear.) Of these twenty-five electoral contests, fourteen were in Upper Canada, but not at one of them did a candidate appear in opposition to our scheme. And let it be observed how large a portion of the country these twenty-five electoral districts embraced. It is true that the eleven Lower House elections only included that number of counties, but the fourteen Upper House elections embraced no fewer than forty counties. (Hear, hear.) Of the 130 constituencies, therefore, into which Canada is divided for representa-

tion in this chamber, not fewer than fifty have been called on since our scheme was announced to pronounce at the polls their verdict upon it, and at the whole of them but four candidates on both sides of politics ventured to give it opposition. (Cheers.) Was I not right then in asserting that the electors of Canada had, in the most marked manner, pronounced in favor of the scheme? (Hear, hear.) And will honorable gentlemen deny that the people and press of Great Britain have received it with acclamations of approval?—that the Government of England have cordially endorsed and accepted it?—aye, that even the press and the public men of the United States have spoken of it with a degree of respect they never before accorded to any colonial movement? Sir, I venture to assert that no scheme of equal magnitude, ever placed before the world, was received with higher eulogiums, with more universal approbation, than the measure we have now the honor of submitting for the acceptance of the Canadian Parliament. And no higher eulogy could, I think, be pronounced than that I heard a few weeks ago from the lips of one of the foremost of British statesmen, that the system of government we proposed seemed to him a happy compound of the best features of the British and American Constitutions. And well, Mr. SPEAKER, might our present attitude in Canada arrest the earnest attention of other countries. Here is a people composed of two distinct races, speaking different languages, with religious and social and municipal and educational institutions totally different; with sectional hostilities of such a character as to render government for many years well-nigh impossible; with a Constitution so unjust in the view of one section as to justify any resort to enforce a remedy. And yet, sir, here we sit, patiently and temperately discussing how these great evils and hostilities may justly and amicably be swept away forever. (Hear, hear.) We are endeavoring to adjust harmoniously greater difficulties than have plunged other countries into all the horrors of civil war. We are striving to do peacefully and satisfactorily what Holland and Belgium, after years of strife, were unable to accomplish. We are seeking by calm discussion to settle questions that Austria and Hungary, that Denmark and Germany, that Russia and Poland, could only crush by the iron heel of armed force. We are seeking to do without foreign intervention that which deluged in blood the sunny plains of Italy. We are striving to settle forever issues hardly less momentous

than those that have rent the neighboring republic and are now exposing it to all the horrors of civil war. (Hear, hear.) Have we not then, Mr. SPEAKER, great cause of thankfulness that we have found a better way for the solution of our troubles than that which has entailed on other countries such deplorable results? And should not every one of us endeavor to rise to the magnitude of the occasion, and earnestly seek to deal with this question to the end in the same candid and conciliatory spirit in which, so far, it has been discussed? (Loud cries of hear, hear.) The scene presented by this chamber at this moment, I venture to affirm, has few parallels in history. One hundred years have passed away since these provinces became by conquest part of the British Empire. I speak in no boastful spirit—I desire not for a moment to excite a painful thought—what was then the fortune of war of the brave French nation, might have been ours on that well-fought field. I recall those olden times merely to mark the fact that here sit to-day the descendants of the victors and the vanquished in the fight of 1759, with all the differences of language, religion, civil law, and social habit, nearly as distinctly marked as they were a century ago. (Hear, hear.) Here we sit to-day seeking amicably to find a remedy for constitutional evils and injustice complained of—by the vanquished? No, sir—but complained of by the conquerors! (Cheers by the French Canadians.) Here sit the representatives of the British population claiming justice—only justice; and here sit the representatives of the French population, discussing in the French tongue whether we shall have it. One hundred years have passed away since the conquest of Quebec, but here sit the children of the victor and the vanquished, all avowing hearty attachment to the British Crown—all earnestly deliberating how we shall best extend the blessings of British institutions—how a great people may be established on this continent in close and hearty connection with Great Britain. (Cheers.) Where, sir, in the page of history, shall we find a parallel to this? Will it not stand as an imperishable monument to the generosity of British rule? And it is not in Canada alone that this scene is being witnessed. Four other colonies are at this moment occupied as we are—declaring their hearty love for the parent State, and deliberating with us how they may best discharge the great duty entrusted to their hands, and give their aid in developing the teeming resources of these vast

possessions. And well, Mr. SPEAKER, may the work we have unitedly proposed rouse the ambition and energy of every true man in British America. Look, sir, at the map of the continent of America, and mark that island (Newfoundland) commanding the mouth of the noble river that almost cuts our continent in twain. Well, sir, that island is equal in extent to the kingdom of Portugal. Cross the straits to the main land, and you touch the hospitable shores of Nova Scotia, a country as large as the kingdom of Greece. Then mark the sister province of New Brunswick—equal in extent to Denmark and Switzerland combined. Pass up the river St. Lawrence to Lower Canada—a country as large as France. Pass on to Upper Canada,—twenty thousand square miles larger than Great Britain and Ireland put together. Cross over the continent to the shores of the Pacific, and you are in British Columbia, the land of golden promise,—equal in extent to the Austrian Empire. I speak not now of the vast Indian Territories that lie between—greater in extent than the whole soil of Russia—and that will ere long, I trust, be opened up to civilization under the auspices of the British American Confederation. (Cheers.) Well, sir, the bold scheme in your hands is nothing less than to gather all these countries into one—to organize them all under one government, with the protection of the British flag, and in heartiest sympathy and affection with our fellow-subjects in the land that gave us birth. (Cheers.) Our scheme is to establish a government that will seek to turn the tide of European emigration into this northern half of the American continent—that will strive to develop its great natural resources—and that will endeavor to maintain liberty, and justice, and christianity throughout the land.

MR. T. C. WALLBRIDGE—When?

HON. MR. CARTIER—Very soon!

HON. MR. BROWN—The hon. member for North Hastings asks when all this can be done? Sir, the whole great ends of this Confederation may not be realized in the lifetime of many who now hear me. We imagine not that such a structure can be built in a month or in a year. What we propose now is but to lay the foundations of the structure—to set in motion the governmental machinery that will one day, we trust, extend from the Atlantic to the Pacific. And we take especial credit to ourselves that the system we have devised, while admirably adapted to our present situation, is capable of gradual and efficient expansion in future years to meet all the great pur-

poses contemplated by our scheme. But if the honorable gentleman will only recall to mind that when the United States seceded from the Mother Country, and for many years afterwards their population was not nearly equal to ours at this moment; that their internal improvements did not then approach to what we have already attained; and that their trade and commerce was not then a third of what ours has already reached; I think he will see that the fulfilment of our hopes may not be so very remote as at first sight might be imagined—(hear, hear.) And he will be strengthened in that conviction if he remembers that what we propose to do is to be done with the cordial sympathy and assistance of that great Power of which it is our happiness to form a part. (Hear, hear.) Such, Mr. SPEAKER, are the objects of attainment to which the British American Conference pledged itself in October. And said I not rightly that such a scheme is well fitted to fire the ambition and rouse the energies of every member of this House? Does it not lift us above the petty politics of the past, and present to us high purposes and great interests that may well call forth all the intellectual ability and all the energy and enterprise to be found among us? (Cheers.) I readily admit all the gravity of the question—and that it ought to be considered cautiously and thoroughly before adoption. Far be it from me to deprecate the closest criticism, or to doubt for a moment the sincerity or patriotism of those who feel it their duty to oppose the measure. But in considering a question on which hangs the future destiny of half a continent, ought not the spirit of mere fault-finding to be hushed?—ought not the voice of partisanship to be banished from our debates?—ought we not to sit down and discuss the arguments presented in the earnest and candid spirit of men, bound by the same interests, seeking a common end, and loving the same country? (Hear, hear, and cheers.) Some honorable gentlemen seem to imagine that the members of Government have a deeper interest in this scheme than others—but what possible interest can any of us have except that which we share with every citizen of the land? What risk does any one run from this measure in which all of us do not fully participate? What possible inducement could we have to urge this scheme, except our earnest and heartfelt conviction that it will inure to the solid and lasting advantage of our country? (Hear, hear.) There is one consideration, Mr. SPEAKER, that cannot be banished from this discussion, and that ought, I think, to be remembered

in every word we utter; it is that the constitutional system of Canada cannot remain as it is now. (Loud cries of hear, hear.) Something must be done. We cannot stand still. We cannot go back to chronic, sectional hostility and discord—to a state of perpetual Ministerial crises. The events of the last eight months cannot be obliterated; the solemn admissions of men of all parties can never be erased. The claims of Upper Canada for justice must be met, and met now. I say, then, that every one who raises his voice in hostility to this measure is bound to keep before him, when he speaks, all the perilous consequences of its rejection,—I say that no man who has a true regard for the well-being of Canada, can give a vote against this scheme, unless he is prepared to offer, in amendment, some better remedy for the evils and injustice that have so long threatened the peace of our country. (Hear, hear.) And not only must the scheme proposed in amendment be a better scheme—it must be something that can be carried. (Hear, hear.) I see an honorable friend now before me, for whose opinions I have the very highest respect, who says to me: “Mr. BROWN, you should not have settled this part of the plan as you have done; here is the way you should have framed it.” “Well, my dear sir,” is my reply, “I perfectly agree with you, but it could not be done. Whether we ask for parliamentary reform for Canada alone or in union with the Maritime Provinces, the French Canadians must have their views consulted as well as us. This scheme can be carried, and no scheme can be that has not the support of both sections of the province.”

HON. MR. CARTIER—Hear, hear! there is the question!

HON. MR. BROWN—Yes, that is the question and the whole question. No constitution ever framed was without defect; no act of human wisdom was ever free from imperfection; no amount of talent and wisdom and integrity combined in preparing such a scheme could have placed it beyond the reach of criticism. And the framers of this scheme had immense special difficulties to overcome. We had the prejudices of race and language and religion to deal with; and we had to encounter all the rivalries of trade and commerce, and all the jealousies of diversified local interests. To assert, then, that our scheme is without fault, would be folly. It was necessarily the work of concession; not one of the thirty-three framers but had, on some points, to yield his opinions; and, for myself, I freely admit that I struggled earnestly, for days together, to

have portions of the scheme amended. But, Mr. SPEAKER, admitting all this—admitting all the difficulties that beset us—admitting frankly that defects in the measure exist—I say that, taking the scheme as a whole, it has my cordial, enthusiastic support, without hesitation or reservation. (Hear, hear.) I believe it will accomplish all, and more than all, that we, who have so long fought the battle of parliamentary reform, ever hoped to see accomplished. I believe that, while granting security for local interests, it will give free scope for carrying out the will of the whole people in general matters—that it will draw closer the bonds that unite us to Great Britain—and that it will lay the foundations deep and strong of a powerful and prosperous people. (Cheers.) And if the House will allow me to trespass to a somewhat unusual degree on its indulgence, I am satisfied that I can clearly establish that such are the results fairly to be anticipated from the measure. Mr. SPEAKER, there are two views in which this scheme may be regarded, namely, the existing evils it will remedy, and the new advantages it will secure for us as a people. Let us begin by examining its remedial provisions. First, then, it applies a complete and satisfactory remedy to the injustice of the existing system of parliamentary representation. (Hear, hear.) The people of Upper Canada have bitterly complained that though they numbered four hundred thousand souls more than the population of Lower Canada, and though they have contributed three or four pounds to the general revenue for every pound contributed by the sister province, yet the Lower Canadians send to Parliament as many representatives as they do. Now, sir, the measure in your hands brings this injustice to an end;—it sweeps away the line of demarcation between the two sections on all matters common to the whole province; it gives representation according to numbers wherever found in the House of Assembly; and it provides a simple and convenient system for re-adjusting the representation after each decennial census. (Cheers.) To this proposed constitution of the Lower Chamber, I have heard only two objections. It has been alleged that until after the census of 1871, the number of members is to remain as at present; but this is a mistake. Upper Canada is to receive from the start eighty-two representatives, and Lower Canada sixty-five; and whatever increase the census of 1871 may establish will be then adjusted. It has also been objected that though the resolutions provide that the existing Parliament

of Canada shall establish the electoral divisions for the first organization of the Federal Parliament, they do not determine in whose hands the duty of distributing any additional members is to be vested. No doubt on this head need exist; the Federal Parliament will of course have full power to regulate all arrangements for the election of its own members. But I am told by Upper Canadians—the constitution of the Lower House is all well enough, it is in the Upper House arrangements that the scheme is objectionable. And first, it is said that Upper Canada should have had in the Legislative Council a greater number of members than Lower Canada.—

MR. T. C. WALLBRIDGE—Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BROWN—The honorable member for North Hastings is of that opinion; but that honorable gentleman is in favor of a legislative union, and had we been forming a legislative union, there might have been some force in the demand. But the very essence of our compact is that the union shall be federal and not legislative. Our Lower Canada friends have agreed to give us representation by population in the Lower House, on the express condition that they shall have equality in the Upper House. On no other condition could we have advanced a step; and, for my part, I am quite willing they should have it. In maintaining the existing sectional boundaries and handing over the control of local matters to local bodies, we recognize, to a certain extent, a diversity of interests; and it was quite natural that the protection for those interests, by equality in the Upper Chamber, should be demanded by the less numerous provinces. Honorable gentlemen may say that it will erect a barrier in the Upper House against the just influence that Upper Canada will exercise, by her numbers, in the Lower House, over the general legislation of the country. That may be true, to a certain extent, but honorable gentlemen will bear in mind that that barrier, be it more or less, will not affect money bills. (Hear, hear.) Hitherto we have been paying a vast proportion of the taxes, with little or no control over the expenditure. But, under this plan, by our just influence in the Lower Chamber, we shall hold the purse strings. If, from this concession of equality in the Upper Chamber, we are restrained from forcing through measures which our friends of Lower Canada may consider injurious to their interests, we shall, at any rate, have power, which we never had before, to prevent them from forcing through

whatever we may deem unjust to us. I think the compromise a fair one, and am persuaded that it will work easily and satisfactorily. (Hear, hear.) But it has been said that the members of the Upper House ought not to be appointed by the Crown, but should continue to be elected by the people at large. On that question my views have been often expressed. I have always been opposed to a second elective chamber, and I am so still, from the conviction that two elective houses are inconsistent with the right working of the British parliamentary system. I voted, almost alone, against the change when the Council was made elective, but I have lived to see a vast majority of those who did the deed wish it had not been done. It is quite true, and I am glad to acknowledge it, that many evils anticipated from the change, when the measure was adopted, have not been realized. (Hear, hear.) I readily admit that men of the highest character and position have been brought into the Council by the elective system, but it is equally true that the system of appointment brought into it men of the highest character and position. Whether appointed by the Crown or elected by the people, since the introduction of parliamentary government, the men who have composed the Upper House of this Legislature have been men who would have done honor to any legislature in the world. But what we most feared was, that the Legislative Councilors would be elected under party responsibilities; that a partisan spirit would soon show itself in the chamber; and that the right would soon be asserted to an equal control with this House over money bills. That fear has not been realised to any dangerous extent. But is it not possible that such a claim might ere long be asserted? Do we not hear, even now, mutterings of a coming demand for it? Nor can we forget that the elected members came into that chamber gradually; that the large number of old appointed members exercised much influence in maintaining the old forms of the House, the old style of debate, and the old barriers against encroachment on the privileges of the commons. But the appointed members of the Council are gradually passing away, and when the elective element becomes supreme, who will venture to affirm that the Council would not claim that power over money bills which this House claims as of right belonging to itself? Could they not justly say that they represent the people as well as we do, and that the control of the purse strings ought, therefore, to belong to them as much as to us. (Hear, hear.) It is said they have not

the power. But what is to prevent them from enforcing it? Suppose we had a conservative majority here, and a reform majority above—or a conservative majority above and a reform majority here—all elected under party obligations,—what is to prevent a dead-lock between the chambers? It may be called unconstitutional—but what is to prevent the Councillors (especially if they feel that in the dispute of the hour they have the country at their back) from practically exercising all the powers that belong to us? They might amend our money bills, they might throw out all our bills if they liked, and bring to a stop the whole machinery of government. And what could we do to prevent them? But, even supposing this were not the case, and that the elective Upper House continued to be guided by that discretion which has heretofore actuated its proceedings,—still, I think, we must all feel that the election of members for such enormous districts as form the constituencies of the Upper House has become a great practical inconvenience. I say this from personal experience, having long taken an active interest in the electoral contests in Upper Canada. We have found greater difficulty in inducing candidates to offer for seats in the Upper House, than in getting ten times the number for the Lower House. The constituencies are so vast, that it is difficult to find gentlemen who have the will to incur the labor of such a contest, who are sufficiently known and popular enough throughout districts so wide, and who have money enough—(hear)—to pay the enormous bills, not incurred in any corrupt way,—do not fancy that I mean that for a moment—but the bills that are sent in after the contest is over, and which the candidates are compelled to pay if they ever hope to present themselves for re-election. (Hear, hear.) But honorable gentlemen say—“This is all very well, but you are taking an important power out of the hands of the people, which they now possess.” Now this is a mistake. We do not propose to do anything of the sort. What we propose is, that the Upper House shall be appointed from the best men of the country by those holding the confidence of the representatives of the people in this Chamber. It is proposed that the Government of the day, which only lives by the approval of this Chamber, shall make the appointments, and be responsible to the people for the selections they shall make. (Hear, hear.) Not a single appointment could be made, with regard to which the Government would not be open to censure, and which the

representatives of the people, in this House, would not have an opportunity of condemning. For myself, I have maintained the appointed principle, as in opposition to the elective, ever since I came into public life, and have never hesitated, when before the people, to state my opinions in the broadest manner; and yet not in a single instance have I ever found a constituency in Upper Canada, or a public meeting declaring its disapproval of appointment by the Crown and its desire for election by the people at large. When the change was made in 1855 there was not a single petition from the people asking for it—it was in a manner forced on the Legislature. The real reason for the change was, that before Responsible Government was introduced into this country, while the old oligarchical system existed, the Upper House continuously and systematically was at war with the popular branch, and threw out every measure of a liberal tendency. The result was, that in the famous ninety-two resolutions the introduction of the elective principle into the Upper House was declared to be indispensable. So long as Mr. ROBERT BALDWIN remained in public life, the thing could not be done; but when he left, the deed was consummated. But it is said, that if the members are to be appointed for life, the number should be unlimited—that, in the event of a dead lock arising between that chamber and this, there should be power to overcome the difficulty by the appointment of more members. Well, under the British system, in the case of a legislative union, that might be a legitimate provision. But honorable gentlemen must see that the limitation of the numbers in the Upper House lies at the base of the whole compact on which this scheme rests. (Hear, hear.) It is perfectly clear, as was contended by those who represented Lower Canada in the Conference, that if the number of the Legislative Councillors was made capable of increase, you would thereby sweep away the whole protection they had from the Upper Chamber. But it has been said that, though you may not give the power to the Executive to increase the numbers of the Upper House, in the event of a dead-lock, you might limit the term for which the members are appointed. I was myself in favor of that proposition. I thought it would be well to provide for a more frequent change in the composition of the Upper House, and lessen the danger of the chamber being largely composed of gentlemen whose advanced years might forbid the punctual and vigorous discharge of their public

duties. Still, the objection made to this was very strong. It was said: "Suppose you appoint them for nine years, what will be the effect? For the last three or four years of their term they would be anticipating its expiry, and anxiously looking to the Administration of the day for re-appointment; and the consequence would be that a third of the members would be under the influence of the Executive." The desire was to render the Upper House a thoroughly independent body—one that would be in the best position to canvass dispassionately the measures of this House, and stand up for the public interests in opposition to hasty or partisan legislation. It was contended that there is no fear of a dead-lock. We were reminded how the system of appointing for life had worked in past years, since Responsible Government was introduced; we were told that the complaint was not then, that the Upper Chamber had been too obstructive a body—not that it had sought to restrain the popular will, but that it had too faithfully reflected the popular will. Undoubtedly that was the complaint formerly pressed upon us—(hear, hear.)—and I readily admit that if ever there was a body to whom we could safely entrust the power which by this measure we propose to confer on the members of the Upper Chamber, it is the body of gentlemen who at this moment compose the Legislative Council of Canada. The forty-eight Councillors for Canada are to be chosen from the present chamber. There are now thirty-four members from the one section, and thirty-five from the other. I believe that of the sixty-nine, some will not desire to make their appearance here again, others, unhappily, from years and infirmity, may not have strength to do so; and there may be others who will not desire to qualify under the Statute. It is quite clear that when twenty-four are selected for Upper Canada and twenty-four for Lower Canada, very few indeed of the present House will be excluded from the Federal Chamber; and I confess I am not without hope that there may be some way yet found of providing for all who desire it, an honorable position in the Legislature of the country. (Hear, hear.) And, after all, is it not an imaginary fear—that of a dead-lock? Is it at all probable that any body of gentlemen who may compose the Upper House, appointed as they will be for life, acting as they will do on personal and not party responsibility, possessing as they must, a deep stake in the welfare of the country, and desirous as they must be of

holding the esteem of their fellow-subjects—would take so unreasonable a course as to imperil the whole political fabric? The British House of Peers itself does not venture, *à l'outrance*, to resist the popular will, and can it be anticipated that our Upper Chamber would set itself rashly against the popular will? If any fear is to be entertained in the matter, is it not rather that the Councillors will be found too thoroughly in harmony with the popular feeling of the day? And we have this satisfaction at any rate, that, so far as its first formation is concerned—so far as the present question is concerned—we shall have a body of gentlemen in whom every confidence may be placed. (Hear, hear.) But it is objected that in the constitution of the Upper House, so far as Lower Canada is concerned, the existing electoral divisions are to be maintained, while, as regards Upper Canada, they are to be abolished—that the members from Lower Canada are to sit as representing the divisions in which they reside or have their property qualification; while in Upper Canada there is no such arrangement. Undoubtedly this is the fact; it has been so arranged to suit the peculiar position of this section of the province. Our Lower Canada friends felt that they had French Canadian interests and British interests to be protected, and they conceived that the existing system of electoral divisions would give protection to these separate interests. We, in Upper Canada, on the other hand, were quite content that they should settle that among themselves, and maintain their existing divisions if they chose. But, so far as we in the west were concerned, we had no such separate interests to protect—we had no diversities of origin or language to reconcile—and we felt that the true interest of Upper Canada was that her very best men should be sent to the Legislative Council, wherever they might happen to reside or wherever their property was located. (Hear, hear.) If there is one evil in the American system which in my mind stands out as preëminently its greatest defect, except universal suffrage, it is that under that Constitution the representatives of the people must reside in the constituencies for which they sit. (Hear, hear.) The result is that a public man,—no matter what his talent, or what his position—no matter how necessary it may be for the interest of the country that he should be in public life, unless he happens to belong to the political party popular for the time being in the constituency where he resides, cannot possibly find a seat

in Congress. And over and over again have we seen the very best men of the Republic, the most illustrious names recorded in its political annals, driven out of the legislature of their country, simply because the majority in the electoral division in which they lived was of a different political party from ~~them~~. I do think the British system infinitely better than that, securing as it does that public men may be trained to public life, with the assured conviction that if they prove themselves worthy of public confidence, and gain a position in the country, constituencies will always be found to avail themselves of their services, whatever be the political party to which they may adhere. You may make politicians by the other, but assuredly this is the way that statesmen are produced. But it is further objected that the property qualification of the members of the Upper House from Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland may be either real or personal estate, while in the others it is to be real estate alone. This is correct; but I fancy it matters little to us upon what species of property our friends in Prince Edward Island or in Newfoundland base their qualification. Here in Canada real estate is abundant; every one can obtain it; and admittedly by all it is the best qualification, if it be advisable to have any property qualification at all. But in Newfoundland it would be exceedingly inconvenient to enforce such a rule. The public lands there are not even surveyed to any considerable extent; the people are almost entirely engaged in fishing and commercial pursuits, and to require a real estate qualification would be practically to exclude some of its best public men from the Legislative Council. Then in Prince Edward Island a large portion of the island is held in extensive tracts by absentee proprietors and leased to the settlers. A feud of long standing has been the result, and there would be some difficulty in finding landed proprietors who would be acceptable to the people as members of the Upper House. This also must be remembered, that it will be a very different thing for a member from Newfoundland or Prince Edward Island to attend the Legislature at Ottawa from what it is for one of ourselves to go there. He must give up not only his time, but the comfort and convenience of being near home—and it is desirable to throw no unnecessary obstacle in the way of our getting the very best men from these provinces. (Hear.) But it is further objected that these resolutions do not define how the legislative councillors are to be chosen at

first. I apprehend, however, there is no doubt whatever as regards that. Clause 14 says: "the first selection of the members to constitute the Federal Legislative Council shall be made from the members of the new existing legislative councils, by the Crown, at the recommendation of the General Executive Government, upon the nomination of the respective local governments." The clear meaning of this clause simply is, that the present governments of the several provinces are to choose out of the existing bodies—so far as they can find gentlemen willing and qualified to serve—the members who shall at starting compose the Federal Legislative Council; that they are to present the names so selected to the Executive Council of British America when constituted—and on the advice of that body the Councillors will be appointed by the Crown. (Hear.) And such has been the spirit shown from first to last in carrying out the compact of July last by all the parties to it, that I for one have no apprehension whatever that full justice will not be done to the party which may be a minority in the Government, but is certainly not in a minority either in the country or in this House. I speak not only of Upper Canada but of Lower Canada as well—

HON. MR. DORION—Ha! ha!

HON. MR. BROWN—My honorable friend laughs, but I assure him, and he will not say I do so for the purpose of deceiving him, that having been present in Conference and in Council, having heard all the discussions and well ascertained the feelings of all associated with me, I have not a shadow of a doubt on my mind that full justice will be done in the selection of the first Federal Councillors, not only to those who may have been in the habit of acting with me, but also to those who have acted with my honorable friend the member for Hochelaga. (Hear, hear.) Now, Mr. SPEAKER, I believe I have answered every objection that has come from any quarter against the proposed constitution of the Federal Legislature. I am persuaded there is not one well-founded objection that can be urged against it. It is just to all parties; it remedies the gross injustice of the existing system; and I am convinced it will not only work easily and safely, but be entirely satisfactory to the great mass of our people. But I go further; I say that were all the objections urged against this scheme sound and cogent, they sink into utter insignificance in view of all the miseries this scheme will relieve us from,—in view of all the difficulties

that must surround any measure of parliamentary reform for Canada that could possibly be devised. (Cheers.) Will honorable gentlemen who spend their energies in hunting out blemishes in this scheme, remember for a moment the utter injustice of the one we have at present? Public opinion has made rapid strides in the last six months on the representation question,—but think what it was a week before the present coalition was formed! Remember how short a time has elapsed since the member for Peel (Hon. Mr. J. HILLYARD CAMERON) proposed to grant one additional member to Upper Canada, and could not carry even that. Remember that but a few weeks ago the hon. member for Hochelaga (Hon. Mr. DORION), who now leads the crusade against this measure, publicly declared that five or six additional members was all Upper Canada was entitled to, and that with these the Upper Canadians would be content for many years to come. (Hear, hear.) And when he has reflected on all this, let the man who is disposed to carp at this great measure of representative reform, justify his conduct, if he can, to the thousands of disfranchised freeholders of Upper Canada demanding justice at our hands. (Cheers.) For myself, sir, I unhesitatingly say, that the complete justice which this measure secures, to the people of Upper Canada in the vital matter of parliamentary representation alone, renders all the blemishes averred against it utterly contemptible in the balance.—(Continued cheers.) But, Mr. SPEAKER, the second feature of this scheme as a remedial measure is, that it removes, to a large extent, the injustice of which Upper Canada has complained in financial matters. We in Upper Canada have complained that though we paid into the public treasury more than three-fourths of the whole revenue, we had less control over the system of taxation and the expenditure of the public moneys than the people of Lower Canada. Well, sir, the scheme in your hand remedies that. The absurd line of separation between the provinces is swept away for general matters; we are to have seventeen additional members in the house that holds the purse; and the taxpayers of the country, wherever they reside, will have their just share of influence over revenue and expenditure. (Hear, hear.) We have also complained that immense sums of public money have been systematically taken from the public chest for local purposes of Lower Canada, in which the people of Upper Canada had no interest whatever, though compelled to contribute three-fourths of the cash.

Well, sir, this scheme remedies that. All local matters are to be banished from the General Legislature; local governments are to have control over local affairs, and if our friends in Lower Canada choose to be extravagant, they will have to bear the burden of it themselves. (Hear, hear.) No longer shall we have to complain that one section pays the cash while the other spends it; hereafter, they who pay will spend, and they who spend more than they ought will have to bear the brunt. (Hear, hear.) It was a great thing to accomplish this, if we had accomplished nothing more,—for if we look back on our doings of the last fifteen years, I think it will be acknowledged that the greatest jobs perpetrated were of a local character—that our fiercest contests were about local matters that stirred up sectional jealousies and indignation to its deepest depth. (Hear, hear.) We have further complained that if a sum was properly demanded for some legitimate local purpose in one section, an equivalent sum had to be appropriated to the other as an offset,—thereby entailing prodigal expenditure, and unnecessarily increasing the public debt. Well, sir, this scheme puts an end to that. Each province is to determine for itself its own wants, and to find the money to meet them from its own resources. (Hear, hear.) But, sir, I am told that though true it is that local matters are to be separated and the burden of local expenditure placed upon local shoulders, we have made an exception from that principle in providing that a subsidy of eighty cents per head shall be taken from the federal chest and granted to the local governments for local purposes. Undoubtedly this is the fact—and I do not hesitate to admit that it would have been better if this had been otherwise. I trust I commit no breach of discretion in stating that in Conference I was one of the strongest advocates for defraying the whole of the local expenditures of the local governments by means of direct taxation, and that there were liberal men in all sections of the provinces who would gladly have had it so arranged. But, Mr. SPEAKER, there was one difficulty in the way—a difficulty which has often before been encountered in this world—and that difficulty was simply this, it could not be done. (Hear, and laughter.) We could neither have carried it in Conference nor yet in any one of the existing provincial legislatures. Our friends in Lower Canada, I am afraid, have a constitutional disinclination to direct taxation, and it was obvious that if the Confederation scheme had had attached to it a provision for the imposition of such a

system of taxation, my honorable friends opposite would have had a much better chance of success in blowing the bellows of agitation than they now have. (Laughter, and cheers.) The objection, moreover, was not confined to Lower Canada—all the Lower Provinces stood in exactly the same position. They have not a municipal system such as we have, discharging many of the functions of government; but their General Government performs all the duties which in Upper Canada devolve upon our municipal councils, as well as upon Parliament. If then the Lower Provinces had been asked to maintain their customs duties for federal purposes, and to impose on themselves by the same act direct taxation for all their local purposes, the chances of carrying the scheme of union would have been greatly lessened. (Hear, hear.) But I apprehend that if we did not succeed in putting this matter on the footing that would have been the best, at least we did the next best thing. Two courses were open to us—either to surrender to the local governments some source of indirect revenue, some tax which the General Government proposed to retain,—or collect the money by the federal machinery, and distribute it to the local governments for local purposes. And we decided in favor of the latter. We asked the representatives of the different governments to estimate how much they would require after the inauguration of the federal system to carry on their local machinery. As at first presented to us, the annual sum required for all the provinces was something like five millions of dollars—an amount that could not possibly have been allotted. The great trouble was that some of the governments are vastly more expensive than others—extensive countries, with sparse populations, necessarily requiring more money per head for local government than countries more densely populated. But as any grant given from the common chest, for local purposes, to one province, must be extended to all, on the basis of population, it follows that for every \$1,000 given, for example, to New Brunswick, we must give over \$1,300 to Nova Scotia, \$4,000 to Lower Canada, and \$6,000 to Upper Canada—thereby drawing from the federal exchequer much larger sums than these provinces needed for local purposes. The course we adopted then was this: We formed a committee of Finance Ministers and made each of them go over his list of expenditures, lopping off all unnecessary services and cutting down every item to the lowest possible figure. By this means we succeeded in re-

ducing the total annual subsidy required for local government to the sum of \$2,630,000—of which Lower Canada will receive annually \$880,000, and Upper Canada \$1,120,000. But it is said that in addition to her eighty cents per head under this arrangement, New Brunswick is to receive an extra grant from the federal chest of \$63,000 annually for ten years. Well, this is perfectly true. After cutting down as I have explained the local expenditures to the lowest mark, it was found that New Brunswick and Newfoundland could not possibly carry on their local governments with the sum per head that would suffice for all the rest. New Brunswick imperatively required \$63,000 per annum beyond her share, and we had either to find that sum for her or give up the hope of union. The question then arose, would it not be better to give New Brunswick a special grant of \$63,000 for a limited number of years, so that her local revenues might have time to be developed, rather than increase the subsidy to all the local governments, thereby placing an additional burden on the federal exchequer of over eight hundred thousand dollars per annum? We came unanimously to the conclusion that the extra sum needed by New Brunswick was too small to be allowed to stand in the way of union—we also determined that it would be the height of absurdity to impose a permanent burden on the country of \$800,000 a year, simply to escape a payment of \$63,000 for ten years—and so it came about that New Brunswick got this extra grant—an arrangement which received and receives now my hearty approval. (Hear, hear.) It is only right to say, however, that New Brunswick may possibly be in a position to do without this money. The House is aware that the Federal Government is to assume the debts of the several provinces, each province being entitled to throw upon it a debt of \$25 per head of its population. Should the debt of any province exceed \$25 per head, it is to pay interest on the excess to the federal treasury; but should it fall below \$25 per head, it is to receive interest from the federal treasury on the difference between its actual debt and the debt to which it is entitled. Now, it so happens that the existing debt of New Brunswick is much less than it is entitled to throw on the Federal Government. It is, however, under liability for certain works, which if proceeded with would bring its debt up to the mark of \$25 a head. But if these works are not proceeded with New Brunswick will be entitled to a large

amount of annual interest from the federal chest, and that money is to be applied to the reduction of the sixty-three thousand extra grant. (Hear, hear.) And this, moreover, is not to be forgotten as regards New Brunswick, that she brings into the union extensive railways now in profitable operation, the revenues from which are to go into the federal chest. (Hear.) A similar arrangement was found necessary as regards the Island of Newfoundland—it, too, being a vast country with a sparse population. It was found absolutely essential that an additional grant beyond eighty cents per head should be made to enable her Local Government to be properly carried on. But, in consideration of this extra allowance, Newfoundland is to cede to the Federal Government her Crown lands and minerals—and assuredly, if the reports of geologists are well founded, this arrangement will be as advantageous to us as it will be to the inhabitants of Newfoundland. I am persuaded then, Mr. SPEAKER, that the House will feel with me that we in Canada have very little to complain of in regard to the subsidies for local government. But if a doubt yet remains on the mind of any honorable member, let him examine the Trade Returns of the several provinces, and he will see that, from the large quantity of dutiable goods consumed in the Maritime Provinces, they have received no undue advantage under the arrangement. Let this too ever be kept in mind that the \$2,630,000 to be distributed to the local governments from the federal chest is to be in full and final extinguishment of all claims hereafter for local purposes; and that if this from any cause does not suffice, the local governments must supply all deficiencies from direct tax on their own localities. (Hear, hear.) And let honorable members from Upper Canada who carp at this annual subsidy, remember for a moment what we pay now, and they will cease their grumbling. Of all the money raised by the General Government for local purposes in Canada, the tax-payers of Upper Canada now pay more than three-fourths; but far from getting back in proportion to what they contribute, or even in proportion to their population, they do not get one-half of the money spent for local purposes. But how different will it be under Federation! Nine hundred thousand people will come into the union, who will contribute to the revenue quite as much, man for man, as the Upper Canadians, and in the distribution of the local subsidy we will receive our share on the basis of population. A very

different arrangement from that we now endure. (Hear, hear.) I confess to you, sir, that one of the strongest arguments in my mind for Confederation is the economical ideas of the people of these Maritime Provinces, and the conviction, that the influence of their public men in our legislative halls will be most salutary in all financial matters. A more economical people it would be difficult to find; their prime ministers and their chief justices get but £600 a year, Halifax currency, and the rest of their civil list is in much the same proportion. (Hear, hear.) But, Mr. SPEAKER, there is another great evil in our existing system that this scheme remedies; it secures to the people of each province full control over the administration of their own internal affairs. We in Upper Canada have complained that the minority of our representatives, the party defeated at the polls of Upper Canada, have been, year after year, kept in office by Lower Canada votes, and that all the local patronage of our section has been dispensed by those who did not possess the confidence of the people. Well, sir, this scheme remedies that. The local patronage will be under local control, and the wishes of the majority in each section will be carried out in all local matters. (Hear, hear.) We have complained that the land system was not according to the views of our western people; that free lands for actual settlers was the right policy for us—that the price of a piece of land squeezed out of an immigrant was no consideration in comparison with the settlement among us of a hardy and industrious family; and that the colonization road system was far from satisfactory. Well, sir, this scheme remedies that. Each province is to have control of its own crown lands, crown timber and crown minerals,—and will be free to take such steps for developing them as each deems best.—(Hear, hear.) We have complained that local works of various kinds—roads, bridges and landing piers, court houses, gaols and other structures—have been erected in an inequitable and improvident manner. Well, sir, this scheme remedies that; all local works are to be constructed by the localities and defrayed from local funds. And so on through the whole extensive details of internal local administration will this reform extend. The people of Upper Canada will have the entire control of their local matters, and will no longer have to betake themselves to Quebec for leave to open a road, to select a county town, or appoint a coroner. But I am told that to this general principle of placing all local matters under

local control, an exception has been made in regard to the common schools. (Hear, hear.) The clause complained of is as follows:—

6. Education; saving the rights and privileges which the Protestant or Catholic minority in both Canadas may possess as to their Denominational Schools at the time when the Union goes into operation.

Now, I need hardly remind the House that I have always opposed and continue to oppose the system of sectarian education, so far as the public chest is concerned. I have never had any hesitation on that point. I have never been able to see why all the people of the province, to whatever sect they may belong, should not send their children to the same common schools to receive the ordinary branches of instruction. I regard the parent and the pastor as the best religious instructors—and so long as the religious faith of the children is uninterfered with, and ample opportunity afforded to the clergy to give religious instruction to the children of their flocks, I cannot conceive any sound objection to mixed schools. But while in the Conference and elsewhere I have always maintained this view, and always given my vote against sectarian public schools, I am bound to admit, as I have always admitted, that the sectarian system, carried to the limited extent it has yet been in Upper Canada, and confined as it chiefly is to cities and towns, has not been a very great practical injury. The real cause of alarm was that the admission of the sectarian principle was there, and that at any moment it might be extended to such a degree as to split up our school system altogether. There are but a hundred separate schools in Upper Canada, out of some four thousand, and all Roman Catholic. But if the Roman Catholics are entitled to separate schools and to go on extending their operations, so are the members of the Church of England, the Presbyterians, the Methodists, and all other sects. No candid Roman Catholic will deny this for a moment; and there lay the great danger to our educational fabric, that the separate system might gradually extend itself until the whole country was studded with nurseries of sectarianism, most hurtful to the best interests of the province, and entailing an enormous expense to sustain the hosts of teachers that so prodigal a system of public instruction must inevitably entail. Now it is known to every honorable member of this House that an Act was passed in 1863, as a final settlement of this sectarian controversy. I was not in Quebec at the time, but

if I had been here I would have voted against that bill, because it extended the facilities for establishing separate schools. It had, however, this good feature, that it was accepted by the Roman Catholic authorities, and carried through Parliament as a final compromise of the question in Upper Canada. When, therefore, it was proposed that a provision should be inserted in the Confederation scheme to bind that compact of 1863 and declare it a final settlement, so that we should not be compelled, as we have been since 1849, to stand constantly to our arms, awaiting fresh attacks upon our common school system, the proposition seemed to me one that was not rashly to be rejected. (Hear, hear.) I admit that, from my point of view, this is a blot on the scheme before the House; it is, confessedly, one of the concessions from our side that had to be made to secure this great measure of reform. But assuredly, I, for one, have not the slightest hesitation in accepting it as a necessary condition of the scheme of union, and doubly acceptable must it be in the eyes of honorable gentlemen opposite, who were the authors of the bill of 1863. (Cheers.) But it was urged that though this arrangement might perhaps be fair as regards Upper Canada, it was not so as regards Lower Canada, for there were matters of which the British population have long complained, and some amendments to the existing School Act were required to secure them equal justice. Well, when this point was raised, gentlemen of all parties in Lower Canada at once expressed themselves prepared to treat it in a frank and conciliatory manner, with a view to removing any injustice that might be shown to exist; and on this understanding the educational clause was adopted by the Conference.

MR. T. C. WALLBRIDGE—That destroys the power of the local legislatures to legislate upon the subject.

HON. MR. BROWN—I would like to know how much "power" the honorable gentleman has now to legislate upon it? Let him introduce a bill to-day to annul the compact of 1863 and repeal all the sectarian school acts of Upper Canada, and how many votes would he get for it? Would twenty members vote for it out of the one hundred and thirty who compose this House? If the honorable gentleman had been struggling for fifteen years, as I have been, to save the school system of Upper Canada from further extension of the sectarian element, he would have found precious little diminution of power over it in this very moderate compromise. And what says the hon.

orable gentleman to leaving the British population of Lower Canada in the unrestricted power of the Local Legislature? The Common Schools of Lower Canada are not as in Upper Canada—they are almost entirely non-sectarian Roman Catholic Schools. Does the honorable gentleman, then, desire to compel the Protestants of Lower Canada to avail themselves of Roman Catholic institutions, or leave their children without instruction? (Hear hear, and cheers.) But, Mr. SPEAKER, I am further in favor of this scheme because it will bring to an end the sectional discord between Upper and Lower Canada. It sweeps away the boundary line between the provinces so far as regards matters common to the whole people—it places all on an equal level—and the members of the Federal Legislature will meet at last as citizens of a common country. The questions that used to excite the most hostile feelings among us have been taken away from the General Legislature, and placed under the control of the local bodies. No man need hereafter be debarred from success in public life because his views, however popular in his own section, are unpopular in the other,—for he will not have to deal with sectional questions; and the temptation to the Government of the day to make capital out of local prejudices will be greatly lessened, if not altogether at an end. What has rendered prominent public men in one section utterly unpopular in the other in past years? Has it been our views on trade and commerce—immigration—land settlement—the canal system—the tariff,—or any other of the great questions of national interest? No, sir, it was from our views as to the applying of public money to local purposes—the allotment of public lands to local purposes,—the building of local roads, bridges, and landing-piers with public funds—the chartering of ecclesiastical institutions—the granting of public money for sectarian purposes—the interference with our school system—and similar matters, that the hot feuds between Upper and Lower Canada have chiefly arisen, and caused our public men, the more faithful they were to the opinions and wishes of one section, to be the more unpopular in the other. A most happy day will it be for Canada when this bill goes into effect, and all these subjects of discord are swept from the discussion of our Legislature. (Hear.) But, Mr. SPEAKER, I am further in favor of this scheme as a remedial measure, because it brings to an end the doubt that has so long hung over our position, and gives a stability to our future in the eyes of the world that

could not otherwise have been attended. (Repeated marks of approval, but ironical cheers from Hon. Mr. HOLTON.) The hon. member for Chateauguay cries “hear, hear” in a very credulous tone; but the hon. member should be one of the very last to express doubts on this point. Has he not, for many years, admitted the absolute necessity of constitutional changes, ere peace and prosperity could be established in our land? Has he not taken part in the contests to obtain those changes? Has he not experienced the harsh and hostile feelings that have pervaded this House and the whole country? And did he not sign the report of my committee last session, declaring a Federal union to be the true solution of our troubles, political and constitutional? And does the honorable member think these matters were not well known in the United States, and that the hope of our annexation to the republic was not kept alive by them from year to year? Does he fancy that our discords and discontent were not well known in Great Britain, and that the capitalist and the emigrant were not influenced by our distractions? Does he fancy that people abroad, as well as at home, did not perfectly understand that Upper Canada would not much longer submit to the injustice from which she suffered—and that until the future relations of the two sections were adjusted, no one could predict safely what our future position might be? But when the measure before us has been adopted—when justice has been done to both sections—when all are placed on an equal footing—when the sectional matters that rent us have been handed over to sectional control—when sectional expenditure shall be placed on sectional shoulders—will not a sense of security and stability be inspired, which we never before enjoyed and never could have enjoyed under existing circumstances? (Cheers.) Viewed then, Mr. SPEAKER, from a merely Canadian stand-point—viewed solely as a remedial measure—I fearlessly assert that the scheme in your hands is a just and satisfactory remedy for the evils and injustice that have so long distracted the province—(cheers)—and so strongly do I feel this, that were every word of objection urged against our union with the Maritime Provinces just and true to the very letter, I would not hesitate to adopt the union as the price of a measure of constitutional reform in Canada, so just and so complete as now proposed. (Cheers.) But, Mr. SPEAKER, so far from the objections urged against union with the Maritime Provinces being sound, so far from union with them being a drawback to this

measure, I regard it as the crowning advantage of the whole scheme. (Continued cheering.) Sir, I make no pretension to having been in past years an advocate of the immediate union of the British American Colonies. I always felt and always said that no statesman could doubt that such was the best and almost the certain future destiny of these colonies; but I doubted greatly whether the right time for the movement had yet arrived. I knew little of the Maritime Provinces or the feelings of their people; the negotiations for a union were likely to be difficult and long protracted, and I was unwilling to accept the hope of a measure so remote and so uncertain in lieu of the practical remedy for practical evils in Canada which we were earnestly seeking to obtain, and which our own Legislature had the power immediately to grant. But of late, sir, all this has been changed. The circumstances are entirely altered. A revolution has occurred in Great Britain on the subject of colonial relations to the parent state—the Government of the United States has become a great warlike power—our commercial relations with the republic are seriously threatened—and every man in British America has now placed before him for solution the practical question, what shall be done in view of the changed relations on which we are about to enter? Shall we continue to struggle along as isolated communities, or shall we unite cordially together to extend our commerce, to develop the resources of our country and to defend our soil? But more than this—many of us have learned, since we last met here, far more of the Maritime Provinces than we ever did before. We have visited the Maritime Provinces—we have seen the country—we have met the people and marked their intelligence and their industry and their frugality—we have investigated their public affairs and found them satisfactory—we have discussed terms of union with their statesmen and found that no insuperable obstacle to union exists, and no necessity for long delay. We come to the consideration of the question to-day in a totally different position from what we ever did before—and if the House will grant me its indulgence, I think I can present unanswerable arguments to show that this union of all British America should be heartily and promptly accepted by all the provinces. (Cheers.) Mr. SPEAKER, I am in favor of a union of the British American Colonies, first, because it will raise us from the attitude of a number of inconsiderable colonies into a great and powerful people. (Cheers.) The united

population of Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island, is at this moment very close on four millions of souls. Now, there are in Europe forty-eight Sovereign States, and out of that number there are only eleven having a greater population than these colonies united—(hear, hear)—while three of the eleven are so little ahead of us, that before the next census is taken, in 1871, we shall stand equal in population to the ninth Sovereign State of Europe. (Hear.) Then, sir, the public revenues of the united provinces for 1864 were \$13,260,000, and their expenditures summed up to \$12,507,000. And, large as these sums may appear, it is satisfactory to know that the taxation of British America—were there no reduction from present burdens, which I am sure there will be—will be one-third less per head than the taxation of England or France. There are only five or six countries in Europe in which the taxation is less than ours will be—and these, moreover, are either petty principalities or states which do not enjoy a very high degree of civilization. (Hear.) Then, sir, as regards the Imports and Exports of the united provinces, they summed up in 1863, to the following dimensions:—

Imports.....	\$70,600,963
Exports.....	66,846,604

Total trade.....\$137,447,567

Now, sir, I should like honorable gentlemen to notice this fact, that in 1793—long after the United States had achieved their independence and established a settled Government—their exports and imports did not amount to one-third what ours do at this moment. (Cheers.) There are few states in Europe, and those with a vastly greater population than ours, that can boast of anything like the extent of foreign commerce that now passes through our hands. (Hear.) Then, sir, as to our agricultural resources, I find that 45,638,854 acres have passed from the governments of these colonies into private hands, of which only 13,128,229 are yet tilled, and 32,510,625 acres have still to be brought into cultivation. The whole of these forty-five millions are picked lands—most of them selected by the early settlers in this country; and if our annual agricultural products are so great now, what will they be when the thirty-two millions yet to pass under the plough have been brought into cultivation?—and what will they not be when the vast tracts still held by Government are peopled with hardy settlers?

(Hear.) According to the census of 1861, the value of the agricultural productions of the previous year in the united provinces of British America was \$120,000,000; and if we add to that the garden products, and the improvements made on new lands by the agricultural laborers of the provinces, it will be found that the actual product of the industry of our farmers in that year was \$150,000,000. (Hear, hear.) The assessed value of our farms—which is always greatly less than the real value—was \$550,000,000 in the year 1861. (Hear.) Then, sir, in regard to the minerals of the united provinces—what vast fields of profitable industry will we have in the great coal beds of Nova Scotia—in the iron deposits found all over the provinces—in the exhaustless copper regions of Lakes Huron and Superior and the Eastern Townships of Lower Canada—and in the gold mines of the Chaudière and Nova Scotia. And if the mind stretches from the western bounds of civilization through those great north-western regions, which we hope ere long will be ours, to the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains, what vast sources of wealth to the fur trader, the miner, the gold hunter and the agriculturist, lie there ready to be developed. (Hear, hear.) Nor can another source of wealth be altogether forgotten. The President of the United States is said recently to have declared that the produce of the petroleum wells of the United States will in half a dozen years pay off the whole national debt of the republic. Well, sir, we too have “struck oil,” and every day brings us intelligence of fresh discoveries—(hear, hear, and laughter)—and if the enormous debt of our neighbors may possibly be met by the oily stream, may we not hope that some material addition to our annual industrial revenue may flow from our petroleum regions? (Hear, hear.) Another vast branch of British American industry is the timber and lumber trade. In the year 1862, our saw-mills turned out not less than 772,000,000 feet of manufactured lumber, and our whole timber exports summed up to the value of fifteen millions of dollars. (Hear, hear.) The manufacturing interests of the provinces, too, are fast rising into importance; agricultural implement works, woollen factories and cotton mills, tanneries and shoe factories, iron works and rolling mills, flax works and paper mills, and many other extensive and profitable mechanical establishments are springing up among us, and rapidly extending their operations. (Hear, hear.) And to add to all, we have

already 2,500 miles of railway, 4,000 miles of electric telegraph, and the noblest canal system in the world, but which, I hope, will soon be infinitely improved. (Cheers.) These, Mr. SPEAKER, are some examples of the industrial spectacle British America will present after the union has been accomplished; and I ask any member of this House to say whether we will not, when thus united, occupy a position in the eyes of the world, and command a degree of respect and influence that we never can enjoy as separate provinces? (Hear, hear.) Must it not affect the decision of many an intending emigrant, when he is told not of the fishing and mining pursuits of Nova Scotia, or of the ship-building of New Brunswick, or of the timber trade of Lower Canada, or of the agriculture of Upper Canada, but when he is shown all these in one view, as the collective industrial pursuits of British America? (Hear, hear.) I am persuaded that this union will inspire new confidence in our stability, and exercise the most beneficial influence on all our affairs. I believe it will raise the value of our public securities, that it will draw capital to our shores, and secure the prosecution of all legitimate enterprises; and what I saw, while in England, a few weeks ago, would alone have convinced me of this. Wherever you went you encountered the most marked evidence of the gratification with which the Confederation scheme was received by all classes of the people, and the deep interest taken in its success. Let me state one fact in illustration. For some time previous to November last our securities had gone very low down in the market, in consequence, as my honorable friend the Finance Minister explained the other night, of the war raging on our borders, the uncertainty which hung over the future of this province, and the fear that we might be involved in trouble with our neighbors. Our five per cent. debentures went down in the market so low as 71, but they recovered from 71 to 75, I think, upon the day the resolutions for Confederation, which we are now discussing, reached London. Well, sir, the resolutions were published in the London papers, with eulogistic editorial articles, and the immediate effect of the scheme upon the public mind was such that our five per cents. rose from 75 to 92. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—What has put them down since?

HON. MR. BROWN—I will presently tell the honorable gentleman what has put them down since. But I say that, if anything could show more clearly than another the

fect this union is to have on our position over the world, it is a fact like this, that our securities went up 17 per cent. in consequence of the publication of the details of our scheme. (Hear, hear.) The honorable member for Chateaugay asks, "What put them down again?" I will tell him. They remained at 91 or 92 until the news came that a raid had been made from Canada into the United States, that the raiders had been arrested and brought before a Canadian Court, and that upon technical legal grounds, not only had they been set free, but the money of which they had robbed the banks had been handed over to the robbers. The effect of this news, coupled with General DIX's order, was to drive down our securities 11 per cent. almost in one day. (Hear, hear.) But, as my honorable friend the Finance Minister suggests, this is but an additional proof of the accuracy of the argument I have been sustaining—for this would not have happened, at all events to the same extent, if all the provinces had been united and prepared, as we are now proposing, not only for purposes of commerce but for purposes of defence. (Hear, hear.) But secondly, Mr. SPEAKER, I go heartily for the union, because it will throw down the barriers of trade and give us the control of a market of four millions of people. (Hear, hear.) What one thing has contributed so much to the wondrous material progress of the United States as the free passage of their products from one State to another? What has tended so much to the rapid advance of all branches of their industry, as the vast extent of their home market, creating an unlimited demand for all the commodities of daily use, and stimulating the energy and ingenuity of producers? Sir, I confess to you that in my mind this one view of the union—the addition of nearly a million of people to our home consumers—sweeps aside all the petty objections that are averred against the scheme. What, in comparison with this great gain to our farmers and manufacturers, are even the fallacious money objections which the imaginations of honorable gentlemen opposite have summoned up? All over the world we find nations eagerly longing to extend their domains, spending large sums and waging protracted wars to possess themselves of more territory, untilled and uninhabited. (Hear, hear.) Other countries offer large inducements to foreigners to emigrate to their shores—free passages, free lands, and free food and implements to start them in the world. We, ourselves, support costly establishments to attract immigrants to our coun-

try, and are satisfied when our annual outlay brings us fifteen or twenty thousand souls. But here, sir, is a proposal which is to add, in one day, near a million of souls to our population—to add valuable territories to our domain, and secure to us all the advantages of a large and profitable commerce, now existing. And because some of us would have liked certain of the little details otherwise arranged, we are to hesitate in accepting this alliance! (Hear, hear.) Have honorable gentlemen forgotten that the United States gladly paid twenty millions in hard cash to have Louisiana incorporated in the Republic? But what was Louisiana then to the Americans, in comparison with what the Maritime Provinces are at this moment to Canada? I put it to honorable gentlemen opposite—if the United States were now to offer us the State of Maine, what possible sum could be named within the compass of our ability that we would not be prepared to pay for that addition to our country? (Hear, hear.) If we were offered Michigan, Iowa or Minnesota, I would like to know what sum, within the compass of Canada, we would not be prepared to pay? These are portions of a foreign country, but here is a people owning the same allegiance as ourselves, loving the same old sod, enjoying the same laws and institutions, actuated by the same impulses and social customs,—and yet when it is proposed that they shall unite with us for purposes of commerce, for the defence of our common country, and to develop the vast natural resources of our united domains, we hesitate to adopt it! If a Canadian goes now to Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, or if a citizen of these provinces comes here, it is like going to a foreign country. The customs officer meets you at the frontier, arrests your progress, and levies his imposts on your effects. But the proposal now before us is to throw down all barriers between the provinces—to make a citizen of one, citizen of the whole; the proposal is, that our farmers and manufacturers and mechanics shall carry their wares unquestioned into every village of the Maritime Provinces; and that they shall with equal freedom bring their fish, and their coal, and their West India produce to our three millions of inhabitants. The proposal is, that the law courts, and the schools, and the professional and industrial walks of life, throughout all the provinces, shall be thrown equally open to us all. (Hear, hear.) But, thirdly, Mr. SPEAKER, I am in favor of a union of the provinces because—and I call the attention of honorable

gentlemen opposite to it—because it will make us the third maritime state of the world. (Hear, hear.) When this union is accomplished, but two countries in the world will be superior in maritime influence to British America—and those are Great Britain and the United States. (Hear, hear.) In 1863, no fewer than 628 vessels were built in British America, of which the aggregate tonnage was not less than 230,312 tons. (Hear, hear.) There were built—

	Vessels.	Tons.
In Canada	158 with	67,209
" Nova Scotia.....	207 "	46,862
" New Brunswick.....	137 "	85,250
" Prince Edward Island 100 "		24,991
" Newfoundland.....	26 "	6,000
Total.....	628.....	230,312

Now, sir, in 1861—the year preceding the outbreak of the civil war—all the vessels built in the United States, with their vast seaboard and thirty millions of people, were in the aggregate but 233,193 tons—only three thousand tons in excess of the British American Provinces. (Hear, hear.) And I hesitate not to affirm that if the people of British America unite cordially together in utilizing the singular facilities we unitedly possess for the extension of the shipping and ship-building interests, many years will not elapse before we greatly surpass our neighbors in this lucrative branch of industry. (Cheers.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—How much of the shipping built in that year do we own now?

HON. MR. BROWN—How much of what the Americans built in 1861 do they own now? Why is my honorable friend so anxious to decry the industry of his country? If we have not the ships it is because we sold them, and the money is in our pockets, and we are ready to build more. In 1863 we sold ships built by our mechanics to the large amount of \$9,000,000 in gold. (Cheers.) But if my honorable friend from Chateauguay will permit me, I am going on to indoctrinate him upon the point of the ownership of vessels—

HON. MR. HOLTON—Don't!

HON. MR. BROWN—Ah! my honorable friend does not require to be instructed; well, will he tell us how many tons of shipping are now owned by British America?

HON. MR. HOLTON—I am aware that most of the vessels my honorable friend speaks of, and the building of which he cites as a proof that we will be a great maritime power, were sold abroad. Building ships is a good thing, and selling them is a better, but that

does not prove us to be a great maritime power.

HON. MR. BROWN—My honorable friend cannot eat his cake and have it too. If we got \$9,000,000 for a portion of the ships we built in 1863, it is clear we cannot own them also. It did not require a man of great wisdom to find out that. (Laughter.) But I was going on to show the amount of shipping that was owned in these provinces. I hold in my hand a statement of the vessels owned and registered in British America, made up to the latest dates, and I find that the provinces unitedly own not fewer than 8,530 vessels, with an aggregate tonnage of not less than 932,246 tons.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Sea-going?

HON. MR. BROWN—Sea-going and inland.

HON. MR. HOLTON—(ironically)—Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BROWN—Why is my honorable friend from Chateauguay so anxious to depreciate? Is it then so deplorable a thing to own inland vessels? None knows better than my honorable friend when to buy and when to sell—and yet, I greatly mistake if there was not a time when my honorable friend thought it not so bad a thing to be the owner of ships and steamers on our inland seas. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) Am I wrong in believing that my honorable friend laid the foundation of his well-merited fortune in the carrying trade of the lakes?—and is it for him, from momentary partisanship, to depreciate such an important branch of national industry? What matters where the ship floats, if she is a good and a sound ship?—and the inland tonnage includes so many steamers, that in value it will compare favorably with that of the sea-going. On the 31st December,—

	Vessels.	Tons.
1864, Canada owned.....	2,311 ..	287,187
1863, Nova Scotia.....	3,539 ..	309,554
1863, New Brunswick.....	891 ..	211,680
1863, Prince Edward Island ..	360 ..	34,222
1863, Newfoundland.....	1,429 ..	89,603
Total.....	8,530	932,246

Now, sir, it is quite true that the United States have a much larger commercial navy than this, and Great Britain a vastly larger one—but it is equally true that the country next to them in importance is France, and that notwithstanding her thirty-five millions of people, large foreign trade, and extensive sea-coast, she owns but 60,000 tons of ship-

ping more than British America. (Hear, hear.) In 1860, the aggregate commercial navy of France was but 996,124 tons. I say then, that even as ship-owners, the British American Confederacy will occupy from the first, a proud place among the Maritime States of the world—and that when all her ships hoist a distinctive flag alongside the Cross of Red, there will be few seas in which it will not be unfurled. And let me here mention a fact which came under my notice while recently in the Lower Provinces—a fact of great importance, and from which, I think, we, who are more inland, may well profit. I learned that, as in the British Isles, a system of joint-stock ship-building has been spreading over many parts of the Maritime Provinces. Ships are built and owned in small shares—say in sixteenth, thirty-second, or sixty-fourth parts, and all classes of the people are taking small ventures in the trade. Most of the ships so built are sold, but a portion, and an increasing portion, every year, are sailed, and sailed with profit, by the original joint-stock builders. (Hear, hear.) I was delighted to be told that some of those clipper vessels which we often hear of as making wonderful trips from China and India and Australia to British ports, are vessels built and owned in New Brunswick, under this joint-stock system. (Hear, hear.) So much for the building and ownership of ships. Now let me show you what will be the strength of the united provinces in seafaring men. By the census of 1861, it appears that the numbers of sailors and fishermen were then—

In Canada	5,958
In Nova Scotia	19,637
In New Brunswick	2,765
In Prince Edward Island	2,318
In Newfoundland	38,578
Total	69,256

Whether regarded merely as a lucrative branch of industry, or as affecting our maritime position before the world, or as a bulwark of defence in time of need, this one fact that British America will have a combined force of seventy thousand seamen, appears to me an immense argument in favor of the union. (Hear, hear.) And let us look at the products of the labor of a portion of these men—the fishermen. From the latest returns I have been able to meet with, I find the joint products of our sea-coasts and inland lakes were, in the years named, estimated at the following values:—

Upper Canada, 1859	\$ 380,000
Lower Canada, 1862	703,895
Nova Scotia, 1861	2,072,081
New Brunswick, 1861	518,630
Newfoundland, 1861	6,347,730

Total

(Hear, hear.) I was unable to find any estimate as regards Prince Edward Island, but fancy the amount there must be about \$200,000. But, be this as it may, so valuable a fishing trade as this of the united provinces does not exist in any part of the world. And no doubt these estimates are far under the fact, as a large portion of the delicious food drawn by our people from the sea and inland waters could not possibly be included in the returns of the fishery inspectors. (Hear, hear.) And let us observe, for a moment, the important part played by this fishing industry in the foreign commerce of the provinces. The exports of products of the sea in the year 1863 were as follows:—

From Canada	\$ 789,913
“ Nova Scotia	2,390,661
“ New Brunswick (1862)	303,477
“ Newfoundland	4,090,970
“ Prince Edward Island	121,000

Total exports

Add to this, nine millions of dollars received in the same year for new ships, and we have \$16,696,021 as one year's foreign exports of our ship-building and fishing interests. (Hear, hear.) With such facts before us as the result of only a partially-developed traffic, may we not fearlessly look forward to the future in the confident hope of still more gratifying results, when, by combined and energetic action, a new impetus has been given to these valuable branches of industry? But there remains a still more singular comparison to be made. The Minister of Finance referred to it last night—but he scarcely did justice to our position, because he excluded altogether the inland shipping. I refer to the statement of ships annually entering and leaving our ports. Of course every one comprehends that a large amount of the tonnage entering and leaving ports on the upper lakes is repeated in the returns over and over again. This is the case, for instance, with the ferry boats between the American and Canadian shores, that carry passengers and a small quantity of goods. It would be unfair to put down the tonnage of such boats every time they enter or leave a port, as foreign commerce. Still there is a

large amount of valuable shipping engaged in the inland trade, and a vast amount of freight is carried between the countries; and the only just plan is to state separately that which is sea-going shipping and that which is inland. Acting on this plan, I find that in 1863, the tonnage between Canada and foreign ports was as follows:—

	Inwards.	Outwards.	Total.
Canada.....	1,041,309	1,091,895	2,133,204
Nova Scotia.....	712,939	719,915	1,432,854
New Brunswic	659,258	727,727	1,386,985
P. E. Island, 1862.....	69,080	81,208	150,288
Newfoundland.....	156,578	148,610	305,188
	2,639,164	2,769,355	5,408,519
Inland Navigation.			
Canada.....	3,538,701	3,368,432	6,907,133
Total tons.....	6,177,865	6,137,787	12,315,652

Now, sir, the United States are in the same position as we are in respect to this inland traffic, and they include it in their returns as is done here. And what, sir, do you think is the difference between their tonnage and ours? Why ours is over twelve millions and theirs is but sixteen millions. There are not four millions of tons of difference between the two. (Hear, hear.) And let it be recollected that the United States have had seventy years start of us. As regards France, the whole amount of shipping that entered and left the ports of that great country in one year was but 8,456,734 tons—four millions of tons less than that of the British American Provinces. May we not then, when this union is accomplished, fairly claim to be the third maritime state of the world; and may we not even entertain the hope that, at some future day, a still higher position is not beyond our reach, when the days of puberty have been passed and the strength of manhood has been reached? I ask honorable gentlemen, in looking at these figures, to consider what the effect must be when they are set down thus collectively, side by side, in official commercial returns, in comparison with the commerce of all the great maritime states? Will it not strengthen our position abroad?—will it not give us a degree of influence and importance to have it known that British America wields so large a share of the world's commerce?—And if honorable gentlemen will still further consider the deep importance to Canada, in her inland position, of exercising her just influence in the control of so valuable a maritime interest, I think they will come to the conclusion that all the objections urged against this union are, in the balance of its advantages, utterly contemptible.

(Cheers.) But, in the fourth place, Mr. SPEAKER, I go for a union of the provinces, because it will give a new start to immigration into our country. It will bring us out anew prominently before the world—it will turn earnest attention to our resources, and bring to our shores a stream of immigration greater, and of a better class, than we ever had before. I was in England when the first public announcement of this scheme was made, and witnessed, with pleasure, the marked impression it produced. You could not go abroad, you could not enter into any company, in any class of society, where Canada or the British American Provinces were mentioned, but you heard this union movement spoken of almost with enthusiasm. And I say it is desirable that this scheme should not be delayed, but be carried through promptly and vigorously. I hesitate not to say that it should be accompanied with a vigorous effort to give a new impetus to our industrial enterprises, to open up fresh lands for settlement, and to cheapen the transport of our produce to the sea-board. With the consummation of this union, I trust we will have a new immigration and a new land settlement policy—that we will ascertain every lot of land we actually own, so that a printed list may be placed in the hands of every immigrant—that the petty price we have been heretofore exacting will no longer be exacted, but that to actual settlers, who come among us to hew out for themselves and their children homes in the forest, no burthen or condition will be demanded, beyond resident occupation for a certain number of years, and a fixed amount of improvement on the land.—

HON. MR. HOLTON—Unfortunately for your argument, the lands will be in the hands of the local governments.

HON. MR. BROWN—So much the better. My honorable friend can manage his public lands in Lower Canada as he likes, and we will manage ours. And, speaking for the western section, I am bound to say there are very few shrewd men in Upper Canada who do not feel that far more public benefit is to be gained from the industry of a hardy actual settler upon 100 acres of land given to him free, than the trumpery \$150 that can be squeezed out of him as its price, the payment of which keeps him in trouble perhaps for years, and retards the progress of the country. On this question of immigration turns, in my opinion, the whole future success of this great scheme which we are now discussing. Why, sir, there is hardly a political or financial or social problem suggested by this union that

does not find its best solution in a large influx of immigration. The larger our population, the greater will be our productions, the more valuable our exports, and the greater our ability to develop the resources of our country. The greater the number of tax-payers, and the more densely they are settled, the more lightly will the burden of taxation fall upon us all. And in this question of immigration is found the only true solution of the problem of defence. Fill up our vacant lands, double our population, and we will at once be in a position to meet promptly and effectually any invader who may put his foot with hostile intent upon our soil. (Hear, hear.) And this question of immigration naturally brings me to the great subject of the North-West territories. (Hear, hear.) The resolutions before us recognize the immediate necessity of those great territories being brought within the Confederation and opened up for settlement. But I am told that, while the Intercolonial Railroad has been made an absolute condition of the compact, the opening up of the Great West and the enlargement of our canals have been left in doubt. Now, sir, nothing can be more unjust than this. Let me read the resolutions:—

The General Government shall secure, without delay, the completion of the Intercolonial Railway from Rivière du Loup, through New Brunswick, to Truro in Nova Scotia.

The communications with the North-Western Territory, and the improvements required for the development of the trade of the Great West with the seaboard, are regarded by this Conference as subjects of the highest importance to the Federated Provinces, and shall be prosecuted at the earliest possible period that the state of the finances will permit.

The Confederation is, therefore, clearly committed to the carrying out of both these enterprises. I doubt if there was a member of the Conference who did not consider that the opening up of the North-West and the improvement of our canal system, were not as clearly for the advantage of the Lower Provinces as for the interests of Upper Canada. Indeed, one gentleman held that the Lower Provinces were more interested—they wished to get their products into the west—they wanted a back country as much as we did—they wanted to be the carriers for that great country—and they were, therefore, to say the least, as much interested in these questions as we were. But honorable gentlemen lay stress upon the point, that, while the one enterprise is to be undertaken at once, the other is not to be commenced until the state of the

finances will permit. No doubt this is correct, and the reason for it is simply this—the money has already been found for the Intercolonial Railway. They must be well aware that the late Government (the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Administration) agreed to build the Intercolonial Railway, and obtained from the Imperial Government a guarantee of the debentures for building it—so that that money is ready at a very low rate of interest, whenever required. We know where to find the money for one enterprise at a rate we are able to bear, and can thus at once go on with a work which must be gone on with if this union is to be consummated. But we don't know this of the other great work—and we all felt that it would be exceedingly indiscreet—I, myself, as the special advocate of opening up the Great West and of the enlargement of our canals,—felt that I could not put my name to a document which declared that at all hazards, while our five per cent. debentures were quoted at 75 or 80 per cent. in the money market—we would commence at once, without an hour's delay, any great public work whatever. (Hear, hear.) Honorable gentlemen opposite must not imagine that they have to do with a set of tricksters in the thirty-three gentlemen who composed that Conference. What we have said in our resolutions was deliberately adopted, in the honest sense of the words employed, and not for purposes of deception. Both works are to go on at the earliest possible moment our finances will permit, and honorable gentlemen will find the members of the Cabinet from Lower, as well as from Upper Canada, actuated by the hearty desire to have this whole scheme carried out in its fair meaning.

HON. MR. CARTIER—Hear, hear!

HON. MR. GALT—Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BROWN—When recently in England, I was charged to negotiate with the Imperial Government for the opening up of the North-West territories. In a few days the papers will be laid before the House, and it will then be seen whether or not this Government is in earnest in that matter. Sir, the gentlemen who formed the Conference at Quebec did not enter upon their work with the miserable idea of getting the advantage of each other, but with a due sense of the greatness of the work they had on hand, with an earnest desire to do justice to all, and keeping always in mind that what would benefit one section in such a union must necessarily benefit the whole. (Cheers.) It has always appeared to me that the opening up of the North-West ought to be one of the most cherished project-

of my honorable friends from Lower Canada. During the discussion on the question for some years back I had occasion to dip deep in North-West lore—into those singularly interesting narratives of life and travels in the North-West in the olden time, and into the history of the struggles for commercial dominancy in the great fur-bearing regions,—and it has always struck me that the French Canadian people have cause to look back with pride to the bold and successful part they played in the adventures of those days. Nothing perhaps has tended more to create their present national character than the vigorous habits, the power of endurance, the aptitude for out-door life, acquired in their prosecution of the North-West fur-trade. (Hear, hear.) Well may they look forward with anxiety to the realization of this part of our scheme, in confident hope that the great north-western traffic shall be once more opened up to the hardy French Canadian traders and *voyageurs*. (Hear, hear.) Last year furs to the value of £280,000 stg. (\$1,400,000) were carried from that territory by the Hudson's Bay Company—smuggled off through the ice bound regions of James' Bay, that the pretence of the barrenness of the country and the difficulty of conveying merchandise by the natural route of the St. Lawrence may be kept up a little longer. Sir, the carrying of merchandise into that country, and bringing down the bales of pelts ought to be ours, and must ere long be ours, as in the days of yore—(hear, hear)—and when the fertile plains of that great Saskatchewan territory are opened up for settlement and cultivation, I am confident that it will not only add immensely to our annual agricultural products, but bring us sources of mineral and other wealth on which at present we do not reckon. (Hear, hear.) While speaking on this question of immigration, I would remind the House, and it is impossible to urge it too strongly, that these provinces are now presented to the world in a very disadvantageous aspect, as different communities. When a party in Europe thinks of emigrating here, he has to ascertain separately all about New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, and Nova Scotia, and Upper and Lower Canada; and if by chance he meets a party from some one of these provinces, he has to listen to a picture of the merits of that one section in high contrast to the demerits of all the rest, and the result is the poor man's ideas about us become a mass of confusion. On the other hand, if he seeks to know the inducements for emigration to New South Wales, or New Zealand, he gets it

in one picture—in an official form—and the offer is made to pay his passage to these lands of hope. A large amount of emigration, and of money which the emigrant takes with him, are thus carried off to a much more distant land than this, and one that does not offer equal inducements to the settler. But how different will all this be when these provinces stand united, and present to emigrants a combination of so many branches of profitable industry? In turning over some United States statistics I recently fell upon a very curious official calculation made by the United States Government, as to the value of immigration. By the census of 1861 the population of the United States was over thirty millions; and this calculation was to ascertain what the population would have been had there been no immigration into the country, but had the population been left to advance solely by its own natural increase. And what do you think, sir, was the result? Why, it is shewn that if the United States had received all the immigrants that came to them up to 1820, and then stopped receiving them—the population, at this moment, instead of thirty millions, would have been but 14,601,485. (Hear, hear.) It is shewn that if immigration had gone on until 1810, and stopped then, the population now would have been only 12,678,562. Had it stopped in 1800, the population now would have been 10,462,944; and had it stopped in 1790, the population now, instead of thirty millions, would have been but 8,789,969. (Hear, hear.) These, sir, are most valuable facts, which should be impressed on the mind of every public man in British America. If we wish our country to progress, we should not leave a single stone unturned to attract the tide of emigration in this direction; and I know no better method of securing that result, than the gathering into one of these five provinces, and presenting ourselves to the world in the advantageous light which, when united, we would occupy. (Cheers.) But, fifthly, Mr. SPEAKER, I am in favor of a union of these provinces, because it will enable us to meet, without alarm, the abrogation of the American Reciprocity Treaty, in case the United States should insist on its abolition. (Hear, hear.) I do not believe that the American Government is so insane as to repeal that treaty. But it is always well to be prepared for contingencies—and I have no hesitation in saying that if they do repeal it, should this union of British America go on, a fresh outlet for our commerce will be opened up to us quite as advantageous as the American trade has ever been.

I have never heretofore ventured to make this assertion, for I know well what a serious task it is to change, in one day, the commercial relations of such a country as this. When the traffic of a country has passed for a lengthened period through a particular channel, any serious change of that channel tends, for a time, to the embarrassment of business men, and causes serious injury to individuals, if not to the whole community. Such a change we in Canada had in 1847. But as it was in 1847, so it will be in 1866, if the Reciprocity Treaty is abolished. Our agricultural interest had been built up on the protective legislation of Great Britain, and in 1847 it was suddenly brought to an end. We suffered severely, in consequence, for some years; but, by degrees, new channels for our trade opened up—the Reciprocity Treaty was negotiated—and we have been more prosperous since 1847 than we ever were before. And so, I have not a doubt, will it be in the event of the Reciprocity Treaty being abolished. Profitable as that treaty has unquestionably been to us—and it has been more profitable to the Americans—still, were it brought to an end to-morrow, though we would suffer a while from the change, I am convinced the ultimate result would be that other foreign markets would be opened to us, quite as profitable, and that we would speedily build up our trade on a sounder basis than at present. A close examination of the working of the Reciprocity Treaty discloses facts of vital importance to the merits of the question, to which you never hear the slightest allusion made by American speakers or writers. Our neighbours, in speaking of the treaty, keep constantly telling us of the Canadian trade—what they take from Canada and what Canada takes from them. Their whole story is about the buying and selling of commodities in Canada. Not a whisper do you ever hear from them about their buying and selling with the Maritime Provinces—not a word about the enormous carrying trade for all the provinces which they monopolize—not a word of the large sums drawn from us for our vast traffic over their railways and canals—and not a whisper as to their immense profits from fishing in our waters, secured to them by the treaty. (Hear, hear.) No, sir, all we hear of is the exports and imports of Canada—all is silence as to other parts of the treaty. But it must not be forgotten that if the treaty is abolished and this union is accomplished, an abolition of reciprocity with Canada means abolition of reciprocity with all the British American Provinces—means bringing to an

end the right of the Americans to fish in our waters; their right to use our canals; their right to the navigation of the St. Lawrence; and that it also implies the taking out of their hands the vast and lucrative carrying trade they now have from us. (Hear, hear.) It must be always kept in mind that though the United States purchase from Canada a large amount of agricultural products, a great portion of what they purchase does not go into consumption in the States, but is merely purchased for transmission to Great Britain and the West India markets. (Hear, hear.) They merely act as commission agents and carriers in such transactions, and splendid profits they make out of the business. But beyond this, another large portion of these produce purchases, for which they take so much credit to themselves, they buy in the same manner for export to the Maritime Provinces of British America, reaping all the benefit of the sea-going as well as the inland freight—charges and commissions. (Hear, hear.) The commercial returns of the Lower Provinces show not only that the Americans send a large quantity of their own farm products to those provinces, but a considerable amount of what they (the Americans) receive from us, thereby gaining the double advantage of the carrying trade through the United States to the seaboard, and then by sea to the Lower Provinces. (Hear, hear.) I hold in my hand a return of the articles purchased by the Maritime Provinces from the United States in 1863, which Canada could have supplied. I will not detain the House by reading it, but any member who desires can have it for examination. I may state, however, in brief, that in that year the breadstuffs alone bought by the Lower Provinces amounted to no less than \$4,447,207—that the import of meats, fresh and cured, amounted to \$659,917—and that the total value of products which the Lower Provinces might have bought more advantageously from us, summed up to over seven millions of dollars. (Hear, hear.) The Americans must, therefore, bear in mind, that if they abolish the Reciprocity Treaty, they will not only lose that seven millions which they now receive for their products, but the carrying trade which goes with it. But on the other hand, when we have this union, these products will, as they naturally should, go down the St. Lawrence, not only for the advantage of our farmers—but swelling the volume of our own shipping interests. (Hear, hear.) The Americans, hitherto, have had a large portion of our carrying trade; they have

brought us our goods—even our European goods—and taken our produce not only to Europe but even to the Lower Provinces; and I say one of the best features of this union is, that if in our commercial relations with the United States we are compelled by them to meet fire with fire—it will enable us to stop this improvidence and turn the current of our own trade into our own waters. Far be it from me to say I am an advocate of a coercive commercial policy—on the contrary, entire freedom of trade, in my opinion, is what we in this country should strive for. Without hesitation, I would, to-morrow, throw open the whole of our trade and the whole of our waters to the United States, if they did the same to us. But, if they tell us, in the face of all the advantages they get by Reciprocity, that they are determined to put a stop to it, and if this is done through a hostile feeling to us—deeply as I should regret that this should be the first use made by the Northern States of their new-found liberty—then, I say, we have a policy, and a good policy of our own, to fall back upon. And let me say a word as to the effect of the repeal of Reciprocity on the American fishing interest. The Americans, in 1851, had engaged in the cod and mackerel fishing, in our waters, shipping to the extent of 129,014 tons—but under the influence of the Reciprocity Treaty it rose, in 1861, to 192,662—an increase, in ten years, of upwards of 63,000 tons, or fifty per cent. (Hear, hear.) The repeal of Reciprocity will give us back all this increase, and more, for it will be a very different thing in the future from what it was formerly, to poach on our fishing grounds, when these provinces are united and determined to protect the fisheries of the Gulf. This fishing interest is one which may be cultivated to an extent difficult, perhaps, for many of us to conceive. But we have only to look at the amount of fish taken from our waters by the Americans and other nations, and the advantages we possess, to perceive that, if we apply ourselves, as a united people, to foster that trade, we can vastly increase the great traffic we now enjoy. (Hear, hear.) On the whole, then, sir, I come firmly to the conclusion that, in view of the possible stoppage of the American Reciprocity Treaty, and our being compelled to find new channels for our trade, this union presents to us advantages, in comparison with which any objection that has been offered, or can be offered to it, is utterly insignificant. (Hear, hear.) But, sixthly, Mr. SPEAKER, I am in favor of the union of the provinces, because, in the event

of war, it will enable all the colonies to defend themselves better, and give more efficient aid to the Empire, than they could do separately. I am not one of those who ever had the war-fever; I have not believed in getting up large armaments in this country; I have never doubted that a military spirit, to a certain extent, did necessarily form part of the character of a great people; but I felt that Canada had not yet reached that stage in her progress when she could safely assume the duty of defence; and that, so long as peace continued and the Mother Country threw her shield around us, it was well for us to cultivate our fields and grow in numbers and material strength, until we could look our enemies fearlessly in the face. But it must be admitted—and there is no use of closing our eyes to the fact—that this question of defence has been placed, within the last two years, in a totally different position from what it ever occupied before. The time has come—it matters not what political party may be in power in England—when Britain will insist on a reconsideration of the military relations which a great colony, such as Canada, ought to hold to the Empire. And I am free to admit that it is a fair and just demand. We may doubt whether some of the demands that have been made upon us, without regard to our peculiar position at the moment, and without any attempt to discuss the question with us in all its breadth, were either just or well-considered. But of this I think there can be no doubt, that when the time comes in the history of any colony that it has overcome the burdens and embarrassments of early settlement, and has entered on a career of permanent progress and prosperity, it is only fair and right that it should contribute its quota to the defence of the Empire. What that quota ought to be, I think, is a matter for grave deliberation and discussion, as well as the measure of assistance the colony may look for, in time of war, from the parent state—and, assuredly, it is in this spirit that the present Imperial Government is desirous of approaching the question. (Hear, hear.) I am persuaded that nothing more than that which is fairly due at our hands will be demanded from us, and anything less than this, I am sure, the people of Canada do not desire. (Hear, hear.) In the conversations I had, while in England, with public men of different politics—while I found many who considered that the connection between Canada and England involved the Mother Country in some danger of war with the powerful state upon our borders, and that

the colonial system devolved heavy and unreasonable burdens upon the Mother Country—and while a still larger number thought we had not acted as cordially and energetically as we ought in organizing our militia for the defence of the province, still I did not meet one public man, of any stripe of politics, who did not readily and heartily declare that, in case of the invasion of Canada, the honor of Great Britain would be at stake, and the whole strength of the Empire would be unhesitatingly marshalled in our defence. (Hear, hear.) But, coupled with this, was the invariable and most reasonable declaration that a share of the burden of defence, in peace and in war, we must contribute. And this stipulation applies not only to Canada, but to every one of the colonies. Already the Indian Empire has been made to pay the whole expense of her military establishment. The Australian Colonies have agreed to pay £40 sterling per man for every soldier sent there. This system is being gradually extended—and union or no union, assuredly every one of these British American Colonies will be called upon to bear her fair share towards the defence of the Empire. And who will deny that it is a just demand, and that great colonies such as these, should be proud to meet it in a frank and earnest spirit. (Cheers.) Nothing, I am persuaded, could be more foreign to the ideas of the people of Canada, than that the people of England should be unfairly taxed for service rendered to this province. Now, the question presented to us is simply this: will these contributions which Canada and the other provinces must hereafter make to the defence of the Empire, be better rendered by a hardy, energetic, population, acting as one people, than as five or six separate communities? (Hear, hear.) There is no doubt about it. But not only do our changed relations towards the Mother Country call on us to assume the new duty of military defence—our changed relations towards the neighboring Republic compel us to do so. For myself, I have no belief that the Americans have the slightest thought of attacking us. I cannot believe that the first use of their new-found liberty will be the invasion, totally unprovoked, of a peaceful province. I fancy that they have had quite enough of war for a good many years to come—and that such a war as one with England would certainly be, is the last they are likely to provoke. But, Mr. SPEAKER, there is no better mode of warding off war when it is threatened, than to be prepared for it if it comes. The Americans are

now a warlike people. They have large armies, a powerful navy, an unlimited supply of warlike munitions, and the carnage of war has to them been stript of its horrors. The American side of our lines already bristles with works of defence, and unless we are willing to live at the mercy of our neighbors, we, too, must put our country in a state of efficient preparation. War or no war—the necessity of placing these provinces in a thorough state of defence can no longer be postponed. Our country is coming to be regarded as undefended and indefensible—the capitalist is alarmed, and the immigrant is afraid to come among us. Were it merely as a measure of commercial advantage, every one of these colonies must meet the question of military defence promptly and energetically. And how can we do this so efficiently and economically as by the union now proposed? (Hear, hear.) I have already shewn that union would give us a body of 70,000 hardy seamen ready and able to defend our sea-coasts and inland lakes; let us now see what would be the military strength of the Confederation. By the last census (1861) it appears that the men capable of bearing arms in British America were as follows:—

Upper Canada, from 20 to 60.....	308,955
Lower Canada, from 20 to 60.....	225,620
Nova Scotia, from 20 to 60.....	67,467
New Brunswick, from 20 to 60.....	51,625
Newfoundland, from 20 to 60.....	25,532
Prince Edward Island, '21 to 60....	14,819

Total.....693,918

With the body of efficient soldiers that might be obtained from this vast array of men, the erection of defensive works at salient points, and the force of British troops that would soon come to our aid—who can doubt that the invasion of our country would be successfully resisted? But, seventhly, Mr. SPEAKER, I am in favor of this union because it will give us a sea-board at all seasons of the year. (Hear, hear.) It is not to be denied that the position of Canada, shut off as she is from the sea-board during the winter months, is far from satisfactory—and should the United States carry out their insane threat of abolishing the bonding system, by which our merchandise passes free through their territory, it would be still more embarrassing. The Maritime Provinces are equally cut off from communication inland. Now, this embarrassment will be ended by colonial union. The Inter-colonial Railway will give us at all times access to the Atlantic through British terri-

tory. (Hear, hear.) As a commercial enterprise, the Intercolonial Railway has not, I apprehend, any considerable merit; as a work of defence it has, however, many advocates; but, if the union of the provinces is to go on, it is an absolute necessity; and, as the price of union, were there no other argument in its favor, I heartily go for it. (Hear, hear.) The advantage it will confer on the Maritime Provinces can hardly be over-rated. It will make Halifax and St. John the Atlantic seaports of half a continent—it will insure to Halifax, ere long, the establishment of a line of powerful steamers running in six days from her wharves to some near point on the west coast of Ireland—and it will bring a constant stream of passengers and immigrants through those Lower Provinces that never otherwise would come near them. Mr. SPEAKER, I could go on for many hours piling up arguments in favor of this scheme, but already I have detained the House too long—(cries of “no, no;” “go on!”)—and must draw to a close. But I think I have given reasons enough to satisfy every candid man who desires the advancement of his country, why this House should go unanimously and enthusiastically for “the union, the whole union, and nothing but the union!” Before sitting down, however, there are one or two general objections urged against the scheme which I am desirous of meeting, and I will try to do so as briefly as possible. And first, sir, I am told that we should have made the union legislative and not federal. Undoubtedly this is a point on which different opinions may be honestly held by men sincerely seeking the same ends—but, speaking my own views, I think we came to a most wise conclusion. Had we continued the present legislative union, we must have continued with it the unjust system of taxation for local purposes that now exists—and the sectional bickering would have gone on as before. And can any honorable gentleman really believe that it would have been possible for a body of men sitting at Ottawa to administer efficiently and wisely the parish business of Red River and Newfoundland, and all the country between? Only think of bringing suitors and witnesses such distances to promote a bill for closing a side-line or incorporating a club! And if such a thing were desirable, would it be possible for any body of men to go through such a mass of work? Why, sir, the Imperial Parliament with 650 members sits for eight months in the year, and even our Parliament sits three or four months,—how then

would it be possible for the legislature of all the provinces with a thousand or twelve hundred bills before it, to accomplish it all? The whole year would not suffice for it—and who in these colonies is able to sacrifice his whole time to the duties of public life? But there is another reason why the union was not made legislative—it could not be carried. (Hear, hear.) We had either to take a federal union or drop the negotiation. Not only were our friends from Lower Canada against it, but so were most of the delegates from the Maritime Provinces. There was but one choice open to us—federal union or nothing. But in truth the scheme now before us has all the advantages of a legislative union and a federal one as well. We have thrown over on the localities all the questions which experience has shown lead directly to local jealousy and discord, and we have retained in the hands of the General Government all the powers necessary to secure a strong and efficient administration of public affairs. (Hear, hear.) By placing the appointment of the judges in the hands of the General Government, and the establishment of a central court of appeal, we have secured uniformity of justice over the whole land. (Hear, hear.) By vesting the appointment of the lieutenant governors in the General Government, and giving a veto for all local measures, we have secured that no injustice shall be done without appeal in local legislation. (Hear, hear.) For all dealings with the Imperial Government and foreign countries we have clothed the General Government with the most ample powers.—And finally, all matters of trade and commerce, banking and currency, and all questions common to the whole people, we have vested fully and unrestrictedly in the General Government. The measure, in fact, shuns the faults of the federal and legislative systems and adopts the best parts of both, and I am well persuaded it will work efficiently and satisfactorily. (Hear, hear.) But, Mr. SPEAKER, I am told that the cost of working this Federation scheme will be enormous. Now, it would be a very rash thing of me, or of any other person, to assert that the expense will not be great; for we all know that any system of government may be made either economical or extravagant, precisely according to the discretion of those who administer it. But this I am confident of, that with ordinary discretion, far from being more costly than the existing system, a very considerable reduction may be readily effected; and one thing is quite certain, that no ingenuity

could make it a more costly or extravagant system than the one we have now. (Loud cries of hear, hear.) Undoubtedly the mode in which the local governments shall be constructed will very much affect the cost of the whole scheme; but if we adopt (as I earnestly hope we will) simple and inexpensive machinery for local purposes, I am quite satisfied that there will be a reduction to the people of Canada on the amount they now contribute. I have great confidence in the economical effect of placing local expenditures on local shoulders, and in the salutary influence in the same direction, of the representatives of the Maritime Provinces when they come among us.

HON. MR. HOLTON—The trouble is that they will spend our money—not theirs.

HON. MR. BROWN—The honorable gentleman is entirely wrong, and I am amazed at his making such a statement. There is no portion of the community that will pay more money, per head, to the revenue than the people of the Maritime Provinces. If the honorable gentleman had turned up the commercial returns of those Lower Provinces and calculated the effect of our tariff, if applied to them—or even a tariff less than ours, for our tariff must be reduced, he would have known that they will bear their full proportion of the national burdens. (Hear, hear.) But, Mr. SPEAKER, I am told that the arrangement as to the debt is unfair—that we have thrown on the Federal exchequer the whole of the debts of the Maritime Provinces, but only a portion of the debt of Canada. There is not a particle of force in this objection. The whole debt of Canada is \$67,500,000, but five millions of this is due to our own people, to meet which there are certain local funds. Now, if we had thrown the whole \$67,500,000 on the Federal treasury, we must also have handed over to it the local revenues, which, so far as these five millions are concerned, would have been precisely the same thing. But, as regards the public debt with which the Federal Government would start, it would not have been the same thing. By restricting the debt of Canada to \$62,500,000, we restricted the debt of the Maritime Provinces to the same proportion, or \$25 per head of their population; but had we thrown our whole debt of sixty-seven and a half millions on the Confederation, the proportion of debt for the several Maritime Provinces must have been increased, and the whole debt very greatly augmented. (Hear.) But in throwing these five millions on the local governments of Upper and Lower Canada, do we impose a burden on them they

are unable to bear? Quite the contrary—for with the debt, we give them the corresponding sources of revenue from which to meet it. The local governments of Upper and Lower Canada will severally not only have funds from the subsidy and other sources, to meet all expenditure, but a large surplus besides. But, Mr. SPEAKER, I am told that this Federation scheme may be all very right—it may be just and the very thing the country needs—but this Government had no authority from Parliament to negotiate it. The honorable member for Cornwall (Hon. JOHN S. MACDONALD) particularly pressed this objection, and I am sorry he is not in his seat.

HON. MR. HOLTON—It is quite true.

HON. MR. CARTIER—No, the reverse is true.

HON. MR. BROWN—I am astonished to hear such a statement repeated. No one knows better than the honorable member for Chateauguay and the honorable member for Cornwall that in the Ministerial explanations brought down to this House, at the time of the formation of this Government, it was distinctly declared that the Government was formed for the special purpose of maturing a scheme of Federal union, and that it would take means, during the recess, for opening negotiations with the Maritime Provinces, to bring about such a union.

HON. MR. HOLTON—But not to conclude them.

HON. MR. BROWN—What we have done is entirely subject to the approval of Parliament. The honorable member for Cornwall is the very last man who should have raised such an objection, for he attended a caucus of the liberal members of the Assembly, heard the whole plans of the Government explained, precisely as they have been carried out, and he was the very person who moved that I should go into the Government to give them effect. (Hear, hear.)

MR. DUNKIN—And I heard something more said—that nothing should be done which did not leave the House perfectly free.

HON. MR. BROWN—I can assure my honorable friend that, as far as that goes, he never was more free in his life than now. (Laughter.) We do not pretend to say that anything we have done binds this House; any member may object if he pleases; but I do say we received the approval of the House for opening negotiations, and it is a miserable pretence to say anything to the contrary. (Hear, hear.) We did no more than has been done by every Government, under the

British system, that ever existed. We have but made a compact, subject to the approval of Parliament. So far as this Government is concerned, we are firmly committed to the scheme; but so far as the members of the Legislature are concerned, they are as free as air; but I am confident that this House will almost unanimously accept it, and not with changes and amendments, but as a whole—as the very best compromise arrangement that can be obtained.

HON. MR. HOLTON—We have not the treaty-making power.

HON. MR. BROWN—I remember a Government formed from that side of the House, and the honorable member for Hochelaga (Hon. MR. DORION) will remember it too, which made a treaty respecting the building of the Intercolonial Railroad. The honorable member for Cornwall was Premier of that Government, and it does not lie in his mouth now to object to what he himself did. But the honorable gentleman is entirely wrong when he says we had no power to make this compact with the Maritime Provinces. We had full power, express instructions to enter into it.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Did the Parliament of England give you that power?

MR. BROWN—No; the honorable gentleman ought to know that the treaty-making power is in the Crown—the Crown authorized us specially to make this compact, and it has heartily approved of what we did. (Hear, hear.) But, MR. SPEAKER, I am told, that the people of Canada have not considered this scheme, and that we ought not to pass it without appealing to the electors for their approval. Now, sir, a statement more incorrect than this, or more injurious to the people of Canada, could not be made. They not only have considered this scheme—for fifteen years they have been earnestly considering it—but they perfectly comprehend it. (Hear, hear.) If ever question was thoroughly debated in any country, the whole subject of constitutional change has been in Canada. There is not a light in which it could be placed that has not been thoroughly canvassed; and if the House will permit me, I will show from our historical record how totally absurd this objection is. The question of a Federal union was agitated thirty years ago, and here is the resolution adopted by both Houses of the Imperial Parliament so far back as 1837:—

That great inconvenience has been sustained by His Majesty's subjects inhabiting the provinces of Lower Canada and Upper Canada, from the want of some adequate means for regulating and

adjusting questions respecting the trade and commerce of the said provinces, and divers other questions wherein the said provinces have a common interest; and it is expedient that the legislatures of the said provinces respectively, be authorized to make provision for the joint regulation and adjustment of such their common interests.

In the instructions given to Lord DURHAM by the Imperial Government in 1838, this passage occurs:—

It is clear that some plan must be devised to meet the just demands of Upper Canada. It will be for your Lordship, in conjunction with the Committee, to consider if this should not be done by constituting some joint legislative authority, which should preside over all questions of common interest to the two provinces, and which might be appealed to in extraordinary cases, to arbitrate between contending parties in either; preserving, however, to each province its distinct legislature, with authority in all matters of an exclusively domestic concern. If this should be your opinion, you will have further time to consider what should be the nature and limits of such authority, and all the particulars which ought to be comprehended in any scheme for its establishment.

In Lord DURHAM's admirable report of 1839, I find this passage:—

The bill should contain provisions by which any or all of the other North American colonies may, on the application of the legislature, be with the consent of the two Canadas, or their united legislature, admitted into the union on such terms as may be agreed on between them. As the mere amalgamation of the Houses of Assembly of the two provinces would not be advisable, or give at all a due representation to each, a parliamentary commission should be appointed, for the purpose of forming the electoral divisions and determining the number of members to be returned on the principle of giving representation as near as may be, in proportion to population. The same commission should form a plan of local government by elective bodies, subordinate to the general legislature, and exercising a complete control over such local affairs as do not come within the province of general legislation. The plan so framed should be made an act of the Imperial Parliament, so as to prevent the general legislature from encroaching on the powers of the local bodies. A general Executive on an improved principle should be established, together with a supreme court of appeal for all the North American Colonies.

And here is the statement of Lord JOHN RUSSELL, in 1839, while introducing the original bill founded on Lord DURHAM's report:—

The bill provides for the establishment of a central district at Montreal and its neighbourhood, at which the Government shall be carried on, and

where the Assembly shall meet. The other parts of Upper and of Lower Canada are each to be divided into two districts. It is proposed that these districts should be formed for the purpose of becoming municipal districts, for the imposition of taxes and rates, for all local purposes.

My next quotation shall be from the proceedings of a body of gentlemen who made a great commotion in their day and generation—the British American League. I hold in my hand the proceedings of the League of 3rd November, 1849, and among other names mentioned I find those of the Hon. GEORGE MOFFATT, THOMAS WILSON, the Hon. GEO. CRAWFORD, the Hon. ASA A. BURNHAM, JOHN W. GAMBLE, Mr. AIKMAN, of Barton, OGLE R. GOWAN, JOHN DUGGAN, the Hon. Col. FRASER, GEORGE BENJAMIN, the Hon. P. M. VANKOUGHNET, and last, though not least, the Hon. JOHN A. MACDONALD—of whom, however, I find it recorded that he spoke in a very jocose manner. Here is the resolution of the League:—

That whether protection or reciprocity shall be conceded or withheld, it is essential to the welfare of this colony, and its future good government, that a Constitution should be framed in unison with the wishes of the people, and suited to the growing importance and intelligence of the country, and that such Constitution should embrace a union of the British North American Provinces on mutually advantageous and fairly arranged terms, with the concession from the Mother Country of enlarged powers of self-government.

I pass on to 1856 when we had the motion and speech of my honorable friend the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. GALT) in favor of a union of all the British American Provinces, but, as the whole House is familiar with it, I shall not read the document. But in the Votes and Proceedings of this House, of 25th April, 1856, I find a very remarkable document. It is a notice of motion to be made in this House—and its contents are as follow:—

Resolved—1. That the inconveniences arising from the Legislative Union between Upper and Lower Canada, render desirable the dissolution of that union.

2. That a committee be appointed to enquire into the means which should be adopted to form a new political and legislative organization of the heretofore provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, either by the establishment of their former territorial divisions, or by a division of each province so as to form a confederation having a Federal Government, and a local legislature for each one of the new provinces, and to deliberate as to the course which should be adopted to regulate the affairs of united Canada in a manner which would

be equitable to the different sections of the province.

HON. MR. CARTIER.—Whose notice was that?

HON. MR. BROWN.—This notice of motion was given by my honorable friend the member for Hochelaga (Hon. Mr. DORION.) (Cheers.)

HON. MR. DORION.—It was in amendment of that of the honorable member for Sherbrooke, which I did not exactly like.

HON. MR. HOLTON—and which that honorable gentleman did not venture to move, so that the House did not pronounce upon it.

HON. MR. BROWN.—But my honorable friend (Hon. Mr. DORION) made a speech, which I perfectly remember. He held this motion in his hand while he spoke.

HON. MR. DORION.—I made a speech on the motion of the honorable member for Haldimand, Mr. MACKENZIE, not on my own.

HON. MR. BROWN.—That does not signify. I seek not to fasten down my honorable friend to the views he then held. Much light has been thrown on the whole subject since 1856, and I trust we will all act on our conscientious convictions of what is best for the country now—without regard to any opinions we may at other times have held. (Hear, hear.) But when my honorable friend and others allege that there never has been in Canada an agitation in favor of a Federal system, and that the people have never considered such a proposition, I think it directly in point to prove the contrary by my honorable friend's own proceedings. (Hear, hear.) The next step in the constitutional agitation of the country was the formation of the BROWN-DORION Administration. That was in 1858—and to show how serious my honorable friend opposite (Hon. Mr. DORION) and myself and our ten colleagues viewed the position of the country from the denial of constitutional reform, I will read the official statement of the basis on which the Government was formed. I read, sir, from the Journals of the Legislative Council for 1858:—

For some years past, sectional feelings have risen in this country, which, especially during the present session, have seriously impeded the carrying on of the administrative and legislative functions of the Government. The late Administration made no attempt to meet these difficulties or to suggest a remedy for them, and thereby the evil has been greatly aggravated. His Excellency's present Advisers have entered the Government with the fixed determination to propose constitutional measures for the establishment of that harmony between Upper and Lower Canada

which is essential to the prosperity of the province. They respectfully submit that they have a right to claim all the support which His Excellency can constitutionally extend to them in the prosecution of this all-important object.

(Hear, hear.) Here, sir, was a Government formed seven years ago for the express purpose of doing that which we are now engaged in—a Government distinctly telling the Governor General that the peace and prosperity of the country were endangered because constitutional remedies were deferred; and yet my honorable friends opposite, who with me were responsible for that document, tell us that we are not now in a fit position to legislate upon this question. (Hear, hear.) But I come next to the famous despatch to the Colonial Minister, signed in 1858 by my honorable friend the Minister of Finance, the Attorney General East, and the Hon. JOHN ROSS. It stated that "very grave difficulties now presented themselves in conducting the Government of Canada"—that "the progress of population has been more rapid in the western section, and claims are now made on behalf of its inhabitants for giving them representation in the Legislature in proportion to their numbers"—that "the result is shown by an agitation fraught with great danger to the peaceful and harmonious working of our constitutional system, and, consequently, detrimental to the progress of the province"—that "this state of things is yearly becoming worse"—and that "the Canadian Government were impressed with the necessity of seeking for such a mode of dealing with those difficulties as may for ever remove them." What must have been the state of public feeling when the Conservative Government of 1858 ventured to use such language as this?—and how can any one pretend that the people do not comprehend this question, when seven years of agitation have passed since that document was penned? (Hear, hear.) But, Mr. SPEAKER, I come to a still more important document—one that goes into the details and the merits of just such a scheme as that before the House. I refer to the manifesto issued, in 1859, by the Lower Canada members of the liberal party in this House. (Hear, hear.) It is very long, and I will only read from it a few extracts:—

Your committee are impressed with the conviction that whether we consider the present needs or the probable future condition of the country, the true, the statesman-like solution is to be sought in the substitution of a purely Federative for the present so-called Legislative Union; the former, it is believed, would enable us to escape

all the evils, and to retain all the advantages, appertaining to the existing union.

The proposition to federalize the Canadian union is not new. On the contrary, it has been frequently mooted in Parliament and in the press during the last few years. It was, no doubt, suggested by the example of the neighboring states, where the admirable adaptation of the Federal system to the government of an extensive territory, inhabited by people of divers origins, creeds, laws and customs, has been amply demonstrated; but shape and consistency were first imparted to it in 1856, when it was formally submitted to Parliament by the Lower Canada Opposition, as offering, in their judgment, the true corrective of the abuses generated under the present system.

By this division of power the General Government would be relieved from those questions of a purely local and sectional character, which, under our present system, have led to much strife and ill-will.

The committee believe that it is clearly demonstrable that the direct cost of maintaining both the federal and local governments need not exceed that of our present system, while its enormous indirect cost would, in consequence of the additional checks on expenditure involved in the new system, and the more direct responsibility of public servants in the province to the people immediately affected by such expenditure, be entirely obviated.

The proposed system could in no way diminish the importance of the colony, or impair its credit, while it presents the advantage of being susceptible, without any disturbance of the Federal economy, of such territorial extension as circumstances may hereafter render desirable.

Now, sir, who were the signers of the address?—on whose special responsibility was this manifesto sent forth to the world? Why, it was signed by my honorable friend opposite, Hon. A. A. DORION—(cheers and laughter)—Hon. T. D. MCGEE, Hon. L. T. DRUMMOND, and Hon. L. A. DESSAULLES, four of the most able and most popular leaders of the Lower Canada liberal party—the party now virulently opposing the resolutions before the Chair. (Hear, hear.) So my honorable friend opposite (Hon. Mr. DORION) not only agitated the country for constitutional changes, but insisted that it should take the shape of a Federal union, because of the cheapness of that system and the facility it afforded for bringing within the federation the other British American Provinces—(cheers and laughter)—and yet, six years after the promulgation of this document, my honorable friend gets up and repudiates a Federal union

because of its frightful cost and because it does bring within the Federation the other British American Provinces! (Continued cheering.)

MR. POWELL—Who wrote that document?

HON. MR. BROWN—I cannot exactly say who did the composition; but will not my honorable friend from Chateauguay (Hon. Mr. HOLTON) permit me to ask if his hand is not discoverable in it? (Hear, hear, and laughter.) If so, he well may be proud of it, for it is a masterly exposition.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Will my honorable friend accept it as an amendment to his scheme?

HON. MR. GALT—No; ours is better than that!

HON. MR. BROWN—I come now to the great meeting of the Reformers of Upper Canada, known as the Toronto Convention of 1859, and at which 570 delegates were present from all parts of the western province. Here are the two chief resolutions:—

5. *Resolved*,—That in the opinion of this assembly, the best practicable remedy for the evils now encountered in the Government of Canada is to be found in the formation of two or more local governments, to which shall be committed the control of all matters of a local or sectional character, and some joint authority charged with such matters as are necessarily common to both sections of the province.

6. *Resolved*,—That while the details of the changes proposed in the last resolution are necessarily subject for future arrangement, yet this assembly deems it imperative to declare that no Government would be satisfactory to the people of Upper Canada which is not based on the principle of representation by population.

Here we have the very essence of the measure now before us for adoption—deliberately approved of by the largest body of representative men ever assembled in Upper Canada for a political purpose; and yet we are to be told that our people do not understand the question, and we must go to them and explain it, letter by letter, at an immense cost to the country, and at the risk of losing the whole scheme! (Hear, hear.) But let us see what followed. A general election was ordered in 1861—there was a fierce contest at the polls—and the main question at every hustings, was the demand for constitutional changes. The result of that contest was the overthrow of the CARTIER-MACDONALD Ministry and the formation of the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Administration in its room. But so bitter had been the struggle for and against constitutional changes, and so clearly defined were

party-lines upon it, that it was found impossible to construct that Government without a distinct pledge that it would re-visit every motion made upon the subject—

HON. MR. HOLTON—Did you recognise the propriety of that course?

HON. MR. BROWN—No, indeed, I did not. I but cite the fact to show how thoroughly the whole question has been agitated, and how perfectly its bearings have, for years past, been understood. Well, sir, mark what followed. One short year had not passed over the heads of the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Ministry before they tottered to their fall—and so repugnant to the House and to the country was their conduct on the constitutional question, that they dared not appeal to the country until they had changed their avowed policy upon it, and replaced the men who had forced upon them the narrow policy of the year before, by gentlemen understood to be more in favor of constitutional changes. The Government (MACDONALD-DORION), so reconstructed, went to the country in 1863, but in the year following it, too, fell in its turn, simply because it did not deal boldly with the constitutional question—

HON. MR. DORION—We had the support of all who were in favor of the question.

HON. MR. BROWN—Indeed, you had not.

HON. MR. HOLTON—We should have fallen if we had attempted to deal with it.

HON. MR. BROWN—I entirely deny that; had you pursued a bold policy upon it you might have been in office up to this hour. (Hear, hear.) Well, sir, the MACDONALD-DORION made way for the TACHÉ-MACDONALD Administration—but it, too, soon fell by a majority of two, simply because it did not deal with the constitutional question—

A VOICE—Oh, oh!

HON. MR. BROWN—My honorable friend cries “oh, oh,” and I am perfectly amazed at his doing so. I am about to offer my honorable friend the most complete proof of the correctness of my statement—proof so conclusive that if he does not accept of it as such, I do not know how he can be convinced of anything. In one single day the TACHÉ-MACDONALD Administration, by taking up the constitutional question boldly, turned their minority of two into a majority of seventy. (Loud cries of hear, hear.) Could anything prove more unanswerably than this the deep hold this question has on the public mind, and the assured confidence of the members of this House that their constituents understand its whole

merits, when, in one day, such a startling political revolution was brought about? Was it, think you, a doubtful consideration that could have induced the Upper Canada Opposition, almost as one man, to cast down their party intrenchments and make common cause with their opponents? Could there have been the slightest doubt as to the sentiments of our people and the imperative necessity of immediate action, when such men as now sit on the treasury benches, were forced, by their supporters, to unite for the settlement of this question? And could there be a more conclusive proof of the ripeness of public opinion than the unanimous and cordial manner in which our so uniting has been sustained by the press of all parties, and by the electors at the polls? (Hear, hear.) Never, I venture to assert, was any great measure so thoroughly understood, and so cordially endorsed by the people of Canada, as this measure now under consideration. (Hear, hear.)—The British Government approves of it—the Legislative Council approves of it—this House almost unanimously approves of it—the press of all parties approves of it—and though the scheme has already been directly submitted to fifty out of the one hundred constituencies into which Canada is divided, only four candidates ventured to appear at the hustings in opposition to it—all of them in Lower Canada—and but two of them were elected. (Cheers.) And yet, sir, we are to be told that we are stealing a march upon the country; that it is not understood by the people; and that we must dissolve the House upon it, at a vast cost to the exchequer, and at the risk of allowing political partisanship to dash the fruit from our hands at the very moment we are about to grasp it! (Hear, hear.) Sir, I have no fears whatever of an appeal to the people. I cannot pretend to speak as to the popular feeling in Lower Canada, but I think I thoroughly understand the popular mind of the western province, and I hesitate not to say that there are not five gentlemen in this chamber (if so many) who could go before their constituents in Upper Canada in opposition to this scheme, with the slightest chance of being returned. (Hear, hear.) It is because I thoroughly comprehend the feelings of the people upon it, that I urge the adoption of this measure at the earliest possible moment. The most gross injustice is to be rectified by it; the tax-payer is to be clothed with his rightful influence by it; new commercial relations are to be opened up by it; a new impulse to the industrial

pursuits of the country will be given by it—and I for one would feel myself false to the cause I have so long sustained, and false to the best interests of my constituents, if I permitted one hour unnecessarily to pass without bringing it to a final issue. (Cheers.) It was only by the concurrence of most propitious circumstances that the wonderful progress this movement has made could have been accomplished. Most peculiar were the circumstances that enabled such a coalition to be formed as that now existing for the settlement of this question—and who shall say at what hour it may not be rent asunder? And yet, who will venture to affirm that if party spirit in all its fierceness were once more to be let loose amongst us, there would be the slightest hope that this great question could be approached with that candor and harmony necessary to its satisfactory solution? (Hear, hear.) Then, sir, at the very moment we resolved to deal with this question of constitutional change, the Maritime Provinces were about to assemble in joint conference to consider whether they ought not to form a union among themselves—and the way was thus most propitiously opened up for the consideration of a union of all British America. The civil war too, in the neighboring republic; the possibility of war between Great Britain and the United States; the threatened repeal of the Reciprocity Treaty; the threatened abolition of the American trading system for goods *in transitu* to and from these provinces; the unsettled position of the Hudson's Bay Company; and the changed feeling of England as to the relations of great colonies to the parent state;—all combine at this moment to arrest earnest attention to the gravity of the situation, and unite us all in one vigorous effort to meet the emergency like men. (Hear, hear.) The interests to be affected by this scheme of union are very large and varied—but the pressure of circumstances upon all the colonies is so serious at this moment, that if we cannot now banish partisanship and sectionalism and petty objections, and look at the matter on its broad intrinsic merits, what hope is there of our ever being able to do so? An appeal to the people of Canada on this measure simply means postponement of the question for a year—and who can tell how changed ere then may be the circumstances surrounding us? Sir, the man who strives for the postponement of this measure on any ground, is doing what he can to kill it almost as effectually as if he voted against it. (Hear, hear.) Let there be no mistake as to the manner in which the

Government presents this measure to the House. We do not present it as free from fault, but we do present it as a measure so advantageous to the people of Canada, that all the blemishes, real or imaginary, averred against it, sink into utter insignificance in presence of its merits. (Hear, hear.) We present it, not in the precise shape we in Canada would desire it, but as in the best shape the five colonies to be united could agree upon it. We present it in the form in which the five governments have severally adopted it—in the form the Imperial Government has endorsed it—and in the form in which we believe all the legislatures of the provinces will accept it. (Hear, hear.) We ask the House to pass it in the exact form in which we have presented it, for we know not how alterations may affect its safety in other places, and the process of alteration once commenced in four different legislatures—who can tell where that would end? Every member of this House is free as air to criticise it if he so wills, and amend it if he is able—but we warn him of the danger of amendment, and throw on him all the responsibility of the consequences. (Hear, hear.) We feel confident of carrying this scheme as it stands—but we cannot tell what we can do if it be amended. (Hear, hear.) Let not honorable gentlemen approach this measure as a sharp critic deals with an abstract question, striving to point out blemishes and display his ingenuity; but let us approach it as men having but one consideration before us—the establishment of the future peace and prosperity of our country. (Hear, hear.) Let us look at it in the light of a few months back—in the light of the evils and injustice to which it applies a remedy—in the light of the years of discord and strife we have spent in seeking for that remedy—in the light with which the people of Canada would regard this measure were it to be lost, and all the evils of past years to be brought back upon us again. (Hear, hear.) Let honorable gentlemen look at the question in this view—and what one of them will take the responsibility of casting his vote against the measure? Sir, the future destiny of these great provinces may be affected by the decision we are about to give to an extent which at this moment we may be unable to estimate—but assuredly the welfare for many years of four millions of people hangs on our decision. (Hear, hear.) Shall we then rise equal to the occasion?—shall we approach this discussion without partisanship, and free from every personal feeling but the earnest resolution to discharge conscientiously

the duty which an over-ruling Providence has placed upon us? Sir, it may be that some among us will live to see the day when, as the result of this measure, a great and powerful people may have grown up in these lands—when the boundless forests all around us shall have given way to smiling fields and thriving towns—and when one united government, under the British flag, shall extend from shore to shore:—but who would desire to see that day if he could not recall with satisfaction the part he took in this discussion? Mr. SPEAKER I have done. I leave the subject to the conscientious judgment of the House, in the confident expectation and belief that the decision it will render will be worthy of the Parliament of Canada. (The honorable gentleman resumed his seat amid loud and continued applause.)

On motion of the Hon. Mr. MCGEE, the debate was further adjourned till Thursday evening.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

THURSDAY, *February 9, 1865.*

HON. MR. ALLAN said, that if he acquiesced, or thought that the House acquiesced, in the opinion expressed by the honorable gentleman who spoke at the close of the debate last evening, that under the circumstances in which the resolutions now before them were presented for their consideration, it was useless to discuss their merits or express any opinion upon them; he would not now venture to trespass on the time of the House with any remarks of his on the great scheme which had been submitted for their approval. But believing, as he did, that the Government had not invited them to express their opinion as a mere matter of form, but they were really asked in good faith to examine and discuss the measure, and then to express their approval or disapproval of it as a whole, he would venture to occupy their attention for a few moments, while he stated to the House the reasons which induced him to give it his hearty concurrence and support. He would first, however, premise that he could not see the force of an objection which had also been made, that as they were precluded from making any alteration in the details of the scheme, they would be betraying their trust and violating their duty to their constituents if they

acquiesced in the scheme as a whole, to some of the particular features of which their own convictions might be opposed, and in reference to which they perhaps had no opportunity of ascertaining definitely the views of their constituents. Now, he would ask honorable gentlemen, did it not constantly happen that in the business of life they were obliged to delegate to a few the conduct of many matters in which they were most deeply interested themselves, but which, from the very nature of the interests involved, could not be dealt with advantageously otherwise, and if they had confidence in the judgment and ability of those to whom the task had been committed, were they not satisfied to accept their recommendations, although their views on all points might not coincide with their own? Just so in the case of the Confederation scheme—it was one which required special ability, tact and judgment, to deal with. It was one in which so many conflicting interests, so many nice questions were involved, that it would have been next to impossible to have arrived at any satisfactory settlement of the question, had the task been committed to a popular assembly or any other large body. Now, he was satisfied that the people of this country were fully persuaded at the time of the Conference that the task of framing a scheme for the union of all the North American Provinces had been assumed by those statesmen who, by their ability, experience and judgment were, of all men, the best qualified for the duty; and he had yet to learn, from any expression of public opinion, either out of doors or in the press, that this confidence had been shaken, or that the scheme, as a whole, had been disapproved of. On the contrary, the people of Canada had now been acquainted with all the important features of the measure for some three months at least, and he believed the result had been that, while various opinions had been expressed in reference to the details of the scheme, the great majority of the people were perfectly satisfied to leave the matter in the hands of their representatives, to be assented to by them as a whole, if, after a full discussion of its merits, they were satisfied that they so far outweighed its defects as to commend itself to their adoption. If then, in the best exercise of his judgment, he had come to the conclusion that the peculiar circumstances of the times, and the merits of the scheme as a whole, outweighed any of the defects which might present themselves in the details, he thought he should be fully warranted, acting on behalf of his constituents, in according his support to the

measure, without being in any way chargeable with a dereliction of duty or a betrayal of the trust committed to him. He would now state to the House what were the considerations which induced him to give his support to the measure, and which, to him at least, appeared of sufficient importance to outweigh all objections that had been brought against it. They were twofold—arising in the first place from our internal condition, and in the second place from our position with regard to the neighboring States. And first, with regard to our internal condition, while he partly agreed with the remark which fell from the honorable member for the Brock Division, that our political differences alone could perhaps scarcely be said to necessitate such great and important constitutional changes as those involved in Confederation; yet taken in connection with our external relations, he thought no one would deny that the state of chronic weakness of the governing body had become a subject of grave apprehension to every well-wisher of their country. No one would deny that when storms were impending, it was doubly necessary that the ships of the state should be guided by firm and determined hands—that weakness and vacillation under such circumstances would be sure to end in disaster. Yet for the last few years, when the political horizon had been growing darker and darker, when fresh causes of irritation had unhappily sprung up from time to time between us and our neighbors, we had seen ministry after ministry break down, until anything like a stable and vigorous government seemed to have become a hopeless impossibility. Who could say that such a state of things was not fraught with danger to any community. He believed that in Federation they had found a remedy for those sectional differences between Upper and Lower Canada, which had so long agitated the country, and had been a source of weakness to so many administrations. Under the scheme now proposed, all causes of jealousy and distrust between the two provinces would be removed, and they might well hail with satisfaction any change which, by removing these stumbling-blocks which sectional feeling and party strife had placed in the way of so many successive ministries, had enabled the ablest men of all parties to unite their councils for the formation of a strong, vigorous and permanent government. For these considerations, amongst others, the measure before the House should have his hearty support, but there were to his mind graver reasons still why the union of the provinces

should, if possible, be brought about without further loss of time. No one who had watched the course of public opinion in Great Britain in reference to the colonies, as expressed during the last few years, either in Parliament or in the public press, could doubt that the feeling had been gaining ground there that the time had come for us to assume a larger share than we had hitherto assumed of those responsibilities which attach to every country aspiring to any sort of national existence or political standing. He need scarcely say that he alluded to the question of defence. This was a question which would have been forced upon us sooner or later under any circumstances, because it was neither reasonable nor just that we should expect that Great Britain would continue to give us the protection of her fleets and armies, unless we showed that we were willing to bear our share of the burden, and were ready to contribute our quota of men and means towards the defence of our own hearths and homes should war unhappily threaten us. Under any circumstances, then, the consideration of this question must necessarily have occupied a large share of the attention of the Government and the Legislature, but no one would deny that it had acquired tenfold importance in view of our present relations with the United States, and that what might safely have been left to the unaided resources of Canada alone, had peace and harmony continued to prevail on our borders, would now require all the assistance, all the material aid and moral support, which a close and cordial union with nearly a million of our British fellow-subjects could alone give to us. Feeling then as he did upon these points, he could not help asking himself the question, what would be the result, as regards the well-being and prosperity of Canada, if this Confederation scheme should fall through? Should we not suffer most seriously in all our relations both at home and abroad? Would not the effect on our credit in England be most disastrous? Would they not say that our own folly and want of patriotism had condemned us to a state of isolation and weakness, when union with our sister provinces would have made us strong, powerful and prosperous? Some honorable gentlemen had such strong objections to some of the details of the measure—the alteration in the constitution of this House, for instance—that rather than bring themselves to vote for it, they were willing to run the risk of imperiling the whole scheme. For his own part, he thought it would ill become an elected member like himself to say

anything against the elective system as applied to this House; although he earnestly believed that the majority of his own constituents were in favor of a Legislative Council appointed by the Crown. As for the objection which had been urged that between an Upper House composed exclusively of life members, and an elective Lower House, there might be the danger of a direct collision in the event of one rejecting an important measure which the other had passed, he did not think there was much danger of such a contingency. Indeed he would remind honorable members that the only instance of anything like a dead-lock between the two Houses, which had occurred within late years, at all events, was since the introduction of the elective principle, when the Council in 1859 refused to pass the Supply Bill on account of certain items contained in it, providing for the expense of the removal of the Government to Quebec. The Government on that occasion were left in a minority in this House, although they had a majority in the Assembly, and it was only after an adjournment of some days and upon a reconsideration of the question, after bringing up some life members from Lower Canada, that the Government carried the vote by a majority of two or three. Upon the whole, however, he thought that the life members of the Council would admit that the elective members had so far, at all events, comported themselves in such a way as to maintain the character of the House as a conservative body, free from all violent party feeling, and exercising a wholesome check against all ill-considered or hasty legislation. The real danger, he thought, was that if the House in process of time were to become a purely elective body, and party lines became more closely drawn, the same partisan spirit which too often swayed the proceedings of the popular branch of the Legislature, might find its way into their chamber, larger powers, such as originating money bills, might be claimed, and a collision between the two Houses might then occur at any time. Another objection raised by some honorable gentlemen, was, that this measure was being urged upon the Parliament and people of this country with undue haste, and from the language of some honorable gentlemen it was quite clear that they did not think that our situation was by any means such a critical one as to call for any immediate change. For his own part, he did not understand how any one could look abroad at what was passing on our borders and not take into consideration the fact that our communica-

tion with the sea-board during the winter was about to be cut off—that our trade and commerce with the United States was hampered by the most vexatious and needless restrictions—and that, furthermore, measures of a military and naval character having special reference to our frontier relations, had found favor and countenance with the Government and people of the United States. Looking at all these things, he could not conceive how any Canadian could feel that this was a time for his country to remain in her present comparatively weak and isolated condition, when an opportunity was offered of acquiring that strength which union with the sister provinces could alone give us. It might be that there were some honorable gentlemen who did not view the question, so far as regarded our relations with the United States, in the same light that he did. Now, from whatever point of view he looked at the question of Confederation, he was equally convinced of the extreme desirableness of an early settlement of the question. He would be very unwilling to follow the example of some honorable gentlemen in decrying the resources or underrating the position of Canada; but he was bound to say, that while he freely admitted and heartily acknowledged the many sources of material wealth and prosperity which Canada possessed, in her fertile soil, her rich minerals, her noble system of canals and railways, he nevertheless could not shut his eyes to the fact that our trade and revenue, our commercial and agricultural interests, had been so injuriously affected by the state of things on the other side of the lakes, that unless we could find new avenues for our commerce, new markets for our produce, we must inevitably suffer a most serious check to our prosperity and well-doing. In this Confederation scheme he believed that a golden opportunity was offered to us of remedying the evils under which we were now suffering, and of opening out a new and prosperous career for this country, if we would avail ourselves of it. He believed that it might be said of nations as of individuals:—

There is a tide in the affairs of man
Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
Omitted, all the voyage of their life is spent
In shallows and miseries.
On such a full sea are we now afloat,
And we must take the current as it flows,
Or lose our venture.

He would urge then upon the House, not to allow the opportunity to pass—even should it be at the sacrifice of individual opinions—

of forming a strong, powerful and prosperous Confederation, and thus ensure for ourselves, and our children's children, a national existence as British North Americans, which may endure for many ages to come. (Cheers.)

HON. MR. SANBORN said he rose for the purpose of moving the resolution of which he had given notice, and would take the opportunity of offering some observations on the general subject. In his opinion it could not be injured by discussion, and whatever might be its merits or demerits after going through the crucible, the residuum must be better than the present condition of the subject, both as regarded the legislature and the country. On a former occasion he had expressed himself as not averse to the question, but as inclined, from various considerations, to view Confederation favorably; and acting in the same sense he would now state certain points, which, in his opinion, must lead to the conclusion that such a union would advance the prosperity of the colonies interested, and their ultimate establishment as a nation. The principle of association, as exhibited in commercial partnerships and corporations, continued a secret of prosperity, the precise nature of which it might be difficult to elucidate and account for, but which no one could fail to recognize, and so far as it applied to nations its potency was sufficiently established to show that the analogy was presumed and that it was as operative as in partnerships and corporations. He was also prepared to admit that diversity of interests was no sufficient argument against union, —(hear)—since in this very particular might frequently be found the strongest bond of union. As in electricity, opposite poles attracted each other, so among nations a diversity of interests which might *a priori* be pronounced a bar, was not unfrequently the most effectual means of harmony, and thus a diversity of feeling which brought out talent, might lead to a comparison of opinions which would induce an enlarged policy calculated to elevate and not to depress national energies. He was prepared to admit that Confederation would enlarge the minds of all, and make us better to understand our resources and capabilities. It would make us more enquiring, and teach us so to use our industrial power as to secure the best results. (Hear, hear.) He was prepared to admit that the results of the union between Upper and Lower Canada had been beneficial to both, and he argued that union with the other provinces, inhabited by a people educated under different circumstances and of different origins, could hardly

be without mutual advantage. It would give the inhabitants of each province the opportunity of studying each other's habits and pursuits, and so induce larger and more comprehensive views. He was prepared to admit that the assimilation of tariffs would be an advantage of no little moment, and that it would do away with much chafing in working the machinery of the government. He also admitted the advantage of having ocean seaports of our own, though he was not prepared to attach so much importance to that as some other honorable members. We were told that no inland country could ever be great, and that so long as we had no opening to the sea we could not expect permanent prosperity. He was quite prepared to say that access to the ocean through the ports of St. John, N.B., and Halifax, was very desirable, but he was not at all certain that the grand effects proclaimed would be realized. It was no doubt very desirable to secure all these advantages, but the measure contained some provisions which, if carried out, would, as he believed, be highly injurious to both the general and local governments. Then he must say he had a strong distrust of it on account of the manner in which it was originated. It was not in accordance with the analogy of things or with the lessons taught us by the history of the world, that a few gentlemen, however wise and well-intentioned, but self-elected, should meet together to form a constitution and erect a new nationality. If we looked to the United States (the history of whose Constitution he would presently allude to, and whose Constitution had been more closely followed in that now under consideration than the British Constitution) we would see how patiently they had proceeded to construct it. [Here the honorable member gave a history of the first instrument of federation, established for mutual convenience and support, though not for national union, which occupied from the 7th October to the 15th November, 1777, in the discussing. He then said that this arrangement, not being found to answer the requirements of the States concerned, in September, 1787, they commenced deliberating upon the adoption of a Constitution, which, after being arranged, was for two years before the individual states and the people, being only ratified in October, 1789.] This showed how careful and particular they had been in this important matter, and a distinguished member of the other branch of our legislature had said, only a few evenings ago, that the greatest statesmen who ever lived had been engaged in the work. From the length of the

discussions, and the time given to the people to study and understand the measure, it was seen how anxious they were that it should be made perfectly satisfactory to them. But what was it that gave rise to the desire for federation first in the States? They were poor and comparatively helpless. They had just come out of an exhaustive war with Great Britain, and the duty fell upon them of organizing a government for a broad expanse of country, containing but two and a half or three million souls. This it was that led to the first attempt at federation, and afterwards to a closer union under the constitution of 1789. How was it with us? It was alleged that we had been led step by step, according to the strictest method of induction, to the necessity for the measure now proposed; that without it there must have been an irremediable dead-lock between the parties in the legislature, which would have rendered further progress impossible. But what was the real impediment? Want of patriotism—not the want of a good Constitution. If there had been less virulence of party spirit, and a better disposition to accommodate matters, there would have been no dead-lock. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. ROSS hoped the honorable member felt this.

HON. MR. SANBORN—If the leading men had felt as they ought to have felt, there would have been no dead-lock, for it existed more in name than in reality. There was no cause for saying that no government could be formed which could command a good majority. And what had the difficulties arisen from? From a persistent agitation for representation according to population, in consequence of which the people had at last come to believe that it was a fundamental axiom in government. (Hear, hear.) But did it follow that because there were difficulties that they could not be arranged without recourse to such a measure as this, and was it certain even that Confederation would remove them? Instead of meeting the difficulties, the Government had travelled away from them and formed an agreement with provinces in which they had no existence, without devising means to relieve themselves. Federation was forthwith produced, like Minerva from the head of Jupiter, fully armed; and we were told it was just what we wanted to make all things right. We were told we must take it as presented, without any possible change; we must lay aside our character as a deliberative body, and without considering the country (which had been studiously kept in ignorance of the scheme) vote to accept or

reject it. It was true that soon after the resolutions had been agreed upon, copies had been sent to the members of both Houses confidentially, but the people must be kept in the dark. If the members had acted up to the implied requirement of secrecy, and not divulged the provisions of the scheme, the people were to this day ignorant of its character, and it could not be said that it was ever constitutionally submitted to the country. Then we were told that, as elective members and as patriots, it was our duty to accept the measure as it was, even though portions of it might not be satisfactory, rather than lose it altogether. It had been generally represented by the local newspapers in Upper Canada—fed to do so—that it was commonly approved; but while the simple idea of union might find favor, as he believed it did, it was not less true that the country was waiting for the details, of which they would judge when they had been discussed in Parliament. When this had been done, and the bearing of the manifold particulars was thoroughly understood it was expected, at least among the English of Lower Canada, that it would not be passed until after having been submitted to the people. If it were passed through without such an appeal, he had no hesitation in saying that the Government would assume a very serious responsibility, and if, in after times, the union should prove disastrous, it would bring upon them imprecations instead of blessings. And he was under the impression that the Government, whenever they had given their views on the subject, had never said it would not be so presented, but no doubt their utterances were very much like those of the Delphic oracle, susceptible of being understood in two opposite ways. But what could such an indisposition to speak clearly indicate, if not a purpose to press the matter on to a result, even though the people might not want it. Under this measure the elective members would have a right to vote themselves, two out of three at least, as members for life. Now it had been found necessary to enact a law to ensure the independence of Parliament, and for the purpose of removing all temptation to swerve from the right, they were precluded from occupying even the small offices of postmasters in the remotest parts of the country, or acting as security for such officers. For every day that a member occupied a seat in either House unlawfully, he was subject to the extreme penalty of £500, and if this strictness had been found necessary, was not the spirit of the law violated when this House was invited to pass a measure by which

the members of the Legislative Council of the Confederation would be appointed for life, and selected from the members of the present Legislative Council—even allowing that all the Crown nominated members were to be first chosen, as the Honorable Commissioner of Crown Lands had left us to infer from his remarks.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL said he had stated nothing of the kind, and the honorable member had no foundation whatever for his assertion. He (Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL) had used no such language, but had expressly stated that due consideration would be given to members of both sides of politics, and to life and elective members equally.

HON. MR. SANBORN said he had reason to suppose that what he had stated was a fair inference from what the Honorable Commissioner of Crown Lands said.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—The honorable member could not have been in the House when the statement was made, or how could he draw that conclusion?

HON. MR. SANBORN said he was ready to accept the explanation, as it would not affect his argument. And supposing all the members nominated by the Crown were appointed, he would say it was but just; nay, it would be unjust to deprive them of seats which had been given them for life. The Honorable Commissioner of Crown Lands would thus see that he (Hon. Mr. SANBORN) had attributed only such opinions to him as he himself conscientiously held to be right. Assuming then that the Crown members would retain their seats, there was a direct temptation presented to at least two out of three of the elective members. This, he thought, exhibited the project in a very damaging light. Such a measure was calculated to bias the judgment, and ought not to be presented to any legislative body. He held that elective members had received a sacred trust to exercise; that they were sent here by their constituencies to represent them, and to do that only. Under these circumstances he would ask, whether they could conceive they had the power to vote away the rights of their electors? That was not in their *mandat*, and if they did, they would be doing what they had no authority to do; they would be doing what they could not do without going beyond the authority confided to them. Coming to the principle of elective legislative councils itself, he might say it had already been adopted in four British colonies besides Canada. Canada, though the largest of these, was not the first to adopt it,

though it might claim to be foremost in establishing precedents—especially as with the addition of the Lower Provinces we are told we shall be the third largest nation in the world—(hear, hear, and laughter)—since for a long series of years the demand had been made by the people. They persisted against many discouragements, and the reform constituted one of the famous ninety-two resolutions of the constitutional party in Lower Canada, until with other reforms it was at last conceded and consummated. When the subject was under discussion, objections were made and fears expressed that there might be a feeling among the members, who came from the people, to claim the right to originate money bills, and that an antagonism would thus arise between the two branches, but no such conflict of opinion had ever happened, and the Constitution had worked as heretofore. The infusion of the elective element was made gradually with the view of anticipating such a result, and the effect was attained, for there had been no clashing of interests. The elective principle had been applied to the Legislative Council of Prince Edward Island, and he would ask, how, under the 14th resolution of the Confederation, that body was to be dealt with? He would read that part of the resolution to which he referred—"The first selection of the members of the Legislative Council to be made from the Legislative Councils of the various provinces, except as regards Prince Edward Island," &c. What did this mean? Were the members from Prince Edward Island still to be elected?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—No; they were to be appointed. The resolution was so worded as not to limit the selection in Prince Edward Island to the Legislative Council now in existence there.

HON. MR. SANBORN—Was it because the elective principle had worked so badly in Canada that this change is proposed?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—No; and therefore in Canada the selection was to be made from the House itself.

HON. MR. SANBORN—It appeared then, that Prince Edward Island, dissatisfied with the elective principle, had dictated terms, and Canada had yielded to the dictation.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—The Conference had yielded to Prince Edward Island only in respect of its own members. They were so dissatisfied with their Legislative Council that, with reference to themselves, a choice from the people at large was permit-

ted, but this had no reference whatever to Canada.

HON. MR. SANBORN—Suppose the elective members should be swept off, what became of the people's right of representation by men of their own choice?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—No such thing was intended.

HON. MR. SANBORN said he had only put the case hypothetically, but had been glad to learn the reasons which had led the delegates to resolve upon the abandonment of the elective principle in respect of the Legislative Council. Canada, however, did not deserve to be used in this way. He would now ask whether the representatives of Canada in the Conference had any warrant from the country to justify their action? They had none whatever. If they had not acted under the dictation of Prince Edward Island, they had acted on their own motion, and without authority of any kind. The conclusion was legitimate and logical. The position they had assumed was exceptional and distasteful. Coming to the proposal to amend the resolutions, he would say there existed no reason why the House, if it thought proper, could not change them in any particular. He willingly admitted that they were in the nature of a treaty, and we must accept them, if accepted at all, so that their essential character should not be impaired; but when they were presented to us, we were bound to decide whether they were what we wanted or not. If they were so in the main, there was no necessity for taking exceptions which would affect our relations with the other provinces, but they might be modified and changed in so far as Canada was concerned, and the other provinces would have no cause of complaint. What interest had they in the manner of our choosing our own representatives? All they had a right to say in the matter was that we should not have more than two-thirds of the whole number. There was a way of putting things so as to frighten and convince wavering minds; but he would ask the House to sift this matter to the bottom—to look at the reason of things—and to say if his amendment were adopted, which maintained intact the principle of representation laid down in the resolutions—only retaining the mode of choosing the members—the modification could lead to harm or to anything else than what had already been declared, viz., that the Imperial Parliament might take the scheme with the amendment under consideration, and set upon said amendment. Mr. CAMPBELL had

already remarked upon that very point, and if it were changed, would it not be to retain the elective principle? If the Imperial Parliament may do so, may we not ask them to do it? May we not record our views? And would they, upon a measure of such vast moment and pregnant with such results, proceed to adopt a principle unless they knew its operation to be beneficial? Turning to his proposed amendment, the honorable member said that if it were adopted, the principle of federal representation in the resolutions would be retained; the same members would be retained (in Canada at least); and to render the proportion of the Lower Provinces relatively equal, he would allow them to name ten life members. Were we to be told that such a form would be incongruous, and be deterred from considering the proposition? Then we should be reflecting upon ourselves. He and other honorable members sat under a mandate from the people, while other honorable members sat under a patent from the Crown. It would be a reflection both on our past and present condition. There were the same reasons now for adopting such a form as there were when the elective principle was adopted. It was a domestic matter, and should be left to domestic arrangement. Each province had its own peculiar interests, and should be left to the exercise of its judgment in the management of them. If subsequently a change were desired, it could be granted. He maintained that his views were correct and logical, and he was at a loss to see the incongruity with which they were charged. He could not discover any sufficient cause for the proposed change, and as the people had not asked for it, and as Canada formed a large majority of the whole, it ought not to have been granted without reference to their opinions. Representation according to population was now looked upon as a cardinal principle, but it certainly was not observed in dealing with this important question. We were told the vote was taken by provinces, not by numbers, still the Lower Provinces had the majority of representatives, though they represented but a minority of the people. Then it was said our delegates were leading men and men of talent, which he was quite prepared to allow, yet they did not compose all the talent or statesmanship of Canada. In this way the one-third of the populations interested had given the law to the other two-thirds. We were told again that the Constitution emanating from the Conference was desirable because it was modelled on the British Constitution.

The British Constitution was unmatched in the world, and was not susceptible of imitation. It had grown by the accretions of ages, by the independence of the people, and by their undying love of justice and fair play. (Hear, hear.) It had been produced by the strictest inductive method, and stood unrivalled as a monument of the greatest human wisdom. Except in remote future times, it could not be imitated—(hear)—and he did not urge this difference as a demerit, for it was in the nature of things that it should exist. It had reference to different kinds of people—to people of different genius, and to people of new countries and altered circumstances; but though an able theoretical composition, it might fail to produce the anticipated results. It was not a copy of that horror of our Constitution-makers—the Constitution of the United States—but he would show that the delegates had borrowed more largely from that Constitution than from any other, though to be sure, in some aspects, it differed very much from it, as in the provision which gives to members of the Upper House their seats for life. The resolutions provided that an equal representation should be given to the three sections of the Confederation as having separate interests, while in the Lower House the representation was to be according to population. Both these provisions were copied from the American Constitution. The life membership was supposed to be in conformity with the British Constitution, but the limitation of the number of members was a violation of it. The limitation of the power of the federal, and the power of the local governments, was the old story of federal and state rights—in fact, the bone of contention which had led to the present unhappy war; an apple of discord which our posterity might gather in fruits of the most bitter character. There was another branch of the subject he would fail in his duty if he did not touch upon, and that was the situation in which the English of Lower Canada would be placed. The Honorable Premier had remarked at some length upon the disposition to toleration and the indulgent spirit evinced by his people in past times, and he (Hon. Mr. SANBORN) was not prepared to detract from this. He would freely and fully concede the point. He had always lived in the midst of a mixed population, and his division was more French than English, and it would ill become him to cast reflections on their liberality and desire for fair play or justice to others. But this was the time, when treating of important arrange-

ments for the future, to lay aside all unnecessary delicacy, and by our action to lay down the guarantees for the perpetuation of these kind feelings and this spirit of toleration so long existing, and which he devoutly hoped would never cease. No greater calamity could befall the English, or, in fact, both races, than the introduction of religious discord among the people of Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) It would, however, be a grievous mistake to overlook the safeguards and rules necessary to perpetuate kindly feelings, and to prevent the disposition to aggressions which existed more or less in all minds. That principle—the love of power—was found in every human heart, none were exempt from it, and the history of the world showed that no people had ever risen superior to it. The Honorable Premier had recognized this truth in the remarks he had made in regard of the difficulties between Upper and Lower Canada. The French Canadians had persistently refused the demands of Upper Canada for representation by population, because of the terror they felt that, if granted, their institutions would be in danger; and he had told the French members in the House that under the new Constitution their rights were so effectually guarded that their autonomy was fully secured—the safeguards thereof being put in their own hands. But, at the same time, the English, who were a fourth of the population, and who, by habit and tradition, had their own views of public policy, were left entirely without guarantee other than the good feelings and tolerant spirit of the French. Was this safe? The only safeguard they were to have was in regard of education, but in regard of the rights of property they were to be left to the Legislature. And this brought him to the consideration of that part of the proposed Constitution which had reference to civil rights and rights of property. It was said that the civil laws of Lower Canada were now consolidated into a code, and this would enhance our credit; and if based upon sound principles and rendered permanent, it would undoubtedly do so, for what is so conducive to the prosperity of a country as well-protected rights of property and vested interests? This feature was deeply engrained in the British mind, and in that of the United States also, inasmuch that the American Constitution provides that no law could be passed which would affect the rights of property. This was exemplified in the celebrated Dartmouth College case, in which WEBSTER so distinguished himself, when the endowment was maintained and perpetuated. But

to what power were the rights of property committed in these resolutions? When the Minister of Finance appealed to moneyed men abroad for a loan, could he say the Constitution had provided guarantees against injurious changes, when it was known that the laws relating to property were left to the caprice of the local governments? Where was the security of the great religious societies of Montreal, if a sentiment hostile to monopolies were carried to extremes in the Local Parliament?

HON. SIR. E. P. TACHÉ—The General Legislature had power to disallow such acts.

HON. MR. CURRIE—This would be an interference with local rights.

HON. MR. ROSS—It would preserve local rights.

HON. MR. SANBORN—It was a wise power and commended itself to all; it was, however, not an ordinary power to be commonly resorted to, but an extreme power, and one almost revolutionary. It was a power somewhat similar to that which existed in the second branch of the Legislature to stop the supplies, but in its very nature not one often to be exercised; and it could not be frequently exercised without destroying the very foundations of society, and occasioning evils of the greatest magnitude. On the whole he conceived that entrusting such power to the local governments was illogical and dangerous, and informing the world that the rights of property were not made sure. It was urged by some that, to make the measure now before the House answer the ends proposed, it must be immediately adopted, but he did not participate in this opinion. He knew no reason for this haste, and could not believe that a few months would make any material difference. This union, when formed, was to strengthen us so marvellously that we would be able to intimidate all the rest of the world, and guarantee us a lasting peace with all mankind. It might increase facilities for communication, but could not increase our real strength. How the people of New Brunswick could be expected to come up to Canada to defend us, and leave their own frontier unprotected, he could not comprehend. If he had misinterpreted the statements or explanations on this point, let the ministers show how this greater strength was to be acquired. There would be three or four provinces more united together, but the frontier to be defended would be increased in greater proportion than the additional number of men acquired. It was said by the advocates of the scheme that the naval power of

Great Britain would defend St. John, for instance, and leave scope for the volunteers to defend the frontiers; but the Intercolonial Railway, running as it would along the frontier, would be constantly subject to assaults, and would require all the force which could be spared for that purpose. Lower Canada would continue to be assailable from Maine and Vermont, and Upper Canada from the state of New York. Under these circumstances, each section of the Confederation would have enough to do to attend to its own affairs. We were told to love our neighbors as ourselves, but he was not aware that we were enjoined to love them better. (Hear.) We were not told what appropriations were to be made for defence, indeed pains had been taken to conceal that, and Hon. Mr. TILLEY said that the matter was not debated or determined. The province had already incurred an expense of \$400,000 for the simple purpose of sending a few companies of volunteers to our frontier, and if there were no guarantee in the scheme of union—and he did not see any—for increasing our strength, where was the use of haste? Were we not as safe now as we would be then? The Honorable Premier had stated we were on an inclined plane, and he (Hon. Mr. SANBORN) supposed that like Holland we must dyke ourselves up, lest we slide away into the sea of the great American Confederacy. (Laughter.) Whether we were liable to be hurled thither by an avalanche or gradually glide down, we could not prevent our going there except by Confederation, but Confederation would stop us, and that was something to be thankful for. His own impression was that our position would have been more improved by an agreement with Upper Canada than by the new nationality. Canada had had difficulties with the United States, but they had never exhibited a spirit of aggression towards us, except in times of war, which had arisen from issues between Great Britain and the United States, and he did not believe they entertained such purposes now any more than in former times. If we desired to have a Constitution which would afford good hope of permanency, it must be planted deep in the affections of the people—(hear, hear)—for until their intellects were convinced of its excellence, they would not be prepared to uphold it and resist innovations. But they must feel and comprehend the obligation. (Hear.) To render it secure, it must be in the hearts of the people. Why was it that the English had always resisted attempts upon their Constitution? Because every link of the

great chain had been conquered by resistance to oppression, and by sacrifices of blood—(hear, hear)—by resistance to royal exactions and assumptions—(hear, hear)—and these achievements were preserved, held dear, understood, valued, and clung to with all the tenacity of that great people's nature. (Hear, hear.) This was the reason why it rested upon such a solid foundation, why it had endured so long, and was likely to endure for ever. (Hear, hear.) The Constitution asked for was to be built on a flimsy foundation, consisting of certain ideas in the minds of a few men, who no doubt wished well to their country; but that Constitution was new after all, and they could not, in the small space of time they had given to the project, view the whole subject in all its bearings and aspects, as it was desirable they should. The honorable member closed his remarks by reiterating his opinion that an appeal on the subject was due to the people whose voice had not been heard upon it. The acquiescence spoken of was rather the patient awaiting of the details which were sure to be challenged, and the testimony of a subsidized press was not to be taken in evidence of its general acceptance. He was not prepared for one to take or reject the measure as presented. He believed the people would not approve of such a course, and, even were it infinitely better than it was, he would not take the responsibility of voting for it unless after it had been submitted to the country. (Hear, hear.) He would now move his amendment, which was as follows:

That the following words be added to the resolution now under consideration, as an amendment, by submitting for the eighth resolution the following:—

Upper Canada to be represented in the Legislative Council by twenty-four elective members, and Lower Canada by twenty-four elective members, and the Maritime Provinces by twenty-four members, corresponding with the twenty-four elective members in each section of Canada, of which Nova Scotia shall have ten, New Brunswick ten, and Prince Edward Island shall have four, and the present members of the Legislative Council of Canada, as well life members as elective members, shall be members of the first Legislative Council of the Federal Parliament—the appointed members to remain for life, and the elective members for eight years from the date of their election, unless removed by death or other cause; their successors to be elected by the same divisions and electors as have elected them; and it shall be permitted to the Maritime Provinces to appoint ten additional members for life, four for New Brunswick, four for Nova Scotia, and two for Prince Edward Island, to correspond with the

present life members from Canada, and that after the first appointment of members in the Maritime Provinces, no new appointment shall be made, except to supply the vacancies by death or otherwise in the twenty-four members appointed to correspond with the elective members from the two sections of Canada.

And that in the eleventh section, after the word "Council," in the first line, the following words be added: "in the Maritime Provinces;"

And that section fourteen be struck out.

Seconded by Hon. Mr. BURBAU.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON briefly addressed the House in opposition to the amendment until the hour of adjournment, six o'clock, arrived. His remarks will be found recapitulated in the commencement of his speech on Friday.

At six o'clock the debate was adjourned, Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON having the floor.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

THURSDAY, February 9, 1865.

The order of the day for resuming the adjourned debate on the proposed Address to Her Majesty, on the subject of the Confederation of the British North American Provinces having been called;

The HONORABLE Mr. McGEHE said—Mr. SPEAKER, I rise to endeavor to fulfil the promise made in my name last evening by the Lower Canadian leader of this House. After the four speeches that have already been delivered from this quarter of the House, it may very well be supposed that little of essential importance remains to be said. On Monday the Attorney General West, in exposing the case for the Government, in moving this Address to Her Majesty, went very fully through all the items of the resolutions agreed upon at the Quebec Conference, and gave us a full analysis of the whole project with his own constitutional commentaries upon the proceedings of that body. On the next evening, the Attorney General East gave us his views also, treating chiefly of the difficulties in Lower Canada. The same night, my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, gave us a financial view of the whole subject; and last evening the Hon. President of the Council gave us another extended financial and political address, with some arguments from "the Upper Canadian point of view," as the phrase is. It may well therefore seem that

after these speeches little of essential importance remains to be stated. Still this subject is so vast, the project before the House is so vast, and comprehends within it so many objects of interest, the atmosphere that surrounds a subject of this importance is so subtle and fluctuating, that there may be, I am feign to believe, a little joiner-work still left to do—there may be a *hiatus* here and there to fill up; and although, as far as what is called "the preliminary case" is concerned, the question might perhaps very well have rested with the four speeches already delivered—there may be some slight additional contribution made, and, such as it is, in my own humble way, I propose to make it to-night. (Hear, hear.) We all remember that in the nursery legend of the Three Kings of Cologne, CASPAR brought myrrh, and MELCHIOR incense, and BALTASAR gold, but I am afraid my contribution will be less valuable than any of these, yet such as it is I cheerfully bring it, particularly when there are so many in this and the other provinces who would like to know what my own views are in relation to the present crisis. (Hear.) With your approbation, sir, and the forbearance of the House, I will endeavour to treat this subject in this way:—First, to give some slight sketch of the history of the question; then to examine the existing motives which ought to prompt us to secure a speedy union of these provinces; then to speak of the difficulties which this question has encountered before reaching its present fortunate stage; then to say something of the mutual advantages, in a social rather than political point of view, which these provinces will have in their union, and lastly to add a few words on the Federal principle in general, when I shall have done. In other words, I propose to consider the question of union mainly from within, and as far as possible to avoid going over the ground already so fully and so much better occupied by hon. friends who have already spoken upon the subject. My hon. friend, the member for Hochelaga, thought he did a very clever thing the other evening when he disinterred an old newspaper article of mine, entitled "A New Nationality," and endeavored to fix on me the paternity of the phrase—destined to become prophetic—which was employed by a very distinguished personage in the Speech from the Throne at the opening of the session. I do happen to remember the article alluded to as one of my first essays in political writing in Canada; but

I am quite sure that the almost forgotten publication in which it appeared was never known, even by name, to the illustrious person who delivered the speech on that occasion. But I will own when I saw my bantling held up to the admiration of the House in the delicate and fostering hands of the hon. member for Hochelaga, I was not ashamed of it; on the contrary, perhaps there was some tingling of parental pride when I saw what ten years ago I pointed out as the true position for these colonies to take, about to be adopted by all the colonies under such favorable circumstances. I do not think it ought to be made a matter of reproach to me, or a cause for belittling the importance of the subject, that ten years ago I used the identical phrase employed in the Speech from the Throne. The idea itself is a good one, and it may have floated through the minds of many men and received intellectual hospitality even from the honorable member for Hochelaga himself. One is reminded by this sort of thing, of Puff in the *Critic*. "Two people" happened "to hit upon the same thought, and SHAKSPEARE made use of it first—that's all." (Laughter.) My honorable friend is in this respect, no doubt, the SHAKSPEARE of the new nationality. (Renewed laughter.) If there is anything in the article he has read to the House which is deserving of disapprobation, he is *particeps criminis*, and equally blameable if not more blameable than myself. He is indeed the older sinner, and I bow to him in that character with all proper humility. (Renewed laughter.) Really, Mr. SPEAKER, the attempt to fix the parentage of this child of many fathers is altogether absurd and futile. It is almost as ridiculous as the attempt to fix the name of this new Confederation, in advance of the decision of the Gracious Lady to whom the matter is to be referred. I have read in one newspaper published in a western city not less than a dozen attempts of this nature. One individual chooses Tuponian and another Hochelaga, as a suitable name for the new nationality. Now I would ask any hon. member of this House how he would feel if he woke up some fine morning and found himself, instead of a Canadian, a Tuponian or Hochelagander. (Laughter.) I think, sir, we may safely leave for the present the discussion of the name as well as the origin of the new system proposed; when the Confederation has a place among the nations of the world, and opens a new page in history, it will be

time enough to look into its antecedents, and when it has reached this stage there are a few men who, having struggled for it in its earlier difficulties, will then deserve to be honorably mentioned. I shall not be guilty of the bad taste of complimenting those with whom I have the honor to be associated; but when we reach the stage of research, which lies far beyond the stage of deliberation in these affairs, there are some names that ought not to be forgotten. (Hear, hear.) So far back as the year 1800, the Honorable Mr. UNIACKE, a leading politician in Nova Scotia at that date, submitted a scheme of Colonial Union to the Imperial authorities. In 1815, Chief Justice SEWELL, whose name will be well remembered as a leading lawyer of this city and a far-sighted politician, submitted a scheme. In 1822, Sir JOHN BEVERLEY ROBINSON, at the request of the Colonial Office, submitted a project of the same kind; and I need not refer to the report of Lord DURHAM on Colonial Union in 1839. These are all memorable, and some of them are great names. If we have dreamed a dream of union (as some hon. gentlemen say), it is at least worth while remarking that a dream which has been dreamed by such wise and good men, may, for aught we know or you know, have been a sort of vision—a vision foreshadowing forthcoming natural events in a clear intelligence. A vision (I say it without irreverence, for the event concerns the lives of millions living, and yet to come) resembling those seen by the DANIELS and JOSEPHS of old, foreshadowing the trials of the future; the fate of tribes and peoples; the rise and fall of dynasties. But the immediate history of the measure is sufficiently wonderful without dwelling on the remoter predictions of so many wise men. Whoever, in 1862, or even in 1868, would have told us that we should see, even what we see in these seats by which I stand—such a representation of interests acting together, would be accounted, as our Scotch friends say, "half-daft;"—and whoever, in the Lower Provinces about the same time, would have ventured to foretell the composition of their delegations, which sat with us under this roof last October, would probably have been considered equally demented. (Laughter.) But the thing came about, and if those gentlemen, who have had no immediate hand in bringing it about, and therefore naturally felt less interest in the project than we who did, will only give us the

benefit of the doubt, will only assume that we are not all altogether wrong-headed, we hope to show them still farther, as we think we have already shown them, that we are by no means without reason in entering on this enterprise. I submit, however, we may very well dismiss the antecedent history of the question for the present: it grew from an unnoticed feeble plant, to be a stately and flourishing tree, and for my part any one that pleases may say he made the tree grow, if I can only have hereafter my fair share of the shelter and the shade. (Cheers.) But in the present stage of the question, the first real stage of its success—the thing that gave importance to theory in men's minds—was the now celebrated despatch, signed by two members of this Government and an hon. gentleman formerly their colleague, a member of the other House; I refer to the despatch of 1858. The recommendations in that despatch lay dormant until revived by the Constitutional Committee of last Session, which led to the Coalition, which led to the Quebec Conference, which led to the draft of the Constitution now on our table, which will lead, I am fain to believe, to the union of all these provinces. (Hear, hear.) At the same time that we mention the distinguished politicians, I think we ought not to forget those zealous and laborious contributors to the public press, who, although not associated with governments, and not themselves at the time in politics, addressed the public mind, and greatly contributed to give life and interest to this question, and indirectly to bring it to the happy position in which it now stands. Of those gentlemen I will mention two. I do not know whether hon. gentlemen of this House have seen some letters on colonial union, written in 1855, the last addressed to the late Duke of NEWCASTLE, by Mr. P. S. HAMILTON, an able public writer of Nova Scotia, and the present Gold Commissioner of that province; but I take this opportunity of bearing my testimony to his well-balanced judgment, political sagacity and the skilful handling the subject received from him at a very early period. (Hear, hear.) There is another little book written in English, six or seven years ago, to which I must refer. It is a pamphlet, which met with an extraordinary degree of success, entitled *Nova Britannia*, by my hon. friend the member for South Lanark (Mr. MORRIS); and as he has been one of the principal agents in bringing into existence the present Government,

which is now carrying out the idea embodied in his book, I trust he will forgive me if I take the opportunity, although he is present, of reading a single sentence to show how far he was in advance and how true he was to the coming event, which we are now considering. At page 57 of his pamphlet—which I hope will be reprinted among the political miscellanies of the provinces when we are one country and one people—I find this paragraph:—

The dealing with the destinies of a future Britannic empire, the shaping its course, the laying its foundations broad and deep, and the erecting thereon a noble and enduring superstructure, are indeed duties that may well evoke the energies of our people, and nerve the arms and give power and enthusiasm to the aspirations of all true patriots. The very magnitude of the interests involved, will, I doubt not, elevate many amongst us above the demands of mere sectionalism, and enable them to evince sufficient comprehensiveness of mind to deal in the spirit of real statesmen with issues so momentous, and to originate and develop a national line of commercial and general policy, such as will prove adapted to the wants and exigencies of our position.

There are many other excellent passages in the work, but I will not detain the House with many quotations. The spirit that animates the whole will be seen from the extract I have read. But whatever the private writer in his closet may have conceived, whatever even the individual statesman may have designed, so long as the public mind was uninterested in the adoption, even in the discussion of a change in our position so momentous as this, the union of these separate provinces, the individual laboured in vain—perhaps sir, not wholly in vain, for although his work may not have borne fruit then, it was kindling a fire that would ultimately light up the whole political horizon, and herald the dawn of a better day for our country and our people. Events stronger than advocacy, events stronger than men, have come in at last like the fire behind the invisible writing to bring out the truth of these writings and to impress them upon the mind of every thoughtful man who has considered the position and probable future of these scattered provinces. (Cheers.) Before I go further into the details of my subject, I will take this opportunity of congratulating this House and the public of all the provinces upon the extraordinary activity which has been given to this subject since it has become a leading topic of public discussion in the maritime, and what I may

call relatively to them, the inland provinces. It is astonishing how active has been the public mind in all those communities since the subject has been fairly launched. I have watched with great attention the expression of public opinion in the Lower Provinces as well as in our own, and I am rejoiced to find that even in the smallest of the provinces I have been able to read writings and speeches which would do no discredit to older and more cultivated communities—articles and speeches worthy of any press and of any audience. The provincial mind, it would seem, under the inspiration of a great question, leaped at a single bound out of the slough of mere mercenary struggles for office, and took post on the high and honorable ground from which alone this great subject can be taken in in all its dimensions,—had risen at once to the true dignity of this discussion with an elasticity that does honor to the communities that have exhibited it, and gives assurance that we have the metal, the material, out of which to construct a new and vigorous nationality. (Cheers.) We find in the journals and in the speeches of public men in the Lower Provinces a discussion of the first principles of government, a discussion of the principles of constitutional law, and an intimate knowledge and close application of the leading facts in constitutional history, which gives to me at least the satisfaction and assurance that, if we never went farther in this matter, we have put an end for the present, and I hope for long, to bitterer and smaller controversies. We have given the people some sound mental food, and to every man who has a capacity for discussion we have given a topic upon which he can fitly exercise his powers, no longer gnawing at a file and wasting his abilities in the poor effort of advancing the ends of some paltry faction or party. I can congratulate this House and province and the provinces below, that such is the case, and I may observe, with some satisfaction, that the various authors and writers seem to be speaking or writing as if in the visible presence of all the colonies. (Hear, hear.) They are no longer hole-and-corner celebrities: they seem to think that their words will be scanned and weighed afar off as well as at home. We have, I believe, several hundred celebrities in Canada—my friend Mr. MORGAN, I believe, has made out a list of them—(laughter)—but they are no longer now local celebrities; if celebrities at all

they must be celebrities for British North America; for every one of the speeches made by them on this subject is watched in all the provinces, and in point of fact by the mere appearance of political union, we have made a mental union among the people of all these provinces; and many men now speak with a dignity and carefulness which formerly did not characterize them, when they were watched only by their own narrow and struggling section, and weighed only according to a stunted local standard. (Hear, hear.) Federation, I hope, may supply to all our public men just ground for uniting in nobler and more profitable contests than those which have signalized the past. (Hear, hear.) We on this side, Mr. SPEAKER, propose for that better future our plan of union; and, if you will allow me, I shall go over what appear to me the principal motives which exist at present for that union. My hon. friend the Finance Minister mentioned the other evening several strong motives for union—free access to the sea, an extended market, breaking down of hostile tariffs, a more diversified field for labor and capital, our enhanced credit with England, and our greater effectiveness when united for assistance in time of danger. (Cheers.) The Hon. President of the Council also enumerated several motives for union in relation to the commercial advantages which will flow from it, and other powerful reasons which may be advanced in favor of it. But the motives to such a comprehensive change as we propose, must be mixed motives—partly commercial, partly military, and partly political; and I shall go over a few—not strained or simulated—motives which are entertained by many people of all these provinces, and are rather of a social, or, strictly speaking, political, than of a financial kind. In the first place, I echo what was stated in the speech last night of my honorable friend, the President of the Council—that we cannot stand still; we cannot stave off some great change; we cannot stand alone, province apart from province, if we would; and that we are in a state of political transition. All, even honorable gentlemen who are opposed to this union, admit that we must do something, and that that something must not be a mere temporary expedient. We are compelled, by warning voices from within and without, to make a change, and a great change. We all, with one voice, who are unionists, declare our conviction that we are

not go on as we have gone; but you, who are all anti-unionists, say—"Oh! that is bagging the question; you have not yet proved that." Well, Mr. SPEAKER, what proofs do the gentlemen want? I presume there are three influences which determine any great change in the course of any individual or state. First—his patron, owner, employer, protector, ally, or friend; or, in politics, "Imperial connection." Secondly—his partner, comrade, or fellow-laborer, or near neighbor. And, thirdly,—the man himself, or the state itself. Now, in our case, all three causes have concurred to warn and force us into a new course of conduct. What are these warnings? We have had at least three. The first is from England, and is a friendly warning. England warned us by several matters of fact, according to her custom, rather than verbiage, that the colonies had entered upon a new era of existence, a new phase in their career. She has given us this warning in several different shapes—when she gave us "Responsible Government"—when she adopted Free Trade—when she repealed the Navigation laws—and when, three or four years ago, she commenced that series of official despatches in relation to militia and defence which she has ever since poured in on us, in a steady stream, always bearing the same solemn burthen—"prepare! prepare! prepare!" These warnings gave us notice that the old order of things between the colonies and the Mother Country had ceased, and that a new order must take its place. (Hear, hear.) About four years ago, the first despatches began to be addressed to this country, from the Colonial Office, upon the subject. From that day to this there has been a steady stream of despatches in this direction, either upon particular or general points connected with our defence; and I venture to say, that if bound up together, the despatches of the lamented Duke of NEWCASTLE alone would make a respectable volume—all notifying this Government, by the advices they conveyed, that the relations—the military apart from the political and commercial relations of this province to the Mother Country had changed; and we were told in the most explicit language that could be employed, that we were no longer to consider ourselves, in relation to defence, in the same position we formerly occupied towards the Mother Country. Well, these warnings have been friendly warnings; and if we have failed to do our part in regard to them, we must, at

all events, say this, that they were addressed to our Government so continuously and so strenuously that they freed the Imperial power of the responsibility for whatever might follow, because they showed to the colonies clearly what, in the event of certain contingencies arising, they had to expect. We may grumble or not at the necessity of preparation England imposes upon us, but, whether we like it or not, we have, at all events, been told that we have entered upon a new era in our military relations to the rest of the Empire. (Hear, hear.) Then, sir, in the second place, there came what I may call the other warning from without—the American warning. (Hear, hear.) Republican America gave us her notices in times past, through her press, and her demagogues and her statesmen,—but of late days she has given us much more intelligible notices—such as the notice to abrogate the Reciprocity Treaty, and to arm the lakes, contrary to the provisions of the addenda to the treaty of 1818. She has given us another notice in imposing a vexatious passport system; another in her avowed purpose to construct a ship canal round the Falls of Niagara, so as "to pass war vessels from Lake Ontario to Lake Erie;" and yet another, the most striking one of all, has been given to us, if we will only understand it, by the enormous expansion of the American army and navy. I will take leave to read to the House a few figures which show the amazing, the unprecedented growth, which has not, perhaps, a parallel in the annals of the past, of the military power of our neighbors within the past three or four years. I have the details here by me, but shall only read the results, to show the House the emphatic meaning of this most serious warning. In January, 1861, the regular army of the United States, including of course the whole of the States, did not exceed 15,000 men. This number was reduced, from desertion and other causes, by 5,000 men, leaving 10,000 men as the army of the States. In December, 1862—that is, from January, 1861, to January, 1863, this army of 10,000 was increased to 800,000 soldiers actually in the field. (Hear, hear.) No doubt there are exaggerations in some of these figures—the rosters were, doubtless, in some cases filled with fictitious names, in order to procure the bounties that were offered; but if we allow two-thirds as correct, we find that a people who had an army of 10,000 men in 1861, had in two years increased it to an

army of 600,000 men. As to their ammunition and stock of war material at the opening of the war—that is to say, at the date of the attack upon Fort Sumpter—we find that they had of siege and heavy guns 1,952; of field artillery, 231; of infantry firearms, 473,000; of cavalry firearms, 81,000; and of ball and shell, 363,000. At the end of 1863—the latest period to which I have statistics upon the subject—the 1,052 heavy guns had become 2,116; the 231 field pieces had become 2,965; the 473,000 infantry arms had become 2,423,000; the 81,000 cavalry arms had become 369,000, and the 363,000 ball and shell had become 2,925,000. Now, as to the navy of the United States, I wish to show that this wonderful development of war power in the United States is the second warning we have had, that we cannot go on as we have gone. (Hear, hear.) In January, 1861, the ships of war belonging to the United States were 83; in December, 1864, they numbered 671, of which 54 were monitors and iron-clads, carrying 4,610 guns, with a tonnage of 510,000 tons, and manned by a force of 51,000 men. These are frightful figures for the capacity of destruction they represent, for the heaps of carnage that they represent, for the quantity of human blood spilt that they represent, for the lust of conquest that they represent, for the evil passions that they represent, and for the arrest of the onward progress of civilisation that they represent. But it is not the figures which give the worst view of the fact—for England still carries more guns afloat even than our war-making neighbors. (Cheers.) It is the change which has taken place in the spirit of the people of the Northern States themselves which is the worst view of the fact. How far have they travelled since the humane CHANNING preached the unlawfulness of war—since the living SUMNER delivered his addresses to the Peace Society on the same theme! I remember an accomplished poet, one of the most accomplished the New England States have ever produced, took very strong grounds against the prosecution of the Mexican war, and published the Bigelow Papers, so well known in American literature, to show the ferocity and criminality of war. He thus made Mr. BIRD-OF-FREEDOM SAWIN sing:—

If you take a sword an' draor it,
An go stick a feller thru,
Gov'ment won't answer for it,
God'll send the bill to you!

(Laughter.) This was slightly audacious and irreverent in expression, but it was remarkably popular in New England at that time. The writer is now one of the editors of a popular Boston periodical, and would be one of the last, I have no doubt, to induce a Northern soldier to withdraw his sword from the body of any unhappy Southerner whom he had, contrary to the poet's former political ethics, "stuck thru." (Laughter.) But it is not the revolution wrought in the minds of men of great intelligence that is most to be deplored—for the powerful will of such men may compel their thoughts back again to a philosophy of peace; no, it is the mercenary and military interests created under Mr. LINCOLN—which are represented, the former by an estimated governmental outlay of above \$100,000,000 this year, and the other by the 800,000 men whose blood is thus to be bought and paid for; by the armies out of uniform who prey upon the army; by the army of contractors who are to feed and clothe and arm the million; by that other army, the army of tax-collectors, who cover the land, seeing that no industry escapes unburthened, no possession unentered, no affection even, untaxed. Tax! tax! tax! is the cry from the rear! Blood! blood! blood! is the cry from the front! Gold! gold! gold! is the chuckling undertone which comes up from the mushroom *millionnaires*, well named a shoddy aristocracy. Nor do I think the army interest, the contracting interest, and the tax-gathering interest, the worst results that have grown out of this war. There is another and equally serious interest—the change that has come over the spirit, mind and principles of the people, that terrible change which has made war familiar and even attractive to them. When the first battle was fought—when, in the language of the Duke of WELLINGTON, the first "butcher's bill was sent in"—a shudder of horror ran through the length and breadth of the country; but by and by as the carnage increased, no newspaper was considered worth laying on the breakfast table unless it contained the story of the butchery of thousands of men. "Only a couple of thousand killed! Pooh, pooh, that's nothing!" exclaimed Mr. SHODDY as he sipped his coffee in his luxurious apartment; and nothing short of the news of ten, fifteen, twenty thousand human beings struck dead in one day would satisfy the jaded palate of men craving for excitement, and such horrible excitement as attend-

ed the wholesale murder of their fellow creatures. Have these sights and sounds no warning addressed to us? Are we as those who have eyes and see not; ears and hear not; reason, neither do they understand? If we are true to Canada—if we do not desire to become part and parcel of this people—we cannot overlook this the greatest revolution of our own times. Let us remember this, that when the three cries among our next neighbors are money, taxation, blood, it is time for us to provide for our own security. I said in this House, during the session of the year 1861, that the first gun fired at Fort Sumpter had “a message for us;” I was unheeded then; I repeat now that every one of the 2,700 great guns in the field, and every one of the 4,600 guns afloat, whenever it opens its mouth, repeats the solemn warning of England—prepare—prepare—prepare! (Cheers.) But I may be told by some moralizing friend, Oh! but when they get out of this, they will have had enough of it, and they will be very glad to rest on their laurels. They! Who? The shoddy aristocracy have enough of it? The disbanded army of tax-gathers have enough of it? The manufacturers of false intelligence have enough of it? Who is it possible will have had enough of it? The fighting men themselves? I dare say they would all like to have a furlough, but all experiences teach us, it is not of war soldiers tire but of peace; it is not of the sea sailors tire, but of the land. Jack likes to land, and have a frolic and spend his money, so does Jack’s brother the fighting landsman—but the one is soon as much out of his element as the other, when parted from his comrades; when denied the gypsy joys of the camp, when he no longer feels his sword, he looks up to it where it hangs, and sighs to take it down and be “at work” again. He will even quit his native country, if she continues perverely peaceful, and go into foreign service, rather than remain what he calls “idle.” (Hear.) This is experience, which I beg respectfully to cite in opposition to the seductive, disarming fallacy of my moralizing friend. (Hear, hear.) The Attorney General East told us in his speech the other night, that one of the features of the original programme of the American Revolutionists was the acquisition of Canada to the United States. They pretend to underrate the importance of this country, now that they are fully occupied elsewhere; but I remember well that the late Mr. WEBSTER—who was

not a demagogue—at the opening of the Worcester and Albany Railway, some years since, expressed the hope that the railways of the New England States would all point towards Canada, because their influence and the demands of commerce would in time bring Canada into the union and increase the New England element in that union. (Hear, hear.) I think, sir, I am justified in regarding the American conflict as one of the warnings we have received; and the third warning, that things cannot go on in this country as they are, is a warning voice from within—a warning voice from our own experience in the government of these provinces. (Hear, hear.) On these internal constitutional difficulties existing among ourselves, which were so fully exposed last evening by my hon. friend the President of the Council, I need say little; they are admitted to have been real, not imaginary, on all hands. An illustration was used in another place in explaining this part of the subject by the venerable and gallant knight, our Premier, than which nothing could be more clear. He observed that when we had had five administrations within two years, it was full time to look out for some permanent remedy for such a state of things. True—most true—Constitutional Government among us had touched its lowest point when it existed only by the successful search of a messenger or a page, after a member, willingly or unwillingly absent from his seat. Any one might in those days have been the saviour of his country. (Laughter.) All he had to do was, when one of the five successive governments which arose in two years, was in danger, to rise in his place, say “yea!” and *presto* the country was saved. (Laughter.) This House was fast losing, under such a state of things its hold on the country; the administrative departments were becoming disorganized under such frequent changes of chiefs and policies; we were nearly as bad as the army of the Potomac, before its “permanent remedy” was found in General GRANT. Well! we have had our three warnings. One warning from within and two from without. I dare say, sir, we all remember the old class-book story of Mrs. THRALL’s “Three Warnings;” how Death promised not to come after a certain individual he had unintentionally intruded on, on his wedding day. I say, unintentionally—for Death is a gentleman, and seldom walks in, unannounced—(laughter)—but he promised not to call upon this particular per-

son, without giving him three distinct warnings. Well, the honorable gentleman in question—I dare say he was honorable, and a member of some House,—he, like all the rest of us expected to outlive everybody. But in process of years he fell lame, then afterwards, he became deaf, and at last he grew blind: then Death's hour had come and in spite of some admirable pleading on behalf of the defendant in the case, he had his "three warnings" like a Parisian editor, his case was closed, his form was locked up, and his impression was struck off the face of the earth, and Death claimed and had his own. (Laughter.) Now, sir, we have had three warnings, and if we do not take heed of them and prepare for the possible future condition into which we may be plunged, woe to us if we are found unprepared when the hour of destiny strikes! (Cheers.) We have submitted a plan preparing us for such a contingency, and the Attorneys General East and West have analysed its constitutional character, while the Minister of Finance and the President of the Council have treated it in its financial aspects. There are some objections taken to the plan, I understand, but I do not believe that any member will get up in this House, and declare that he is an anti-unionist, that he is opposed to all union, and that he considers union unnecessary and inexpedient. (Hear, hear.) I do not know that there is one man out of the one hundred and thirty who compose this House, in view of the circumstances in which we are placed, who will declare that he is opposed to any sort of union with the Lower Provinces. One may say that he does not like this or the other clause—that he does not like this or that feature of the proposed scheme; but still all admit that union of some kind would increase our protection and be a source of strength. Some honorable gentlemen, while admitting that we have entered, within the present decade, on a period of political transition, have contended that we might have bridged the abyss with that Prussian pontoon, called a Zollverein. But if any one for a moment will remember that the trade of the whole front of New Brunswick and Nova-Scotia gravitates at present along-shore to Portland and Boston, while the trade of Upper Canada, west of Kingston, has long gravitated across the lakes to New York, he will see, I think, that a mere Zollverein treaty without a strong political end to serve, and some political power at its back, would be, in our new

circumstances, merely waste paper. (Hear, hear.) The charge that we have not gone far enough—that we have not struck out boldly for a consolidated union, instead of a union with reserved local jurisdictions, is another charge which deserves some notice. To this I answer that, if we had had, as was proposed, an Intercolonial Railway twenty years ago, we might by this time have been, perhaps, and only perhaps, in a condition to unite into one consolidated Government; but certain politicians and capitalists having defeated that project twenty years ago, special interests took the place great general interests might by this time have occupied; vested rights and local ambitions arose and were recognized; and all these had to be admitted as existing in a pretty advanced stage of development, when our Conferences were called together. (Hear, hear.) The lesson to be learned from this squandering of quarter centuries by British Americans is this, that if we lose the present propitious opportunity, we may find it as hard a few years hence to get an audience, even for any kind of union (except American union) as we should have found it to get a hearing last year for a Legislative union, from the long period of estrangement and non-intercourse which had existed between these provinces, and the special interests which had grown up in the meantime in each of them. (Cheers.) Another motive to union, or rather a phase of the last motive spoken of, is this, that the policy of our neighbors to the south of us has always been aggressive. There has always been a desire amongst them for the acquisition of new territory, and the inexorable law of democratic existence seems to be its absorption. They coveted Florida, and seized it; they coveted Louisiana, and purchased it; they coveted Texas, and stole it; and then they picked a quarrel with Mexico, which ended by their getting California. (Hear, hear.) They sometimes pretend to despise these colonies as prizes beneath their ambition; but had we not had the strong arm of England over us, we should not now have had a separate existence. (Cheers.) The acquisition of Canada was the first ambition of the American Confederacy, and never ceased to be so, when her troops were a handful and her navy scarce a squadron. Is it likely to be stopped now, when she counts her guns afloat by thousands and her troops by hundreds of thousands? On this motive, a very powerful expression of opinion has

lately appeared in a published letter of the Archbishop of Halifax, Dr. CONNOLLY. Who is the Archbishop of Halifax? In either of the coast colonies, where he has labored in his high vocation for nearly a third of a century, it would be absurd to ask the question; but in Canada he may not be equally well known. Some of my honorable friends in this and the other House, who were his guests last year, must have felt the impress of his character as well as the warmth of his hospitality. (Hear, hear.) Well, he is known as one of the first men in sagacity as he is in position, in any of these colonies; that he was for many years the intimate associate of his late distinguished confrere, Archbishop HUGHES, of New York; that he knows the United States as thoroughly as he does the provinces, and these are his views on this particular point; the extract is somewhat long, but so excellently put that I am sure the House will be obliged to me for the whole of it:—

Instead of cursing, like the boy in the upturned boat, and holding on until we are fairly on the brink of the cataract, we must at once begin to pray and strike out for the shore by all means, before we get too far down on the current. We must at this most critical moment invoke the Arbiter of nations for wisdom, and abandoning in time our perilous position, we must strike out boldly, and at some risk, for some rock on the nearest shore—some resting place of greater security. A cavalry raid or a visit from our Fenian friends on horseback, through the plains of Canada and the fertile valleys of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, may cost more in a single week than Confederation for the next fifty years; and if we are to believe you, where is the security even at the present moment against such a disaster? Without the whole power of the Mother Country by land and sea, and the concentration in a single hand of all the strength of British America, our condition is seen at a glance. Whenever the present difficulties will terminate—and who can tell the moment?—we will be at the mercy of our neighbors; and victorious or otherwise, they will be eminently a military people, and with all their apparent indifference about annexing this country, and all the friendly feelings that may be talked, they will have the power to strike when they please, and this is precisely the kernel and the only touch point of the whole question. No nation ever had the power of conquest that did not use it, or abuse it, at the very first favorable opportunity. All that is said of the magnanimity and forbearance of mighty nations can be explained on the principle of sheer inexpediency, as the world knows. The whole face of Europe has been changed, and the dynasties of many hundred years have been swept away within our own time, on the principle of might alone—the oldest, the

strongest, and as some would have it, the most sacred of all titles. The thirteen original states of America, with all their professions of self-denial, have been all the time, by money, power and by war, and by negotiation, extending their frontier until they more than quadrupled their territory within sixty years; and believe it who may, are they now of their own accord to come to a full stop? No; as long as they have the power, they must go onward: for it is the very nature of power to grip whatever is within its reach. It is not their hostile feelings, therefore, but it is their power, and only their power, I dread; and I now state it, as my solemn conviction, that it becomes the duty of every British subject in these provinces to control that power, not by the insane policy of attacking or weakening them, but by strengthening ourselves—rising, with the whole power of Britain at our back, to their level; and so be prepared for any emergency. There is no sensible or unprejudiced man in the community who does not see that vigorous and timely preparation is the only possible means of saving us from the horrors of a war such as the world has never seen. To be fully prepared is the only practical argument that can have weight with a powerful enemy, and make him pause beforehand and count the cost. And as the sort of preparation I speak of is utterly hopeless without the union of the provinces, so at a moment when public opinion is being formed on this vital point, as one deeply concerned, I feel it a duty to declare myself unequivocally in favor of Confederation as cheaply and as honorably as possible—but Confederation at all hazards and at all reasonable sacrifices.

After the most mature consideration, and all the arguments I have heard on both sides for the last month, these are my inmost convictions on the necessity and merits of a measure which alone, under Providence, can secure to us social order and peace, and rational liberty, and all the blessings we now enjoy under the mildest Government and the hallowed institutions of the freest and happiest country in the world.

These are the words of a statesman—of a mitred statesman—one of that order of mighty men, powerful in their generation, whose statesmanly gifts have been cast in the strong mould of theological discipline—such men as were XIMENES and WOLSEY. No one more deprecates than I do the interference of clergymen in mere party politics, and I think such is the sentiment also of His Grace of Halifax; but when it is an issue of peace or war, of deliverance or conquest, who has a better, who so good a right to speak as the ministers of the gospel of peace, and justice, and true freedom? Observe once more these two closing sentences, “I feel it a duty” says the illustrious Archbishop, “to declare myself unequiv-

cally in favor of Confederation as cheaply and as honorably obtained as possible, but Confederation at all hazards and at all reasonable sacrifices. After the most mature consideration, and all the arguments I have heard on both sides for the last month, these are my inmost convictions on the necessity and merits of a measure which alone, under Providence, can secure to us social order and peace, and rational liberty, and all the blessings we now enjoy under the mildest Government and the hallowed institutions of the freest and happiest country in the world." (Hear, hear.) The next motive for union to which I shall refer is, that it will strengthen rather than weaken the connection with the empire, so essential to these rising provinces. Those who may be called, if there are any such, the anti-unionists, allege, that this scheme here submitted will bring separation in its train. How, pray? By making these countries more important, will you make them less desirable as connections to England? By making their trade more valuable, will you make her more anxious to get rid of it? By reducing their Federal tariff will you lessen their interest for England? By making them stronger for each other's aid, will you make her less willing to discharge a lesser than a greater responsibility? But if the thing did not answer itself, England has answered that she "cordially approves" of our plan of union, —and she has always been accounted a pretty good judge of her own Imperial interests. (Hear, hear.) She does not consider our union inimical to those interests. Instead of looking upon it with a dark and discouraging frown, she cheers us on by her most cordial approval and bids us a hearty "God speed" in the new path we have chosen to enter. (Hear, hear.) But I put it on provincial grounds as well. We are not able to go alone, and if we attempted it we would almost certainly go to our own destruction—so that as we cannot go alone, and as we do not desire union with the United States, it is the duty of every man to do all in his power to strengthen the connection with Great Britain. And how shall we do it? Is it by compelling the Imperial Government to negotiate at Charlottetown, for every man and musket required for our defence, to negotiate again at Halifax, and again at Fredericton, and again at St. John, and again at Quebec? Is it by having these five separate governments that we

are to render the connection desirable and appreciated, or is it by putting the power of these colonies into the hands of one General Government and making the negotiations between two parties only, thereby simplifying the whole transaction and expediting whatever is to be done between the two countries. (Hear, hear.) I will content myself, Mr. SPEAKER, with those principal motives to union; first, that we are in the rapids, and must go on; next that our neighbors will not, on their side, let us rest supinely, even if we could do so from other causes; and thirdly, that by making the united colonies more valuable as an ally to Great Britain, we shall strengthen rather than weaken the Imperial connexion. (Cheers.) Let me now, sir, call your attention to the difficulties, past and present, which this great project had to encounter, before it reached the fortunate stage in which we now find it. When it was first advocated by individuals, however eminent, of course it had but scanty chance of success. (Hear, hear.) That was the first stage; when, as in 1822 and 1839, it found favor with Downing street, it excited the suspicions of the colonists; when it was identified with the Quebec and Halifax railway project, it shared the fate,—it was sacrificed to the jealousies and dissensions which destroyed that particular undertaking. When, as in the case of my hon. friend (Mr. GALT's) motion in 1858, and my own motion in 1860, the subject was mooted in this House by a private member, the Ministry of the day could not allow so grave a measure to succeed in other hands than their own; when, as was the case in 1858, the Ministry committed themselves to it, the Opposition complained that Parliament had not been consulted. When Canada proposed to move, in 1859, Newfoundland alone responded; when Nova Scotia moved, in 1860, New Brunswick alone agreed to go with her; at all events, Canada did not then consent. (Hear, hear.) Of late years the language of the Colonial Office, of Mr. LABOUCHERE, of Sir BULWER LYTON, and of the lamented Duke of NEWCASTLE, was substantially: "Agree among yourselves, gentlemen, and we will not stand in the way." Ah! there was the rub—"Agree among yourselves!" Easier said than done, with five colonies so long estranged, and whose former negotiations had generally ended in bitter controversies. Up to the last year there was no conjunction of circumstances favorable to the bringing about of this union, and

probably if we suffer this opportunity to be wasted we shall never see again such a conjunction of circumstances as will enable us to agree, even so far, among ourselves. By a most fortunate concurrence of circumstances—by what I presume to call, speaking of events of this magnitude, a providential concurrence of circumstances—the Government of Canada was so modified last spring as to enable it to deal fearlessly with this subject, at the very moment when the coast colonies, despairing of a Canadian union, were arranging a conference of their own for a union of their own. Our Government embraced among its members from the western section the leaders of the former Ministry and former Opposition from that section. At the time it was formed it announced to this House that it was its intention as part of its policy to seek a conference with the lower colonies, and endeavor to bring about a general union. This House formally gave the Government its confidence after the announcement of this policy, and although I have no desire to strain terms, it does appear to me that this House did commit itself to the principle of a union of the colonies if found practicable. That is my view, sir, of the relations of this House to the Government after it gave it expressly its confidence. Other members of the House take another view of that matter, they do not think themselves committed even to the principle, and they certainly are not to the details of the scheme. (Hear.) After the Coalition was formed an incident occurred, which, though not of national importance, it would be most ungrateful of me to forget. An intercolonial excursion was proposed and was rendered practicable through the public spirit of two gentlemen representing our great railway, of which so many hard things have been said that I feel it my duty to say this good thing—I refer to the Honorable Mr. FERSTER and Mr. BRYDGES. (Cheers.) Forty members of this House, twenty-five members of the other House, and forty gentlemen of the press and other professions, from Canada, joined in that excursion. So many Canadians had never seen so much of the Lower Provinces before, and the people of the Lower Provinces had never seen so many Canadians. Our reception was beyond all description kind and cordial. The general sentiment of union was everywhere cheered to the echo, though I am sorry to find that some of those who cheered then, when it was but a general sentiment, seem to act very

differently now, that it has become a ripened project, and I fear that they do not intend to act up to the words they then uttered. They may, perhaps, intend to do so, but they have a very odd way of going about it. (Laughter.) Well, sir, this was in August; the Charlottetown Conference was called in September, the Quebec Conference in October, and the tour of the maritime delegates through Canada took place in November. Four months of the eight which have elapsed since we promised this House to deal with it have been almost wholly given up to this great enterprise. Let me bear my tribute, Mr. SPEAKER, now that I refer to the Conference, to the gentlemen from the Lower Provinces, who sat so many days in council with us under this roof. (Cheers.) A very worthy citizen of Montreal, when I went up a day or two in advance of the Montreal banquet, asked me, with a curious sort of emphasis—"What sort of people are they?"—meaning the maritime delegates. I answered him then, as I repeat now, that they were, as a body, as able and accomplished a body as I thought any new country in the world could produce,—and that some among them would compare not unfavorably in ability and information with some of the leading commoners of England. As our Government included a representation both of the former Opposition, and the former Ministry, so their delegations were composed in about equal parts of the Opposition and Ministerial parties of their several provinces. A more hard-working set of men; men more tenacious of their own rights, yet more considerate for those of others; men of readier resources in debate; men of gentler manners; men more willing to bear and forbear, I never can hope to see together at one council table again. (Cheers.) But why need I dwell on this point? They were seen and heard in all our principal cities, and I am sure every Canadian who met them here was proud of them as fellow-subjects, and would be happy to feel that he could soon call them fellow-countrymen in fact as well as in name. (Cheers.) Sir, by this combination of great abilities—by this coalition of leaders who never before acted together—by this extraordinary armistice of party warfare, obtained in every colony at the same moment—after all this labor and all this self-sacrifice—after all former impediments had been most fortunately overcome—the treaty was concluded and signed by us all—and there it lies on your table. The propositions contained in

it have been objected to, and we were reminded the other evening by the honorable member for Chateauguay, that we are not a treaty-making power. Well, in reference to that objection, I believe the Imperial Government has in certain cases, such as the Reciprocity Treaty, conceded to these provinces the right of coercion; and in this case there is the Imperial Despatch of 1862 to Lord MULGRAVE, Governor of Nova Scotia, distinctly authorizing the public men of the colonies to confer with each other on the subject of union, and writing them to submit the result of their conferences to the Imperial Government. (Hear, hear.) We assembled under authority of that despatch, and acted under the sanction it gave. Everything we did was done in form and with propriety, and the result of our proceedings is the document that has been submitted to the Imperial Government as well as to this House, and which we speak of here as a treaty. And that there may be no doubt about our position in regard to that document we say, question it you may, reject it you may, or accept it you may, but alter it you may not. (Hear, hear.) It is beyond your power, or our power, to alter it. There is not a sentence—ay, or even a word—you can alter without desiring to throw out the document. Alter it, and we know at once what you mean—you thereby declare yourselves anti-unionists. (Hear, hear.) On this point, I repeat after all my hon. friends who have already spoken, for one party to alter a treaty, is, of course, to destroy it. Let us be frank with each other; you who do not like our work, nor do you like us who stand by it, clause by clause, line by line, and letter by letter. Oh! but this clause ought to run thus, and this other clause thus. Does any hon. member seriously think that any treaty in the world between five separate provinces ever gave full and entire satisfaction on every point to every party? Does any hon. member seriously expect to have a constitutional act framed to his order, or my order, or any man's order? No, sir, I am sure no legislator at least since ANACHARSIS CLOOTZ was "Attorney General of the Human Race" ever expected such ideal perfection. (Laughter.) It may be said by some hon. gentleman that they admit the principle of this measure to be good, but that it should be dealt with as an ordinary parliamentary subject in the usual parliamentary manner. Mr. SPEAKER, this is not an ordinary parliamentary measure. We do not legislate upon it—we do

not enact it,—that is for a higher authority. Suppose the Address adopted by this House to-morrow, is the act of this House final and conclusive? No. It is for the Imperial Parliament to act upon it. (Hear, hear.) It will be that body that will cause the several propositions to be moulded into a measure which will have the form of law, and these resolutions will probably be the *ipsissima verba* of the measure they will give us and the other provinces. But some hon. gentlemen opposite say, that if there be defects in this measure they ought to be remedied now, and that the Government ought to be glad to have them pointed out. Yes, surely, if this were simply the act of the Parliament of Canada; but it is not to be our act alone. It is an Address to the Throne, in the terms of which other colonies are to agree, and even if we were to make alterations in it, we cannot bind them to accept them. If we were weak and wicked enough to alter a solemn agreement with the other provinces, the moment their representatives had turned their backs and gone home, what purpose would it serve except that of defeating the whole measure and throwing it as well as the country back again into chaos. (Hear, hear.) I admit, sir, as we have been told, that we ought to aim at perfection, but who has ever attained it, except perhaps the hon. member for Brome. (Laughter.) We, however, did strive and aim at the mark, and we think we made a tolerably good shot. The hon. member for Chateauguay will not be satisfied—insatiate archer!—unless we hit the bull's eye. (Laughter.) My hon. friend is well read in political literature—will he mention me one authority, from the first to the last, who ever held that human government ever was or could be anything more than what a modern sage called "an approximation to the right," and an ancient called "the possible best." Well, we believe we have here given to our countrymen of all the provinces the possible best—that we have given it to them in the most imperative moment—their representatives and ours have labored at it, letter and spirit, form and substance, until they found this basis of agreement, which we are all alike confident will not now, nor for many a day to come, be easily swept away. Before I pass to another point, sir, permit me to pay my tribute of unfeigned respect to one of our Canadian colleagues in this work, who is no longer with us; I mean the present Vice-Chancellor of Upper Canada (Hon. Mr. MOWAT), who

took a constant and honorable share in the preparation of this project. (Cheers.) Now, sir, I wish to say a few words in reference to what I call the social relations which I think ought to exist and will spring up between the people of the Lower Provinces and ourselves if there is a closer communication established between us, and also in reference to the social fitness of each of the parties to this proposed union. And first, I will make a remark to some of the French Canadian gentlemen who are said to be opposed to our project, on French Canadian grounds only. I will remind them, I hope not improperly, that every one of the colonies we now propose to re-unite under one rule—in which they shall have a potential voice—were once before united, as New France. (Cheers.) Newfoundland, the uttermost, was theirs, and one large section of its coast is still known as “the French shore;” Cape Breton was theirs till the final fall of Louisburgh; Prince Edward Island was their Island of St. Jean, and Charlottetown was their Port Joli; in the heart of Nova Scotia was that fair Acadian land, where the roll of LONGFELLOW’s noble hexameters may any day be heard in every wave that breaks upon the base of Cape Blomedon. (Cheers.) In the northern counties of New Brunswick, from the Miramichi to the Matapedia, they had their forts and farms, their churches and their festivals, before the English speech had ever once been heard between those rivers. Nor is that tenacious Norman and Breton race extinct in their old haunts and homes. I have heard one of the members for Cape Breton speak in high terms of that portion of his constituency, and I believe I am correct in saying that M^r. LE VISCONTE, the late Finance Minister of Nova Scotia, was, in the literal sense of the term, an Acadian. Mr. COZZANS, of New York, who wrote a very readable little book the other day about Nova Scotia, describes the French residents near the basin of Minas, and he says especially of the women, “they might have stepped out of Normandy a hundred years ago!” In New Brunswick there is more than one county, especially in the north, where business, and law, and politics, require a knowledge of both French and English. A worthy friend of ours, Hon. Mr. MITCHELL, of Chatham, who was present at the earlier meetings of the Conference, owed his first election for one of these counties, because he was *Pierre Michel*, and could speak to his French constituents in their own language.

I will, with leave of the House, read on this interesting subject a passage from a very capital sketch of the French district of New Brunswick in 1863, by Lieutenant Governor GORDON [it is in GALSTON’s *Vacation Tourist for 1864*], and is exceedingly interesting throughout:—

The French population, which forms so large a proportion among the inhabitants of the counties of Westmoreland, Kent and Gloucester, appears to me as contented as the *habitants* of Victoria, but hardly equally as well off. There was an air of comfort and *bien-être* about the large timber two-storied houses, painted a dark Indian red, standing among the trees, the numerous good horses, the well-tilled fields and sleek cattle, which is wanting on the sea coast. We stopped after a pleasant drive, affording us good views of the beautiful peak of Green River Mountain, at the home of a Monsieur VIOLET, at the mouth of Grand River, which was to be our starting point. The whole aspect of the farm was that of the *maîtairie* in Normandy—the outer doors of the house gaudily painted—the panels of a different color from the frame—the large, open, uncarpeted room, with its bare, shining floor—the leases at the spinning-wheel—the French costume and appearance of Madame VIOLET and her sons and daughters, all carried me back to the other side of the Atlantic. After a short conversation with the VIOLETS, we walked down to the bridge, where two log-canoes, manned by Frenchmen—three CYR and a THIBAUDEAU—were waiting for us, and pushed off from the shore. A turn in the river very speedily hid from us the bridge and farm, our empty carriage, and the friends who had accompanied us from Grand Falls standing on the bank, in the evening sunshine, waving us their farewells, and it was not without pleasure that we felt that the same turn which screened them from our view, separated us for some time to come from civilized life.

It will be observed Governor GORDON speaks of four counties in the north of New Brunswick which still bear a marked French character. Well, gentlemen of French origin, we propose to restore these long-lost compatriots to your protection: in the Federal Union, which will recognise equally both languages, they will naturally look to you; their petitions will come to you, and their representatives will naturally be found allied with you. Suppose those four New Brunswick counties are influenced by the French vote, and two in Nova Scotia, and one in Newfoundland, you will, should you need them, have them as sure allies to your own compact body, to aid your legitimate influence in the Federal councils. (Cheers.) I shall proceed with my outline analysis of the maritime population, in order to establish the congruity and

congeniality of our proposed union. In point of time, the next oldest element in that population is the Irish settlement of Ferryland, in Newfoundland, undertaken by Lord BALTIMORE and Lord FALKLAND (Lord Lieutenant of Ireland at the time), immediately after the restoration of King CHARLES I., soon after 1660. Newfoundland still remains strongly Irish, as is natural, since it is the next parish to Ireland—(laughter)—and I think we saw a very excellent specimen of its Irish natives at our Conference, in AMBROSE SHEA. (Cries of hear, hear.) To me, I confess, it is particularly grateful to reflect that the only Irish colony, as it may be called, of our group, is to be included in the new arrangements. (Hear.) Another main element in the Lower Province population is the Highland Scotch. Large tracts of Prince Edward Island and Cape Breton were granted after the Peace of Paris, to officers and men of FRAZER'S Highlanders and other Scottish regiments, which had distinguished themselves during the seven years' war. If my hon. friend from Glen-garry (Mr. D. A. MACDONALD) had been with us last September at Charlottetown, he would have met clansmen, whom he would have been proud to know, and who could have conversed with him in his own cherished Gaelic.

MR. D. A. MACDONALD.—They are all over the world. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. MCGEE—So much the better for the world. (Cheers.) And I will tell him what I think is to their honor, that the Highlanders in all the provinces preserve faithfully the religion, as well as the language and traditions, of their fathers. The Catholic Bishop of Charlottetown is a MCINTYRE; his Right Rev. brother of Arichat (Cape Breton) is a MCKINNON; and in the list of the clergy, I find a constant succession of such names as McDONALD, MCGILLIS, MCGILLIVRAY, McLEOD, MCKENZIE and CAMERON—all "Anglo-Saxons" of course, and mixed up with them FOURNIERS, GAUVREAU, PAQUETS and MARTELLS, whose origin is easy to discover. (Cheers.) Another of the original elements of that population remains to be noticed—the U. E. Loyalists, who founded New Brunswick, just as surely as they founded Upper Canada, for whom New Brunswick was made a separate province in 1794, as Upper Canada was for their relatives in 1791. Their descendants still flourish in the land, holding many

positions of honor, and as a representative of the class, I shall only mention Judge WILMOT, who the other day declared in charging one of his grand juries, that if it were necessary to carry Confederation in New Brunswick, so impressed was he with the necessity of the measure to the very existence of British laws and British institutions, he was prepared to quit the bench for politics. (Cheers.) There are other elements also not to be overlooked. The thrifty Germans of Lunenburg, whose homes are the neatest upon the land, as their fleet is the tightest on the sea, and other smaller subdivisions; but I shall not prolong this analysis. I may observe, however, that this population is almost universally a native population of three or four or more generations. In New Brunswick, at the most there is about twelve per cent. of an immigrant people; in Nova Scotia, about eight; in the two islands, very much less. In the eye of the law we admit no disparity between natives and immigrants in this country; but it is to be considered that where men are born in the presence of the graves of their fathers, for even a few generations, the influence of that fact is great in enhancing their attachment to that soil. I admit, for my part, as an immigrant, of no divided allegiance to Canada and her interests; but it would be untrue and paltry to deny a divided affection between the old country and the new. Kept within just bounds, such an affection is reasonable, is right and creditable to those who cherish it. (Hear, hear.) Why I refer to this broad fact which distinguishes the populations of all the four seaward provinces as much as it does Lower Canada herself, is, to show the fixity and stability of that population; to show that they are by birth British Americans; that they can nearly all, of every origin, use that proud phrase when they look daily from their doors, "this is my own, my native land." (Cheers.) Let but that population and ours come together for a generation or two—such are the elements that compose, such the conditions that surround it—and their mutual descendants will hear with wonder, when the history of these present transactions are written, that this plan of union could ever have been seriously opposed by statesmen in Canada or elsewhere. (Cheers.) I am told, however, by one or two members of this House, and by exclusively-minded Canadians out of it—that they cannot entertain any patriotic feel

ing about this union with New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, and that they cannot look with any interest at those colonies, with which we have had hitherto so little association. "What's Hecuba to me, or I to Hecuba?" Well, I answer to that, know them and my word for it, you will like them. I have been on seven or eight journeys there, and have seen much of the people, and the more I have seen of them, the more I respected and esteemed them. (Hear, hear.) I say, then, to these gentlemen, that if you want to feel any patriotism on the subject; if you want to stir up a common sentiment of affection between these people and ourselves, bring us all into closer relation together, and having the elements of a vigorous nationality with us, each will find something to like and respect in the other; mutual confidence and respect will follow, and a feeling of being engaged in a common cause for the good of a common nationality will grow up of itself without being forced by any man's special advocacy. (Hear, hear.) The thing who shuts up his heart against his kindred, his neighbors, and his fellow-subjects, may be a very pretty fellow at a parish vestry, but do you call such a forked-radish as that, a man? (Laughter.) Don't so abuse the noblest word in the language. (Hear, hear.) Sir, there is one other argument for this union, or rather an illustration of its mutually advantageous character, which I draw from the physical geography and physical resources of the whole territory which it is proposed to unite; but before I draw the attention of the House to it, I may perhaps refer to a charge that probably will be made against me, that I am making what may appear to be a non-political speech. If it be non-political in the sense of non-partisan, then I plead guilty to the charge; but I think that on some of the points to which I have alluded the country is desirous of being informed, and as many hon. gentlemen have not had time to make a tour of the country to the east of us, those who have had the opportunity of doing so cannot, I think, better subserve the interest of the community than by giving what appears to them a fair, just and truthful sketch of those provinces and their people, and thus informing those in Canada who have not had the opportunity of making observations for themselves on the spot. (Hear, hear.) It was remarked by the late Sir JOHN BEVERLEY ROBINSON, in his letter to Lord JOHN RUSSELL in 1839, that if the Bri-

tish Government had attempted to maintain the ancient boundaries of New France, in the treaty which acknowledged the United States, it would have been impossible to do so. Those boundaries extend to Ohio on the south, and included much of what is now called by our neighbours "the North-West." There is great force, I think, in this observation. But in relation to what I may call the ground-plan on which we propose to erect our constitutional edifice, its natural oneness is admirable to contemplate. There is not one port or harbour of all the provinces now proposing to confederate, which cannot be reached from any other by all vessels, if not of too great draught, without ever once leaving our own waters. From the head of Lake Superior the same craft may coast uninterruptedly, always within sight of our own shores nearly the distance of a voyage to England—to St. John, Newfoundland. (Cheers.) We sometimes complain of our inland navigation, that we have it free but half the year round, but what it lacks at one season, it amply compensates by its vast capacity. (Cheers.) Last summer, when we visited Halifax in the *Queen Victoria*, which the good people of that blockade running stronghold mistook for a Confederate cruiser, we were the better part of a week steaming away, always in British American waters, within sight of the bold and beautiful coasts, which it was our privilege to call our own. (Cheers.) While we were thus following our river system to the open sea, I could not help often recurring to the vast extent of the whole. If any hon. gentleman who has never made, and who cannot find time to make, a journey through his own country, will only go to the library he will find an excellent substitute for such a voyage in KEITH JOHNSTON'S *Physical Atlas*, a book that when one opens its leaves his brain opens with the book. (Laughter.) He will find that our matchless St. Lawrence drains an area of 298,000 square miles, of which only 94,000 are occupied by the five great lakes taken together. I shall not attempt to tread in the path of my two friends who sit next me (Hon. Messrs. GALT and BROWN) by exhibiting in any detail the prospects of mutual commercial advantages opened up by this union. I have prepared a statement on this subject, giving certain general results,—which I do not present as complete, but only as proximately correct—and which I now beg to read to the House:—

IMPORTS.				EXPORTS.				
Province.	1868. Amount.	Compara- tive.	Amount per Head.	1868. Amount.	Compara- tive.	Amount per Head.	1868. Tonnage— In and Out.	Average Tonnage.
Canada.....	\$ 45,964,000	65.10	\$ 18 12	\$ 41,841,000	62.58	\$ 16 68	\$ 2,133,000	20 ct.
Nova Scotia.....	10,210,391	14.46	30 36	8,430,068	12.88	25 45	1,431,933	10 ct.
New Brunswick.....	7,764,824	11.00	30 80	8,984,784	13.43	25 56	1,886,980	15 ct.
Prince Edward Island.....	1,438,028	2.02	17 66	1,637,540	2.43	20 12	No return.	11 ct.
Newfoundland.....	5,243,730	7.42	43 75	6,002,212	8.97	48 96	"	10 ct.
Totals.....	\$70,608,965	100.00	\$21 43	\$66,846,604	100.00	\$20 29	(6,907,000 Lake.)	13.8 ct.

But there is one special source of wealth to be found in the Maritime Provinces, which was not in any detail exhibited by my hon. friends—I allude to the important article of coal. I think there can be no doubt that, in some parts of Canada, we are fast passing out of the era of wood as fuel, and entering on that of coal. In my own city every year, there is great suffering among the poor from the enormous price of fuel, and large sums are paid away by national societies and benevolent individuals, to prevent whole families

perishing for want of fuel. I believe must all conclude with Sir WILLIAM LORR, that we have no coal in Canada, and I venture to state, on my own authority other fact, that we have—a five months winter, generally very cold. Now, what the coal resources of our maritime friends whose mines Confederation would give free and untaxed access forever? I have these data from the authority in my hands from the highest authority on the subject, TAYLOR's *Coal Fields of the New World*.

Dr. A. GESNER, in a communication to the Geological Society of London, 1843, states the area of coal fields in New Brunswick been recently determined to be 7,500 square miles; 10,000 square miles, including Nova Scotia but exclusive of Cape Breton. Since his report he has explored the whole of this region, and has found the area covered by coal formation to be no less than 8,000 square miles in New Brunswick. He says the most productive coal beds prevail in the interior, those of Nova Scotia occur on the shores of bays and rivers, where they offer every advantage for mining operations. The coal of the two provinces are united at the boundary line, and belong to the carboniferous period. The developments of almost every season illustrate more clearly the magnitude of these fields, which extend from Newfoundland by Cape Breton, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and across a large portion of New Brunswick to the state of Maine. Mr. HANWOOD, a geologist of high standing, observes that the beautiful extent of these coal treasures it is impossible to describe. In Nova Scotia, Dr. GESNER's measurements exhibit an area of coal formation of 10,000 square miles, while Messrs. LOGAN, DAWSON and BROWN greatly exceed even that area. Dr. E. LOGAN demonstrated by a laborious survey the thickness or depth of the whole group in northern Nova Scotia to be over 2½ miles, an amount which far exceeds anything seen in the coal formation in other parts of North America; in this group there are seventy-six coal beds one after the other.

I must say, sir, that this is a convincing statement of facts, coming to us from the very highest authority, and I feel very much interested with the subject, even while making the statement. (Laughter.) The boundless coal fields will, under this present arrangement which is in fact our Reciprocity Treaty with the Lower Provinces—become, here the great resource of our towns for fuel. I see the cry is raised below by the anti-Confederates that to proceed with Confederation would be to entail the loss of the New England market for their coals. I do not see how they make that out, but even

anti-unionist might see that the population of Canada is within a fraction of that of all New England put together, that we consume in this country as much fuel per annum as they do in all New England; and, therefore, that we offer them a market under the union equal to that which these theorizers want to persuade their followers they would lose. (Hear, hear.) Sir, another cry raised by the anti-unionists below is, that they would have to fight for the defence of Canada—a very specious argument. What, sir, three millions and one million unite, and the one million must do the fighting for all. In proportion to their numbers no doubt these valiant gentlemen will have to fight, if fighting is to be done, but not one man or one shilling more than Canada, *pro rata*, will they have to fight or spend. On the contrary, the greater community, if she should not happen to be first attacked, would be obliged to fight for them, and in doing so, I do not hesitate to say, on far better authority than my own, that the man who fights for the valley and harbour of St. John, or even for Halifax, fights for Canada. I will suppose another not impossible case. I will suppose a hostile American army, on a fishery or any other war, finding it easier and cheaper to seize the lower colonies by land than by sea, by a march from a convenient rendezvous on Lake Champlain, through Lower Canada, into the upper part of New Brunswick, and so downward to the sea—a march like SHERMAN'S march from Knoxville to Savannah. While we obstructed such a march by every means in our power, from the Richelieu to Rivière du Loup, whose battles would we be fighting then? Why the seaports aimed at, for our common subjugation. (Hear, hear.) But the truth is, all these selfish views and arrangements are remarkably short-sighted, unworthy of the subject, and unworthy even of those who use them. In a commercial, in a military, in every point of view, we are all, rightly considered, dependant on each other. Newfoundland dominates the Gulf, and none of us can afford to be separated from her. Lord CHATHAM said he would as soon abandon Plymouth as Newfoundland, and he is said to have understood how to govern men. Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are Siamese twins, held together by that ligature of land between Baie Verte and Cumberland Basin, and the fate of the one must follow the fate of the other. (Hear, hear.) Prince Ed-

ward is only a little bit, broken off by the Northumberland Strait from those two bigger brethren, and Upper and Lower Canada are essential to each other's prosperity. Our very physical outline teaches us the lesson of union, and indicates how many mutual advantages we may all derive from the treaty we have made. Mr. SPEAKER, while we in Canada have no doubt of the ratification of the Intercolonial Treaty, by this House and country, I cannot conceal from myself that our friends in the Lower Provinces are fighting a battle with narrow views and vested interests, which are always most bitter in the smallest communities. There are coasting trade interests and railway interests at work; and there are the strong interests of honest ignorance and dishonest ingenuity. What can these men mean, who are no fools? Do they, too, fancy they can get a government made to their own private order? Do they think they can go on on the old system? Do they mean to give up the country to the Americans? Why not hang up at once the sign, "these provinces for sale—terms cash!—'greenbacks' taken at full value!" I rejoice to see the unionists of the Maritime Provinces so resolved, so high spirited and so united—and though their victory will not be won without work, yet I feel assured it will be a victory. If the honest and misguided would but reflect for a moment the risks they run by defeating, or even delaying this measure, I am sure they would, even yet, retract. (Hear, hear.) If we reject it now, is there any human probability that we shall ever see again so propitious a set of circumstances to bring about the same results? How they came about we all know. (Hear, hear.) The strange and fortunate events that have occurred in Canada; the extraordinary concessions made by the leaders of the Governments below—Dr. TUPPER, the Nova Scotian Premier, for instance, admitting to his confidence, and bringing with him here as his co-representatives, Hon. Messrs. ARCHIBALD and McCULLY, two of his most determined political opponents—can we ever expect, if we reject this scheme, that the same or similar things will occur again to favor it? Can we expect to see the leader of the Upper Canadian conservative party and the leader of the Upper Canadian liberals sitting side by side again, if this project fails to work out, in a spirit of mutual compromise and concession, the problem of our constitutional difficulties? No, sir, it is too much to expect. Miracles

would cease to be miracles if they were events of every day occurrence; the very nature of wonders requires that they should be rare; and this is a miraculous and wonderful circumstance, that men at the head of the Governments in five separate provinces, and men at the head of the parties opposing them, all agreed at the same time to sink party differences for the good of all, and did not shrink, at the risk of having their motives misunderstood, from associating together for the purpose of bringing about this result. (Cheers.) I have asked, sir, what risks do we run if we reject this measure? We run the risk of being swallowed up by the spirit of universal democracy that prevails in the United States. Their usual and favorite motto is—

No pent-up Utica contracts our powers,
But the whole boundless continent is ours.

That is the paraphrase of the Monroe doctrine. And the popular voice has favored—ay, and the greatest statesmen among them have looked upon it as inevitable—an extension of the principles of democracy over this continent. Now, I suppose a universal democracy is no more acceptable to us than a universal monarchy in Europe, and yet for three centuries—from CHARLES V. to NAPOLEON—our fathers combatted to the death against the subjection of all Europe to a single system or a single master, and heaped up a debt which has since burdened the producing classes of the Empire with an enormous load of taxation, which, perhaps, none other except the hardy and ever-growing industry of those little islands could have borne up under. (Hear, hear.) The idea of a universal democracy in America is no more welcome to the minds of thoughtful men among us, than was that of a universal monarchy to the mind of the thoughtful men who followed the standard of the third WILLIAM in Europe, or who afterwards, under the great MARLBOROUGH, opposed the armies of the particular dynasty that sought to place Europe under a single dominion. (Hear, hear.) But if we are to have a universal democracy on this continent, the Lower Provinces—the smaller fragments—will be “gobbled up” first, and we will come in afterwards by way of dessert. (Laughter.) The proposed Confederation will enable us to bear up shoulder to shoulder; to resist the spread of this universal democracy doctrine; it will make it more desirable to maintain on both

sides the connection that binds us to the parent State; it will raise us from the position of mere dependent colonies to a new and more important position; it will give us a new lease of existence under other and more favorable conditions; and resistance to this project, which is pregnant with so many advantages to us and to our children, means simply this, ultimate union with the United States. (Cheers.) But these are small matters, wholly unworthy of the attention of the SMITHS, and ANNANDS, and PALMERS, who have come forward to forbid the banns of British American union. Mr. SPEAKER, before I draw to a close the little remainder of what I have to say—and I am sorry to have detained the House so long—(cries of “No, no”)—I beg to offer a few observations *apropos* of my own position as an English-speaking member for Lower Canada. I venture, in the first place, to observe that there seems to be a good deal of exaggeration on the subject of race, occasionally introduced, both on the one side and the other, in this section of the country. I congratulate my honorable friend the Attorney General for this section on his freedom from such prejudices in general, though I still think in matters of patronage and the like he always thinks first of his own compatriots—(laughter)—for which neither do I blame him. But this theory of race is sometimes carried to an anti-Christian and unphilosophical excess. Whose words are those—“GOD hath made of one blood all the nations that dwell on the face of the earth?” Is not that the true theory of race? For my part, I am not afraid of the French Canadian majority in the future Local Government doing injustice, except accidentally; not because I am of the same religion as themselves; for origin and language are barriers stronger to divide men in this world than is religion to unite them. Neither do I believe that my Protestant compatriots need have any such fear. The French Canadians have never been an intolerant people; it is not in their temper, unless they had been persecuted, perhaps, and then it might have been as it has been with other races of all religions. Perhaps, on this subject, the House will allow me to read a very striking illustration of the tolerance of French Canadian character from a book I hold in my hand, the *Digest of the Synod Minutes of the Presbyterian Church of Canada*, by my worthy friend, the Rev. Mr. KEMP, of the

Free Church, of Montreal. The passage is on page seven of the introduction :—

About the year 1790 the Presbyterians of Montreal of all denominations, both British and American, organized themselves into a Church, and in the following year secured the services of the Rev. JOHN YOUNG. At this time they met in the Recollet Roman Catholic Church, but in the year following they erected the edifice which is now known as St. Gabriel Street Church—the oldest Protestant Church in the province. In their early Minutes we find them, in acknowledgment of the kindness of the Recollet Fathers, presenting them with "One box of candles, 56lbs., at 8d., and one hoghead of Spanish wine at £6 5s."

(Laughter.) I beg my hon. friends, who may have different notions of Christian intercourse at this time of day, just to fancy doings of that sort. (Hear, hear.) Here, on the one hand, are the Recollet Fathers giving up one of their own churches to the disciples of JOHN KNOX to enable them to worship GOD after their own manner, and perhaps to have a gird at Popery in the meantime—(great laughter)—and here, on the other hand, are the grateful Presbyterians presenting to these same Seminary priests wine and wax tapers in acknowledgment of the use of their church, for Presbyterian service. Certainly a more characteristic instance of true tolerance on both sides can hardly be found in the history of any other country. I cite this little incident to draw from it this practical moral—that those who are seeking, and, in some particulars, I believe justly seeking, the settlement of Protestant education in Lower Canada on firmer ground than it now occupies, might well afford to leave the two great Seminaries of Montreal and Quebec at peace. No two institutions in Christendom ever more conscientiously fulfilled the ends of their erection; and whoever does not know all, but even a little, of the good services they have rendered to both the people and the Government of Lower Canada, to the civilisation and settlement of this country, has much yet to learn of the history of Canada. (Hear, hear.) To close this topic, I have no doubt whatever, with a good deal of moderation and a proper degree of firmness, all that the Protestant minority in Lower Canada can require, by way of security to their educational system, will be cheerfully granted to them by this House. I, for one, as a Roman Catholic, will cordially second and support any such amendments, properly framed. I will merely add

in relation to an observation of my friend (Hon. Mr. BROWN) last night on the subject of the Catholic Separate Schools of Upper Canada, that I accepted for my own part, as a finality, the amended act of 1868. I did so because it granted all the petitioners asked, and I think they ought to be satisfied. I will be no party to the re-opening of the question; but I say this, that if there are to be any special guarantees or grants extended to the Protestant minority of Lower Canada, I think the Catholic minority in Upper Canada ought to be placed in precisely the same position—neither better nor worse. (Hear, hear.) At present I shall not add another word on this subject, as I am not aware of the particular nature of the amendments asked for at present, either east or west. (Hear, hear.) All who have spoken on this subject have said a good deal, as was natural, of the interests at stake in the success or failure of this plan of Confederation. I trust the House will permit me to add a few words as to the principle of Confederation considered in itself. In the application of this principle to former constitutions, there certainly always was one fatal defect, the weakness of the central authority. Of all the Federal constitutions I have ever heard or read of, this was the fatal malady: they were short-lived, they died of consumption. (Laughter.) But I am not prepared to say that because the Tuscan League elected its chief magistrates for two months and lasted a century, that therefore the Federal principle failed. On the contrary, there is something in the frequent, fond recurrence of mankind to this principle, among the freest people, in their best times and worst dangers, which leads me to believe, that it has a very deep hold in human nature itself—an excellent basis for a government to have. But indeed, sir, the main question is the due distribution of powers—a question I dare not touch to-night, but which I may be prepared to say something on before the vote is taken. The principle itself seems to me to be capable of being so adapted as to promote internal peace and external security, and to call into action a genuine, enduring and heroic patriotism. It is a fruit of this principle that makes the modern Italian look back with sorrow and pride over a dreary waste of seven centuries to the famous field of Legnano; it was this principle kindled the beacons which burn yet on the rocks of Uri; it was this principle that broke the dykes of Holland and overwhelm-

ed the Spanish with the fate of the Egyptian oppressor. It is a principle capable of inspiring a noble ambition and a most salutary emulation. You have sent your young men to guard your frontier. You want a principle to guard your young men, and thus truly defend your frontier. For what do good men (who make the best soldiers) fight? For a line of scripture or chalk line—for a pretext or for a principle? What is a better boundary between nations than a parallel of latitude, or even a natural obstacle?—what really keeps nations intact and apart?—a principle. When I can hear our young men say as proudly, “our Federation” or “our Country,” or “our Kingdom,” as the young men of other countries do, speaking of their own, then I shall have less apprehension for the result of whatever trials the future may have in store for us. (Cheers.) It has been said that the Federal Constitution of the United States has failed. I, sir, have never said it. The Attorney General West told you the other night that he did not consider it a failure; and I remember that in 1861, when in this House I remarked the same thing, the only man who then applauded the statement was the Attorney General West—so that it is pretty plain he did not simply borrow the argument for use the other night, when he was advocating a Federal union among ourselves. (Hear, hear.) It may be a failure for us, paradoxical as this may seem, and yet not a failure for them. They have had eighty years’ use of it, and having discovered its defects, may apply a remedy and go on with it eighty years longer. But we also are lookers on, who saw its defects as the machine worked, and who have prepared contrivances by which it can be improved and kept in more perfect order when applied to ourselves. And one of the foremost statesmen in England, distinguished alike in politics and literature, has declared, as the President of the Council informed us, that we have combined the best parts of the British and the American systems of government, and this opinion was deliberately formed at a distance, without prejudice, and expressed without interested motives of any description. (Hear, hear.) We have, in relation to the head of the Government, in relation to the judiciary, in relation to the second chamber of the Legislature, in relation to the financial responsibility of the General Government,

and in relation to the public officials whose tenure of office is during good behaviour, instead of at the caprice of a party—in all these respects we have adopted the British system; in other respects we have learned something from the American system, and I trust and believe we have made a very tolerable combination of both (Hear, hear.) The principle of Federation is a generous principle. It is a principle that gives men local duties to discharge, and invests them at the same time with general supervision, that excites a healthy sense of responsibility and comprehension. It is a principle that has produced a wise and true spirit of statesmanship in all countries in which it has ever been applied. It is a principle eminently favorable to liberty, because local affairs are left to be dealt with by local bodies and cannot be interfered with by those who have no local interest in them, while matters of a general character are left exclusively to a general government. It is a principle coincident with every government that ever gave extended and important services to a country, because all governments have been more or less confederations in their character. Spain was a federation, for although it had a king reigning over the whole country, it had its local governments for the administration of local affairs. The British Isles are a confederation, and the old French dukedoms were confederated in the States General. It is a principle that runs through all the history of civilisation in one form or another, and exists alike in monarchies and democracies; and having adopted it as the principle of our future government, there were only the details to arrange and agree upon. Those details are before you. It is not in our power to alter any of them even if the House desires it. If the House desires it can reject the treaty, but we cannot, nor can the other provinces which took part in its negotiation, consent that it shall be altered in the slightest particular. (Hear, hear.) Mr. SPEAKER, I am sorry to have detained the House so long, and was not aware till I had been some time on my legs that my physical force was so inadequate to the exposition of these few points which, not specially noticed by my predecessors in this debate, I undertook to speak upon. We stand at present in this position: we are bound in honor, we are bound in good faith, to four provinces occupied by our fellow-colonists, to carry out

the measure agreed upon here in the last week of October. We are bound to carry it to the foot of the Throne, and ask there from Her Majesty, according to the first resolution of the Address, that She will be graciously pleased to direct legislation to be had on this subject. We go to the Imperial Government, the common arbiter of us all, in our true Federal metropolis—we go there to ask for our fundamental Charter. We hope, by having that Charter that can only be amended by the authority that made it, that we will lay the basis of permanency for our future government. The two great things that all men aim at in any free government, are liberty and permanency. We have had liberty enough—too much perhaps in some respects—but at all events, liberty to our heart's content. There is not on the face of the earth a freer people than the inhabitants of these colonies. But it is necessary there should be respect for the law, a high central authority, the virtue of civil obedience, obeying the law for the law's sake; even when a man's private conscience may convince him sufficiently that the law in some cases may be wrong, he is not to set up his individual will against the will of the country expressed through its recognised constitutional organs. We need in these provinces, we can bear, a large infusion of authority. I am not at all afraid this Constitution errs on the side of too great conservatism. If it be found too conservative now, the downward tendency in political ideas which characterizes this democratic age, is a sufficient guarantee for amendment. That is the principle on which this instrument is strong and worthy of the support of every colonist, and through which it will secure the warm approbation of the Imperial authorities. We have here no traditions and ancient venerable institutions; here, there are no aristocratic elements hallowed by time or bright deeds; here, every man is the first settler of the land, or removed from the first settler one or two generations at the furthest; here, we have no architectural monuments calling up old associations; here, we have none of those old popular legends and stories which in other countries have exercised a powerful share in the government; here, every man is the sor of his own works. (Hear, hear.) We have none of those influences about us which, elsewhere, have their effect upon government just as much as the invisible atmosphere itself tends to influence life, and animal and vegetable

existence. This is a new land—a land of pretension because it is new; because classes and systems have not had that time to grow here naturally. We have no aristocracy but of virtue and talent, which is the only true aristocracy, and is the old and true meaning of the term. (Hear, hear.) There is a class of men rising in these colonies, superior in many respects to others with whom they might be compared. What I should like to see is—that fair representatives of the Canadian and Acadian aristocracy, should be sent to the foot of the Throne with that scheme, to obtain for it the royal sanction—a scheme not suggested by others, or imposed upon us, but one the work of ourselves, the creation of our own intellect and of our own free, unbiassed and untrammelled will. I should like to see our best men go there, and endeavor to have this measure carried through the Imperial Parliament—going into Her Majesty's presence, and by their manner, if not actually by their speech, saying—"During Your Majesty's reign we have had Responsible Government conceded to us; we have administered it for nearly a quarter of a century, during which we have under it doubled our population and more than quadrupled our trade. The small colonies which your ancestors could scarcely see on the map have grown into great communities. A great danger has arisen in our neighborhood. Over our homes a cloud hangs, dark and heavy. We do not know when it may burst. With our own strength we are not able to combat against the storm, what we can do, we will do cheerfully and loyally. But we want time to grow—we want more people to fill our country, more industrious families of men to develop our resources—we want to increase our prosperity—we want more extended trade and commerce—we want more land tilled—more men established through our wastes and wildernesses. We of the British North American Provinces want to be joined together, that if danger comes, we can support each other in the day of trial. We come to Your Majesty, who have given us liberty, to give us unity, that we may preserve and perpetuate our freedom; and whatsoever Charter, in the wisdom of Your Majesty and of Your Parliament, you give us, we shall loyally obey and fulfil it as long as it is the pleasure of Your Majesty and Your Successors to maintain the connection between Great Britain and these Colonies." (The hon. gentleman then sat down amid prolonged cheers.)

ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD moved that the debate be adjourned till Thursday, 13th instant, and be then the first Order of the Day, after half-past seven.

HON. MR. HOLTON said :—MR. SPEAKER, we on this side had some doubt lest the Opposition might be placed at a disadvantage, by allowing the speeches of the Government to go to the country, without any comment on them. But if these five speeches, to which we have now listened, contain all that can be said in favor of this scheme, we have no fear of letting them go unanswered. I listened to the speech of the Attorney General West with great disappointment. The cause of that disappointment was simple enough. The hon. gentleman was, in that speech, giving the lie to twenty years of his political life. He was offering to the cause he is now advocating one speech against his continuous voice and vote for twenty years. He was struggling, all through that speech, against the consciousness of the falseness of his political position, and what every one conceived would be the brightest effort of his life was the feeblest address he ever delivered on any important question, during the twenty years he has sat in this House. The Attorney General West was followed by the Attorney General East. I know not how to characterize the speech of that hon. gentleman, further than to say that it was quite characteristic. It was perfectly characteristic. I doubt whether any attorney general who ever existed, since attorneys general were first invented, besides that hon. gentleman, could have delivered, on an occasion like this, the speech which he delivered. It may be said of that hon. gentleman, as the poet said of a very different style of man—one who was not an hon. gentleman in the sense in which we are now speaking—"None but himself can be his parallel." (Laughter.) No attorney general, I repeat, since attorneys general were first invented, could have delivered a speech at all like that pronounced by the Attorney General East, in opening his side of the great question now submitted to the consideration of Parliament. Then followed the singularly able speech of my hon. friend the Finance Minister, which was delivered with all that ease and grace that mark all his efforts in this House, and with that fluency of diction which we all admire, and which I am always ready to acknowledge. But I think it will also be admitted by that hon. gentle-

man's own friends, that his speech was chiefly remarkable for an adroit avoidance of the very topics on which he was expected, or might have been expected, to address the House, and for a very adroit assumption of those very things which he might have been expected to prove. Such, at least, was the impression which that speech made upon my mind. Then came the speech—the herculean effort—of my hon. friend, the President of the Council, who, I am sorry to see, is not in his seat, and with reference, therefore, to whose speech I shall not make the remarks I might have done, if he were in his place. I must say, however, that that speech was a disappointing speech. (Cries of "oh! oh!" and "hear, hear.") I did expect, from the conspicuous part which that hon. gentleman has so long played in the politics of the country—from the leading part he has had in all the proceedings which have conducted to the project now before the House—that we should have had from him, at all events, some vindication of the steps which he has seen fit to take—some vindication of the principles of the proposed union, so contrary to all those principles which he has hitherto advocated. I say, we did expect that we would have had something of that kind from that hon. gentleman. But, instead of that, his whole speech was mainly an apology for his abandonment of all those objects for which he has contended through his political life, saving only the shadow of representation by population, to attain which shadow he seems to have sacrificed all the material objects, all the real objects, for the attainment of which the agitation for that change has proceeded on his part. Then we have had, to-night, the speech of my hon. friend, the Minister of Agriculture, a speech which I admit was one of very great interest, as a historical essay—one which will read very nicely in those reports which we are to get in a few days—one which does very great credit to his literary research and literary taste—but one, which I do venture to say, had very little practical bearing on the question that is now before us. Well, I repeat, I am not afraid that these speeches should go to the country unanswered. The country will see that these hon. gentlemen have utterly failed to establish a cause for revolution. They are proposing revolution, and it was incumbent upon them to establish a necessity for revolution. All revolutions are unjustifiable, except on the ground

of necessity. These hon. gentlemen were, therefore, bound to establish this necessity. The country will see too, that they have failed to explain, to vindicate and to justify the disregard of parliamentary law and of parliamentary usage by which they are attempting to extort from this House an assent, not merely to the principle of union—which would be perfectly proper—but to all the clumsy contrivances adopted by that self-constituted junta which sat in Quebec a few weeks since, for giving effect to that union, and to all those huxtering arrangements by which the representatives of the Lower Provinces were induced to give in their adhesion, and, so far as they could, the adhesion of their provinces to this scheme. I say, they quite failed to explain this and to vindicate it. The country too will see that these hon. gentlemen have carefully refrained from entering into any explanation of the concomitants of this scheme—of the proposed constitutions of the local governments for instance, which are, at least, as important as the Constitution of the Federal Government. It is quite manifest that a union, even if generally desirable, might become undesirable from the bad, or inconvenient, or expensive arrangements incident to the adoption of that union. And that really explains the position of many hon. gentlemen in this House, who, like myself, are not opposed to the Federal principle, but who find themselves obliged to go counter apparently to their own convictions, because they cannot accept a union clogged with such conditions as this union is. (Hear, hear.) Then it might have been expected that some further, some more distinct, information might have been given than has been given, on the all-important question of education, in respect of which, we have been given to understand, that some final and permanent system will be enacted by this Legislature, in view of the proposed federation of the provinces. We might also have expected that some information would have been vouchsafed to us in respect to the Intercolonial Railway—which we are in fact voting for, without having gone into Committee of the Whole. Without having in point of fact any information with regard to it whatever, we are voting the cost of that road, so far as this Legislature can do so—a road which will certainly cost us \$20,000,000, and, for aught we know, may cost us \$40,000,000. I do think we should

have had some information with respect to that road from those hon. gentlemen, in order that the whole case might have gone to the country. (Hear, hear.) And then, with respect to the defences of the country—what sort of utterances have we had on that subject? We were told by the President of the Council that the subject was engaging the attention of the Imperial Government, and he vindicated union, because defence can be better given by united, than by separate colonies. And what have we been told tonight by the Minister of Agriculture? That despatches are received by every second mail from England telling us that we are entering on a new era with reference to the question of defence. What does all this mean? It means that, in connection with this union, we are to have entailed upon us untold expenditures for the defence of the country. (Hear, hear.) Ought they not to place this information, these despatches, before the House and the country, before any final and irrevocable action is taken with regard to the scheme? These are a few, and but a few, of the leading topics which constitute the contents of this scheme of Federation, in respect to which we had a right to expect the fullest possible information, but in respect to which hon. gentlemen have either maintained a studied reserve, or have spoken, like the Delphic oracles, in language which defies interpretation. (Laughter.) I say, then, let these speeches go to the country, and if the country, by perusing them, is not awakened to the dangers which threaten it from the adoption of this crude, immature, ill-considered scheme of hon. gentlemen—a scheme which threatens to plunge the country into measureless debt—into difficulties and confusions utterly unknown to the present constitutional system—imperfect as that system confessedly is—if the country is not awakened to a sense of its danger by the perusal of these speeches—I do not say I will despair of my country, for I will never despair of my country—(cheers)—but I anticipate for my country a period of calamities, a period of tribulation, such as it has never heretofore known. (Cheers and counter cheers.)

The motion for the adjournment of the debate was agreed to, and the House then adjourned.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

FRIDAY, *February 10, 1865.*

HON. MR. MACPHERSON, continued his speech commenced yesterday, as follows:—In the remarks I offered to this House yesterday, hon. gentlemen, I desired to state my reasons for voting against the amendment of my hon. friend from Wellington, and for the resolutions of Hon. Sir E. P. TACHÉ. I stated that I believed the Confederation scheme was desired by an overwhelming majority of the people of this country, certainly by a very large majority of my own constituents. I stated further that as the resolutions had been before the country for a long time—for a number of months—and as there was no evidence whatever before us of their being disapproved of as a whole, or indeed any one of them, we had good reason to assume that the people were satisfied. The press had published them in full, and there was not one petition against the measure. We have every right to assume that the people are in favor of Confederation. I went on further, and said that during last autumn, I was constantly and daily bringing the matter before a very large constituency, where it was always approved of. During a portion of that canvass, one of my opponents mooted what I may call the smaller Confederation—that is, the Confederation of the two parts of Canada, and the people rejected and scouted it, while approving of the larger one. (Hear.) I went on to say, with respect to the proposed change in the constitution of this House, that I did not look upon it as a disfranchisement of the electors, although the nominative was to be substituted for the elective principle, because while the nomination was not to be made by the people directly, it was to be made on the recommendation of their representatives in the other House of Parliament,—in fact in a manner analogous to the mode adopted for selecting the Senate of the United States—two senators being elected by the Legislature of each state. In our case the monarchical principle was strictly preserved, and the Legislative Council was to be appointed by the Crown, on the advice of the Government of the day. If I viewed it as a measure of disfranchisement, then, looking at my obligation to maintain the franchise of the people, I should have more hesitation in voting for it. An hon. gentleman has said

that the change, from the nominative to the elective plan, was made at the demand of the people. That assertion is not historically correct; it is not correct as far as Upper Canada is concerned, and I think not with respect to Lower Canada either. There was, at one time, a desire in Lower Canada, for the election of its legislative councillors, but the public men who carried out the change, did so more out of respect to the traditions of the country than from any pressure that existed then. In Upper Canada, I am quite sure, that so far from the people desiring it, they were either lukewarm or opposed to it. The liberal and reform party of Upper Canada were all opposed to it. It is well known that the late Hon. ROBERT BALDWIN, so many years the leader of that party, was always opposed to the change. And it is also well known, that the hon. gentleman who is and has been for years the leader of that party, and who now holds in the Government the position of the President of the Council (Hon. Mr. BROWN), opposed the change to the very last wherever his influence extended, in the press which he controlled, and in his place in Parliament I myself saw him stand up to vote against the third reading of the bill. It cannot, therefore, be said that the alteration was made at the earnest desire of the people. (Hear, hear.) I went on further, and stated that I looked on the measure as one which did not admit of amendment, since if we were to amend it, there were nine other houses which might claim the right to do the same, and it could, perhaps, never be carried out. I then expressed approval of the financial arrangements contemplated, and differed from my hon. friend from Port Hope (Hon. Mr. SEYMOUR), who said the revenues of the provinces in past times should have been made the basis on which they should bring their debts into the Confederation. Inasmuch as we are not to continue separate provinces, and not to contribute separate revenues to the treasury, but are to be subject to the same imposts and to have one tariff, a capitation basis is the proper one, and not that desired by my hon. friend. (Hear.) I went on to say that the trifling amount to be paid to New Brunswick by the Confederation, for ten years, was necessary under the circumstances, and ought not to be allowed to weigh for one moment against the benefits to be derived from the proposed arrangement. The hon. gentleman from Niagara (Hon.

Mr. CURRIE) said our expenditure would be greatly increased. I said that would depend upon ourselves, for we should continue to have the management of our own affairs, and the economy with which they are conducted will depend upon those who administer them. If great improvements are carried out—if the Intercolonial Railway is built, and our canals enlarged—if harbors are constructed on Lake Huron, as they must be—and if further aid should be granted to extend a railway to those harbors—if all this is done, it will be impossible to effect it and not increase our present expenditure—but those improvements will be amongst ourselves in Canada, and we shall enjoy the benefits they will confer; and Canada, it should be remembered, will have a just voice in the Confederate Legislature. I myself hope these great improvements will be carried on in the west, simultaneously with the Intercolonial Railway, although this is the only one specifically referred to in the resolutions—the enlargement of the canals being only spoken of generally. The Intercolonial Railway, hon. gentlemen, must be constructed if we have Confederation; but I hope western improvements will be carried on at the same time. (Hear, hear.) I think, honorable gentlemen, we should be governed in our votes by the consideration of the effect of this measure upon the prosperity of the provinces. If it is to do us good, we should adopt it without unnecessary delay. What is it that we expect? Have we not reason to believe that it will settle the sectional difficulties which have so long agitated and distracted the country? Will it not be the means of extending our influence over a large and most valuable territory? Will it not open the way for us to two of the finest harbors on the Atlantic—St. John and Halifax? Will it not give us access to the ocean at all seasons of the year? Will it not open to us the coal fields of the Lower Provinces? Will it not add nearly another million to our present population, and place under one government four millions of souls? (Hear.) But if the measure fails, what will our position be? I believe that our position in Upper Canada would be one of hopelessness, one bordering on despair—with none of the questions settled that have been agitating us, and which have checked the progress of the country; with representation by population not granted, and no prospect of it being granted for a long time to come, while the

agitation for it could not possibly cease until it was granted. (Hear, hear.) Furthermore, hon. gentlemen, you all know the influence that the agreement arrived at in the Conference had upon our credit in England; that it had the effect of raising the price of our securities 15 to 17 per cent. But if we fail to agree upon the measure here in Parliament, what will be the effect in Britain? Would there not be a feeling of disappointment—would not our friends there almost despair of our ever placing ourselves in a position to carry on our affairs with credit, and acting for ourselves in a statesmanlike way? Some hon. gentlemen speak of dreading to take the responsibility of a vote on a question which is to make a change in the constitution of this House, without consulting the people. Why! what are we here for if it is not to take responsibility? The people send us here for that purpose, to act as we think best upon all measures that may be presented to us. But under existing circumstances, I think the responsibility of postponing the adoption of the scheme, of putting Confederation off, is very much greater than the responsibility of sanctioning it. (Hear, hear.) I cannot help thinking that if we postpone the measure—and to adopt any amendment would have the effect of postponing it, and perhaps, of losing Confederation for ever—our conduct will be considered extremely factious and unpatriotic. A good deal has been said about a possible dead-lock between this House and the other House, but there has been little of that in past times, and nothing of a serious nature. If, however, the amendment passes, I can imagine a dead-lock which might be extremely prejudicial to this House—prejudicial to its influence in the country; nay, almost destructive of it. Suppose these resolutions to be carried in the other House by a large majority, which I have little doubt will be the case, and we carry an amendment here—suppose all the legislatures of the Lower Provinces adopt the resolutions, and this House stands alone in rejecting them—do you believe the British Parliament will be turned aside from what it believes to be the best interests of British America by the action of this House? I can imagine a dead-lock occurring then, and one in consequence of which the opinion of this House might be set aside and its vote disregarded. Until this measure is carried out it is impossible the

defences of the country can be properly attended to, while all must admit it is most important they should be proceeded with. Is it patriotic, honorable gentlemen, in the presence of such a state of things, and in view of circumstances which all thinking men admit to be most serious, is it wise to delay unnecessarily the passing of these resolutions? Honorable gentlemen may feel that they do not meet the views of every one in all particulars, but they must see the beneficial tendency of the whole, and they cannot fail to see the importance of getting them passed without delay, for if they are to receive the sanction of the Imperial Parliament at its next session, there is no time to be lost. (Hear, hear.) One honorable gentleman has said the people are not satisfied with the measure. I believe they are perfectly satisfied. It has been before them for a long time, and they are possessed of sufficient intelligence to have made their disapprobation known if it was felt. But, to shew the feeling in reference to the matter, I will read two or three extracts from a report which I received this morning of the proceedings of the Counties Council of York and Peel. These counties send four representatives to the other House of Parliament, and they comprise portions of three of the divisions represented in this Chamber—Midland, Peel and York. Mr. GRAHAM, a member of the council, moved that a select committee be appointed to draft a petition to the Legislature as to the advisability of the people being consulted before the scheme of Confederation should be carried into effect. I will now read from the report:—

Mr. GRAHAM, Vaughan, argued that he did not introduce the resolution with any such intention, for he did not regard it as political. The Administration was composed of men of different shades of politics, and hence the question was not one of any particular party. The present Parliament was not elected to consider this question, and should therefore not pronounce on the scheme without first consulting the people. On questions of far less interest they had gone to the country, and he thought they should on this, as it involved large interests, and was of the greatest importance. The Attorney General had said, in his place in Parliament, that the scheme must be adopted without any amendments, but he (Mr. GRAHAM) thought it needed amendment so far as the people of Upper Canada were concerned.

Mr. HARTLEY said the whole scheme was now before the country, and the people who were interested in the matter were aware of its provisions. In the very riding represented in part by the very

mover of the resolution, the people gave expression in favor of Confederation by the election of the Hon. W. P. HOWLAND; and in fact at every election held since the scheme was proposed, the candidates elected have declared in its favor. He considered the Attorney General perfectly right in declaring that the resolutions must pass without amendment. The measure, as it stood, had received the sanction of all the delegates representing.

Mr. GRAHAM, Gore, stated that some of the members looked upon the resolution as being of a political character. However, be that as it may, the resolution was now before the chair, and had to be disposed of. He thought the question of Confederation was in the hands of the best judges, and they would decide whether it would be advantageous to Canada or not. These representatives of the people were all well posted up in the resources of the provinces, and how such could be best developed, and therefore he thought the question should be left with them for decision. As to an appeal to the people, he could not see what good results would flow from it. The resolutions passed at the Quebec Conference on Confederation were before the people and their representatives, and it is for the latter to decide for or against them; and they are undoubtedly in a good position to form correct conclusions concerning them. He could not see what reasons the statesmen of Canada would have in sacrificing the interests of our country. They all had a common interest with ourselves, and hence would not be likely to do anything detrimental to the best interests of Canada. As regarded the submitting of the question to the people, Mr. GRAHAM thought that ample time had been given the representatives during the recess, to ascertain the feelings of the people on the subject, and that, therefore, they went to Quebec perfectly prepared to deal with the question without putting the country to the expense of a general election. An appeal to the people would be a useless expenditure, and, therefore, he would oppose the resolution.

On being put to the council, the motion was lost on the vote of 6 to 25.

This, honorable gentlemen, is the opinion of the Municipal Council of York and Peel, and I hope this House will do as that council desire, and decide upon the measure without resorting to any course that can produce any delay whatever. (Hear, hear.) So important is this scheme considered in England, as well as in our own country, that I believe the vote taken on it will be regarded as a test of our desire to remain in connection with the British Empire, to maintain our allegiance to our beloved Sovereign, or of our indifference to the prospect of being merged into another country. This might be an unjust conclusion to arrive at, but we have recent examples in our own history of

the way such conclusions are formed abroad. I remember a vote which was misconstrued, much to the prejudice of this country—I refer to that on the Militia Bill rejected in 1862. There is no doubt the rejection of that bill gave rise to the opinion which prevails in England—and you cannot convince the people there to the contrary—that Canadians are unwilling to defend themselves. Nothing could be more unjust to our people than to entertain such an idea, nothing more unjust even to the majority who voted against that bill; but still that was the conviction arrived at, which it took a long time to modify, and which is not entirely removed to this day. I believe that vote has cost the country a very large sum of money in various ways. (Hear, hear.) In conclusion, let me just say that we cannot remain any longer as we are; we have to advance in some direction, and I believe we are going in the right direction when we proceed towards Confederation. I am very much disposed to agree with the honorable and gallant Premier, that we are on the top of an inclined plane, and that if we do not adopt Confederation, we shall very likely find ourselves descending it against our wish, and plunged into a maelstrom of debt, democracy and demagogism. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. BOULTON said he rejoiced to find, in the accession to the House of the honorable member who had just spoken, a gentleman so well calculated to sustain its credit, and to assist by his enlightened and thoroughly patriotic views in the disposal of the many and important questions with which it had to deal, in a manner worthy of the House and beneficial to the country. With respect to the measure in debate, he must state he was delighted at the principles it embodied. He was strongly in its favor, and so far from regarding it as imperilling the interests of the province, thought it eminently adapted to advance its prosperity and welfare. He was not a young man, having numbered more than half a century of years, during the greater part of which period he had filled a seat in either one or the other of the Houses of Parliament, but he had never yet known a measure of equal importance brought under discussion. He might possibly not live to see it carried, but hoped and expected he would, and if it were, he had no doubt it would realize all the anticipations of its framers, and issue in the greatest advantages not to the colonies alone, but to the Mother Country likewise. During the time he had been in Parliament he

could safely say he had been guided by an earnest purpose to vote rightly, but yet he had two or three votes to regret, and that which he most regretted, was the one he gave against the union of Upper and Lower Canada. In this he felt now, as he had felt before, that he was wrong, but his consolation was that he had acted independently and conscientiously, not allowing himself to swerve from what he regarded as his duty even by the earnest entreaties of one of his most valued friends, the then Attorney General for Upper Canada, who had taken a different view of the case. He now recognized the wisdom of the measure, and was glad his fears had been disappointed, and that great benefits had resulted from it to both sections. He viewed the union now proposed as fraught with the largest advantages to all the British North American Provinces, and believed his anticipations would be realized. He had often crossed the Atlantic and travelled extensively in England and the United States, but it was not until last summer, as he acknowledged with shame, that he had paid a visit to the Lower Provinces, now proposed to be united with Canada. This ignorance of sister colonies so near to our own country, he thought, was not creditable to any legislator, and he hoped other honorable members would feel it their duty to acquire for themselves information which was so necessary to their position. Well, he had been there last summer, and his opinions respecting those countries had immediately undergone a very sensible change. He had not expected to see such a beautiful city as St. John, N. B., or such a place as Halifax. He had conceived the people as poor and struggling for existence, but was delighted to find merchants doing a great business, and exhibiting as high a standing and as much enterprise as any in Canada. Then, these provinces were distinguished by the most devoted attachment to the British Empire and loyalty to the British Crown, sentiments which he was unfeignedly delighted to observe. He hoped these sentiments would continue to prevail and even be strengthened by the Confederation now contemplated. (Hear, hear.) When he represented a constituency in Upper Canada and had to seek reëlection, he had always hung out his flag with "British supremacy" inscribed thereon—(hear, hear,)—and he hoped that the sentiment would continue to be cherished in the country so long as he lived. As to the allegations of some honorable members that the people were ignorant as to the merits of the measure proposed, he could say that, so far as the locality from which h

came was concerned, it was a serious error. It had engaged the attention of the people more or less for many years, and especially of late. After alluding to the favorable consideration of a Confederation of the British North American Provinces by many distinguished British statesmen, such as the late Earl of DURHAM and the late Sir WILMOT HORTON, formerly Under Secretary of State, many years ago, the hon. gentleman spoke of the opinion of a particular friend of his own, a distinguished member of the other House, Mr. MORRIS, son of the late Hon. WM. MORRIS, with whom he (Honorable Mr. BOULTON) had had the pleasure of acting for many years in the House of Assembly of Upper Canada. Mr. MORRIS, the present member for South Lanark, in a pamphlet published by him, in 1858, expressed himself clearly and distinctly in favor of the union of the British North American Provinces, and in that pamphlet quoted the views of the present American Secretary of State, Mr. SEWARD, and which he (Hon. Mr. BOULTON) read as follows. Mr. MORRIS introduces those views thus :—

That day may be and I trust is far distant, but sure I am that whatever, in the upheavings of the old world and the restless whirl of events may betide, yet the connection between our country and the parent state will not be rudely severed, but fostered by the power and might of Britain, and, rising in strength and power, thousands of strong hands and bold hearts within our borders will cherish towards Britain sentiments of warm affection and attached loyalty, and will be ready, if need be, in the contests for liberty that may arise, to stand side by side in the foremost rank with the armies of Britain.

There is, indeed, vast room for speculation as to the future of this great British Colonial Empire, and its consideration has engrossed and is engrossing the energies of many minds. Amongst others, hear what Senator SEWARD thinks of us : "Hitherto, in common with most of my countrymen, as I suppose, I have thought Canada, or, to speak more accurately, British America, to be a mere strip lying north of the United States, easily detachable from the parent state, but incapable of sustaining itself, and therefore ultimately, nay right soon, to be taken on by the Federal union without materially changing or affecting its own condition or development. I have dropped the opinion as a national conceit. I see in British North America, stretching as it does across the continent from the shores of Labrador and New foundland to the Pacific, and occupying a considerable belt of the temperate zone, traversed equally with the United States by the lakes, and enjoying the magnificent shores of the St. Lawrence, with its thousands of islands in the river and gulf, a region grand enough for the seat of a great empire."

21

Secretary SEWARD (who was known to be one of the principal men in the American Government) once regarded this country as a poor one, but it was clear he no longer thought so, but had formed a very high opinion of our resources and capabilities. There was no doubt that Canada was a great country and destined to be much greater still, and he held that if we were true to ourselves we could well sustain ourselves, especially as in the effort (if effort ever were needed) we were sure to enlist the sympathies, co-operation and support of the Empire. (Hear, hear.) Then he was satisfied that as the project of Confederation was favorably received at home, as calculated to strengthen our position, we might expect all the aid that we needed. He regretted not being prepared to support his views by statistical statements, but other honorable members who were much more competent than himself, had done so, and no doubt others would follow. Of this, however, he was convinced, that we would lose nothing by the union, but would considerably improve our revenue. The Lower Provinces possessed advantages which we had not, and among them their coal and their gold fields might be regarded as of great value. We would soon require a large and constant supply of coal, a mineral which, so far, had not been found in Canada. It was really melancholy that there should have been so little commercial intercourse between us and those provinces. They were constantly needing large supplies of provisions, which we had to sell, and it was a pity that the money expended in procuring them was not paid to us. He hoped that there would be a great revolution in the state of things before long, and that we would profit largely by it. In every point of view, he conceived this union to be most desirable, though he must confess he would not desire to see it carried out if he thought there was the remotest probability of its leading to a separation from the Empire. (Hear.) The Mother Country had done much for us; mistakes had arisen, but, on the whole, we had been most kindly and generously treated by her; we had been materially assisted by loans on the guarantee of the Imperial Government, and that very fact had greatly enhanced our credit. In this way it was that our great and valuable public works had been constructed. It had often been a matter of surprise to him that we had shown so little care and anxiety with regard to our own defence, but the time had now come when we would be obliged to do something for ourselves in that direction.

the way such conclusions

I remember a vote was

much to the prejudice

refer to that on the

1862. There is

that bill gave rise

vails in England

the people there

dians are unwise

Nothing could

than to enter

more unjustly

against the

viction and

to modify

to this

country

ways.

just

we

tion

dir

er

W

1

any willing to trust it. He was willing to give the people all the power they could reasonably ask, but it was a fact that the power granted had in many instances been abused. Many municipalities have been nearly ruined. They contracted loans, and instead of applying the money in a way to forward the public weal, a good deal of it had gone into the pockets of the borrowers. (Hear, hear.) He desired to prevent a recurrence of such things. When the Municipal Loan Fund Bill was passed, great advantages had been expected from it, and great improvements had been projected, some of which, he was free to say, had been carried out, but some of the municipalities had misapplied and wasted the money, and now they were asking the Government for delay to enable them to pay the interest. In making these remarks he had no intention of saying aught that could be disagreeable, and if he had done so he prayed it might be overlooked. He had taken an active part in the legislature, especially in the other branch, in years gone by, and had always acted independently, and he thought it was the duty of public men to follow the dictates of their own convictions in preference to the solicitations of friends. Having done so in the past, he would try to do so in the future. He would close by expressing the hope that the resolutions would pass by a large majority, as he had no doubt they would. (Cheers.)

HON. MR. AIKINS said:—I do not believe, honorable gentlemen, that what occurred in the Counties Council of York and Peel, to which the honorable member for the Saugeen Division referred, can bear the interpretation that honorable gentleman placed upon it. The honorable member stated that a large majority in that council had declared themselves unfavorable to an appeal to the people on the subject now before the House—the Confederation of the Provinces. Now, I am personally acquainted with most of the members of that body, and think a fuller reading of the proceedings to which the honorable member referred will place the matter in a different light—

HON. MR. MACPHERSON—I read the whole of the report.

HON. MR. AIKINS—Well, I shall read it for myself and draw my own conclusions. [Here the honorable gentleman read the report again, remarking that there was nothing in the speeches of any of the members of the Counties Council to show that they were opposed to an appeal to the people, and then proceeded:]—The members of the Counties

Council were not elected on political grounds, but to administer the affairs of the municipality. Any expression of opinion that they may offer on political subjects is therefore but the expression of their own individual opinions, and however much it may be entitled to respect from the character of the gentlemen composing the council, it can in no way be regarded as the expression of their constituents' wishes on the subject. But I contend, moreover, that the vote in the council was not even an expression of opinion on the part of the members; for we find from the report that several members opposed the motion for an appeal to the people, simply on the ground that the question was one that ought not to have been brought before them, it being of a purely political character, and they rejected it without expressing any opinion upon its real merits. Then, combined with them were the gentlemen who really oppose the appeal to the people, and of these two classes was the majority composed, of which the honorable gentlemen spoke so exultingly. (Hear, hear.) But apart from the expression of opinion of the Counties Council referred to, in whatever light it may be regarded, I object to the resolutions being submitted to Parliament and pressed upon the consideration of this House in the same way as the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. They are said to be passed or rejected as a whole, without alteration or amendment, just as if the Government were bound to stand or fall by the decision. The Government, it appears, has pledged itself to the other governments to abide by these resolutions, and in that case it should have been a condition that they should stand or fall with them. Ministers are opposed further to any expression of opinion on the contents of these resolutions, other than what may be stated in the speeches of honorable members; the resolutions cannot be changed, modified or amended in any particular, and yet the chambers are asked to consider them! What is the use of considering them if we cannot come to our own conclusions and give them effect in the shape of amendments? I stand here as the representative of, if not one of the largest, at least one of the most intelligent constituencies in Upper Canada, and I have no hesitation in saying the people are generally in favor of the principle of the resolutions; in other words, of a Confederation of Canada and the Lower Provinces, but I do not believe they are in favor of all the details of the project. The Honorable Premier, in moving the resolutions, said

they would be productive of two special advantages to Canada;—they would give us strength and durability, and at the same time settle the difficulties under which the province has labored for some years. That honorable member also stated that if this union is not accomplished there will be a danger of our being forced by violence into the United States; that, if not forced therein by violence, we will insensibly slide thither; and that we are upon an inclined plane which must of necessity land us there, and whether by violence or by sliding, we must reach that result. (Hear, hear.) If the Honorable Premier had shown that the proposed union would in reality give us strength, and place us in a position to improve our defences, then I would admit he had made a good case. I have anxiously waited to hear his reasons and explanations, for I wanted better reasons for adopting the resolutions than any I was acquainted with. I am anxious to have them carefully analysed and scrutinized, and desire that they may be found in the interest of Canada. If the Government, in bringing them down, had stated that after a thorough canvass and examination, if deemed desirable, they might be amended in some particulars, I would have accepted the declaration with satisfaction and hope; but no, though allowed to debate them, we cannot proceed any further. They are submitted, as I have already said, like an opening Speech from the Throne, an amendment to which is treated as a motion of want of confidence, and I can see no great use in discussing them at all. I desire, however, prior to the taking of the vote, to know how much the Intercolonial Railway will cost. Only a short time ago public opinion in Upper Canada was adverse to this enterprise, but if new light has dawned upon the subject, I would be glad to share in it. I would like to know also what the route will be, and how many millions it will cost; and if it should be shown that its construction will be a real advantage to the country, I will be prepared to go for it. There are other points upon which I desire information, and one is as to the proportion of the debt which Upper and Lower Canada will be called upon respectively to bear. If the sixty-two and a-half millions of debt the Confederation is to assume is to be divided according to the extent of the two populations, will Lower Canada, over and above its share, assume the amount paid for the abolition of the Seigniorial Tenure? These questions, in my opinion, need answers before this scheme is carried.

The people
now grow
tired at last
they did
struggle
should
the
nothing
us
The
our
U.
st:
(
t
:

very much
statement of the
Crown Lands;
to perceive how
of considering
we now affirm the

—The opportunity
these five millions of
distributed between Upper
and when bills or propo-
before Parliament for that
of the Government
which it considers fair
of the country, and it will be
Parliament, of course, to
in regard to the scheme.

AIKINS—I am quite willing
Government credit for sincerity on
but before I am called upon to
consideration, I would like to know,
this House would like to know,
how much the Intercolonial Railway
how this amount of debt is to
be distributed between Upper and
Canada. It does appear to me very
that we should have all these ex-
prior to being called upon to vote
considerations.

Mr. CAMPBELL—As to the In-
tercolonial Railway, the honorable gentleman
states that it is a matter for the Government
and the Confederation to deal with. The only
question for this House to consider is as to
the five millions of debt is to be distribu-
between the two sections, and as to that
member will have an opportunity of
speaking to or differing from the proposition
of the Government. The question of the rail-

stands on an entirely different footing,
and for the consideration only of the Gene-
ral Legislature of the union.

HON. MR. AIKINS—I am quite well
aware that the Intercolonial Railway is to be
constructed by the General Government, but
I would like to know now how much it is to
cost. It does appear to me that this is a very
important question, and one that lies at the
root of the whole matter in the minds of many
honorable gentlemen. I know that it affects
me very much. (Hear, hear.) Then, with
regard to the Constitution of this Chamber,
the honorable gentleman who has just taken
his seat (Hon. Mr. BOULTON), and who
comes from Cobourg, has indulged in a ge-
neral attack upon the elective system, because,
forsooth, several municipalities throughout the
country have borrowed largely from the Loan
Fund, and because the money they so borrowed
has not been properly invested. He argues
from this that the principle of election by the
people should be done away with in this
House. It does appear strange that any hon.
gentlemen should take the narrow and contract-
ed ground that this Chamber should be appoint-
ed by the Crown, because certain loans have not
been properly distributed by municipal bodies
—especially strange that an honorable gentle-
man should take it who represents a municipi-
ality that is very heavily in arrears to the
Loan Fund.

HON. MR. BOULTON—I did not allude
to the town of Cobourg at all, but to other
municipalities, where the councils squandered
the money borrowed from the Loan Fund and
put large sums of it into their own pockets.
Cobourg expended the money properly in con-
nection with a great public work, and acted
honestly, uprightly and properly in the mat-
ter.

HON. MR. AIKINS—Well, I do not see
why a good thing should be put past the hon-
orable gentleman himself; and when he in-
dulges in an attack upon the elective system,
because certain municipalities have failed to
meet their obligations, I do not see why I
should not point out that Cobourg is a de-
faulter to a large amount. The honorable
member from the Saugeen Division argues
that the appointment of members of this
House by the Crown is not a disfranchise-
ment of the people.

HON. MR. MACPHERSON—The honor-
able gentleman is mistaken. What I said was
that, inasmuch as the appointments are to be
made in the way that has been described—
that is, on the nomination of gentleman re-

presenting the people in the other House—the change does not amount to a disfranchisement. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. AIKINS—If the honorable gentleman had not been quite so sensitive, I would have saved him the trouble of making his explanation.

HON. MR. MACPHERSON—I did not wish to be misrepresented.

HON. MR. AIKINS—It certainly is not my desire to misrepresent the honorable gentleman in any manner. I think the conclusion one would arrive at, after hearing his remarks upon the point, is that the people would still, after this proposed change in the Constitution, have the power to make appointments to this House.

HON. MR. MACPHERSON—No, but through their representatives.

HON. MR. AIKINS—The honorable gentleman says they will have the power, through their representatives, to make their appointments. Well, after reading the fourteenth resolution, it does appear to me that, after the first election of the Chamber, the people will have nothing at all to do with it. (Hear, hear.) The honorable gentleman says, however, that the representatives of the people will have the power of making these appointments. Who are the representatives of the people he refers to? The members of the Government, who will have this power; or, in other words, the Crown will make the appointments.

HON. MR. MACPHERSON—With the advice of the representatives of the people.

HON. MR. AIKINS—Yes, undoubtedly; but the people, nevertheless, will have nothing at all to do with the matter; we advert again, in fact, to the old principle when the Crown made all the appointments. (Hear, hear.) Now, with regard to this question, I feel myself in this position, that although I may be in favor of the Crown making these appointments—upon which principle I express no opinion at this moment—if I voted for these resolutions I would give a vote, and every member of this House would give a vote, by which they would give themselves seats in this House as long as Providence thought fit to let them remain. (Hear, hear.) I came here, honorable gentlemen, to conserve certain interests, to represent certain classes, and to reflect the views of those who sent me here so far as they accorded with my own judgment. But they did not send me here to change the Constitution under which I was appointed, and to sweep away at one dash the privileges

they possess, one of which is, to give a seat in this House to him in whom they have confidence. It does not appear right to me that the members of this House should declare, by their own votes, that we shall remain here for all time to come. (Hear, hear.) The reasons given for the proposed change are various, and to some extent conflicting. We find one member of the Government telling us that it is because the Maritime Provinces are opposed to an elective Chamber, and hence we in Canada—the largest community and the most influential—give way to them, and set aside a principle that was solemnly adopted here, and so far has worked without prejudice to our interests. We find another gentleman, who, when the question came up years ago, strongly opposed the elective principle, quite as strongly opposes it now, because since then certain municipalities have borrowed more than they are able to pay! These are somewhat extraordinary reasons, and I trust the House will give them their due weight. I think, honorable gentlemen, that prior to the proposed change taking place, we ought not to declare by our own votes that we are entitled to permanent seats in this House,—without, at any rate, knowing whether the people consent to it or not; and I do not think I am wrong in using this line of argument, when we have reason to believe that, even if the Crown-appointed members remain here, a large number of the elected members will also remain.

HON. MR. ROSS—How would you act if you were satisfied that the whole public opinion was in favor of it?

HON. MR. AIKINS—I can very easily answer the honorable gentleman. If I did not and could not reflect the views of my constituents on such an important subject as this, there is one thing I could do, return to them the power they placed in my hands. (Hear, hear.) That is the course I should feel compelled to take under such circumstances. (Hear, hear.) With regard to this scheme altogether, I think that a very great deal depends upon the resolutions themselves. If we are to have framed a new Constitution upon them as a basis, all of them, in my opinion, should be thoroughly canvassed and examined; and this House, as well as the other branch of the Legislature, ought not to be prevented by the Government of the day from expressing its opinions with regard to their merits. (Hear.) It is said by many honorable gentlemen that the people are in favor of this scheme. I think the people are in favor of a scheme

of Confederation, but I think it depends altogether upon the details of that scheme whether they will give it their approval or not. I have no hesitation in declaring what is the opinion of the people of my division. I meet and mingle with them almost daily, and have had ample opportunities of ascertaining their views and sentiments. I believe that a very large proportion of them have no fixed and definite opinions with regard to this scheme. They are in favor of Confederation, but they have no definite distinct ideas in regard to the details of the scheme proposed. If they knew that their taxation would be largely increased by it, and that it would add heavily to the public burdens, they would not support it. (Hear, hear.) I think, then, that we who are placed here to conserve and protect the interests of the public, should be extremely careful and analyse these resolutions thoroughly, and ascertain, as nearly as possible, what their effect is likely to be, before we take the responsibility of voting for them. I have no hesitation in declaring that there never was a period in the history of Canada when the people suffered more than they do at present. (Hear, hear.) In consequence of the personal, municipal and national indebtedness, the farmers of the country were never placed in a worse position than that which they now occupy. (Hear, hear.) When we find that property has depreciated in value within the last five years, twenty, thirty, forty, ay, and even sixty per cent.; when we find that the crops of the country have been steadily decreasing in quantity and value within that period; when we find that the people are dissatisfied with the manner in which the country has been governed during the last eight or ten years; when we find all this, we may believe that they are prepared to accept almost any change that promises a relief from their present difficulties. But we were placed here to conserve their interests, to look after their welfare, and should not hastily adopt any scheme, proposed by any Government—whether all of one party stripe or not—without fully examining it and weighing the results likely to flow from it. (Hear, hear.) It is said that the public is well acquainted with the nature of the scheme. I demur to that statement *in toto*. The public is not acquainted with it in all its bearings, and if there is one thing I regret, it is this, that it has not been made a party measure. (Hear, hear.) I regret this because, although perhaps no party could have carried it as a party measure through this Legislature, it would

have been better if proposed as a party scheme, for then its merits would have been more thoroughly canvassed and its demerits more thoroughly exposed. Our public men would have ranged themselves on either side; some would have favored it, and others would have opposed it; they would have pointed out its defects as well as its good points; the whole subject would have been fully ventilated, and the result would have been that, if passed at all, the scheme would have been as perfect as it was possible to have made it. But what do you find now? You scarcely see a newspaper from one end of the country to the other that is not full of laudations of the scheme. And why? Because the leading public men of the country have thought proper to make a fusion; the leading daily journals on both sides applaud the step and the scheme that followed, and the small papers throughout the province, as in duty bound, follow in their wake.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—They only express public opinion.

HON. MR. AIKINS—Public opinion, the honorable gentleman says. I say that public opinion has not sufficiently weighed this scheme, and that we should be influenced here by our own matured opinion in regard to it. (Hear, hear.) As I have already stated, I am in favor of the confederation of these provinces, framed on a proper basis; and all I desire is that we should have the opportunity of examining all these resolutions, and if we object to any of them, finding them imperfect or unsuitable, that we should have power to amend them. (Hear, hear.) So far as the amendment that has been proposed is concerned, there are portions of it with which I cordially agree. After it has been thoroughly discussed, I shall, like other honorable members, make up my mind as to what course I shall pursue in reference to it. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. REESOR—As no one has taken the floor to continue the debate, I beg to enquire of the Honorable Commissioner of Crown Lands why it is that certain export duties are allowed under this scheme to be collected by the local governments in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, but which in Canada are collected by the General Government? It is part of the forty-third resolution, which reads:—"The local legislatures shall have power to make laws respecting the following subjects: Direct taxation, and in New Brunswick the imposition of duties on the export of timber, logs, masts, spars, deals and sawn lumber; and in Nova Scotia, of

coal and other minerals." That, it appears to me, is leaving very valuable material to be subject to taxation by these local governments, for they comprise a very large proportion of the exports of the country. This is giving a great preference to the eastern provinces in regard to powers of taxation. (Hear, hear.) Then, again, as stated by the President of the Council, in another place, the sum of \$63,000 a year is to be given as a sort of gratuity to New Brunswick for a period of ten years. When these things are taken into consideration, certainly it seems that our public men representing Canada in the Conference have gone to work in a rather reckless manner. They have apparently been regardless of expense on the part of Canada, while particularly careful to meet every objection to union on the part of the Lower Provinces. It would appear that because Canada is the largest colony, they were willing to grant everything that the other colonies asked. (Hear, hear.) It seems extraordinary too that these gentlemen should have passed a scheme binding the Government to construct the Intercolonial Railway without any understanding or knowledge as to what it will cost. (Hear.)

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—It will be somewhat inconvenient for a member of the Government to answer at once the questions put by the honorable member, but I have no objection to answer those which he has now asked. The House understands, of course, that the Crown lands of the provinces are retained under the Confederation scheme by each individual province. It was found necessary that they should be retained in order to provide each province with the required funds to carry on the local government. In the province of New Brunswick the duties that are levied in Canada as "stumpage dues" on cutting down timber, are not levied in the woods but collected at the ports as export duties, this being in that province a more convenient and less expensive mode of obtaining revenue from the timber trade. Now, the honorable gentleman will see that if we do not allow the Local Government in New Brunswick to collect these dues in this way, the revenue which is derived in Canada from "stumpage dues" would be lost to New Brunswick. That is the reason why the exception he refers to was made. In the same way, with reference to Nova Scotia, was allowed the royalty on coal, that is the percentage of the product of the mines reserved for the use of the Government, which is collected as a duty on the export of the article. There also

the export duty is reserved as a source of revenue to the Local Government, it being necessary in both cases that they should have the advantage of their territorial revenue in the same way as the local governments in Canada, which will collect the same revenue in a different way. At the first glance it may seem that this clause gives especial advantages to the Lower Provinces not conferred upon the local governments here, but this is not the case. (Hear, hear.) Then, with regard to the subvention of \$63,000 a year to New Brunswick for a period of ten years, it was found necessary because during that time it would be impossible for New Brunswick out of its local revenue to carry out the undertakings upon which the province had entered. The honorable gentleman said, and I regret to hear the statement, that the representatives of Canada must have been reckless, and that as the Lower Provinces made demands conditional upon entering the union, we had to submit with what grace we could. All I can say is that I wish very heartily that those gentlemen who thus find fault had been at the Conference, and then they would have had an opportunity of judging whether indeed we were reckless or not; and I must say to my honorable friend, whom I have had the pleasure of knowing for some years, that if he had truly known the representatives of Canada on that occasion, he would have spared us to-day the imputation made against them that they were reckless. (Hear, hear.) The \$63,000 were given to New Brunswick because it was found that with the local revenue allowed her it would have been impossible for her to fulfil her engagements. It would of course have been idle to have gone into a confederation and find that the revenues of that colony had been so far ceded to us that she was unable to meet the obligations into which she had entered, and that the Confederation would be responsible for the claims of her creditors. The engagements into which she had entered involved a subvention of the railways of the province. In New Brunswick they thought it better, rather than take the shares or mortgages of a railway for the encouragement of railway enterprise, to give a certain sum at once for railway purposes. Any company constructing a railway became entitled to a certain sum per mile out of the public funds. Thus liabilities were incurred which of course it was necessary to redeem. Well, New Brunswick having ceded all her ordinary revenues to the General Government, means had to be provided by it to enable her to meet these

liabilities. And I may say that these railways, which are among the public works ceded to the General Government, are not valueless. They yield a revenue to the public exchequer. I do not remember the exact sum, but it is about \$6,000 or \$8,000 per annum.

HON. MR. CURRIE—That is exactly three-eighths of one per cent. of their cost.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—Well, I said they yielded a revenue—I did not say what proportion it bore to their cost—and when we give this sum we know that we are not entirely without a return for it. Unless we made some provision for this payment we would have been unable to carry out the scheme, and there is a fair probability of these works becoming more productive. Of course, some gentlemen may say that it was possible to have given the other provinces equivalents for this expenditure in New Brunswick, but we all know how unfavorable to our finances has been this system of equivalents. (Hear, hear.) A similar sum might have been granted to the other provinces, but that would have been nothing but extravagance, which, I am sure, the country would be slow to sanction, in view of the past experience in this province in the system of equivalents. (Hear, hear.) This, we all felt convinced, was the most economical and prudent course to have followed in order to obtain the end of Confederation.

HON. MR. SIMPSON—I would like to ask the Commissioner of Crown Lands whether, supposing I sent a vessel from Montreal with flour to a lower port, and it returned with a cargo of coal, there would be an export duty upon it in Nova Scotia?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—I am not aware that there would be, but upon this point I speak under correction. That is a question which, if the honorable gentleman desires explicit information, I would like to reserve for a future occasion. If questions are put, not to embarrass the passage of the scheme before the House, but to elicit information on particular points, I shall prepare myself to answer them as fully as possible. (Hear, hear.) I am sure, however, no honorable gentleman would put questions with a view of embarrassing the subject, but simply to obtain information on certain points.

HON. MR. SIMPSON—I have no desire to ask questions in order to create embarrassment, but this is a question forced upon me by the explanations that have been made, and while I am up I may ask another. I will not

discuss how much Upper Canada gives to the General Government under this scheme, but it strikes me as singular that in making these compensations the Conference gave them all to the Lower Provinces. Why was not this money required by New Brunswick raised by direct taxation, and the colonies thus placed on an equal footing? (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. ROSS—Because the income of these railways in New Brunswick accrues to the General Government.

HON. MR. SIMPSON—But they pay nothing.

HON. MR. ROSS—They do pay something now, and in future they will pay more. I, however, speak only from my own individual point of view, and not from any knowledge other than that in possession of the House.

HON. MR. SIMPSON—And I speak from the same, and think the objection I have made good.

HON. MR. ROSS—As to the export duty on coal from Nova Scotia, it appears from the resolutions that the equivalent given to Upper Canada for this revenue is the duty on Crown timber.

HON. MR. SIMPSON—Well, what about the fishery dues given to the Lower Provinces?

HON. MR. ROSS—We will have that by and by. I am only answering one question now. It is in lieu of the duty we levy on timber, and known as "stumpage dues," that Nova Scotia is allowed to levy an export duty on coal. The honorable gentleman shakes his head, but it is a fact.

HON. MR. SIMPSON—It is not on the stump that we levy dues, but as the hewn timber passes through the slides.

HON. MR. ROSS—Well, it is not an export duty at any rate; but in New Brunswick it pays a duty when exported, either as saw-logs or square timber. In both cases it pays a duty to the Local Government, and it only seems reasonable that Nova Scotia should enjoy a revenue from her coal wherever it goes. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. MOORE—If the coal were exported to a foreign country, then I could understand why a duty should be imposed, but when a ship is laden in one port of the Confederation, with coal, for another port in the same country, it does not appear much like a free Confederation if an export duty is levied upon the cargo. (Hear, hear.) There would seem, then, to be a distinction—a preference for one portion over another—within the limits of the Confederation. If we are to have a union, I hope we shall have it in fact and

not in name alone. I should like to be fully informed as to whether an export duty is to be levied on coal in Nova Scotia, no matter whether it is intended for another part of the Confederation or for a foreign country.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—The royalty collected on coal in Nova Scotia is similar to the stumpage duty on timber in Canada, which is paid no matter where the timber is exported to. It may well be, therefore, that when coal is exported from Nova Scotia to another province it will contribute to the revenues of the Local Government of Nova Scotia. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. REESOR—There are several other provisions in the proposed Constitution which seem to be ambiguous in their meaning, and before discussion upon them it would be well to have them fully explained. In the eleventh clause of the twenty-ninth resolution, for instance, it is declared that the General Parliament shall have power to make laws respecting "all such works as shall, although lying wholly within any province, be specially declared by the acts authorizing them to be for the general advantage." It would appear from this, that works like the Welland canal, which yield a very large revenue, will be given over to the General Government; and this being the case, surely this is a sufficient set-off, five times over, for the railways given by New Brunswick, without the annual subsidy proposed to be given to that province of \$63,000.

HON. MR. MACPHERSON—The cost of these works forms part of the public debt of Canada, which is to be borne in part by the Lower Provinces under the Confederation.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—The honorable gentleman will see that there are some works which, although local in their geographical position, are general in their character and results. Such works become the property of the General Government. The Welland canal is one of them, because, although it is local in its position, it is a work in which the whole country is interested, as the chief means of water communication between the western lakes and the sea. Other works, in the Lower Provinces, may be of the same character, and it is not safe to say that because a certain work lies wholly in one province, it is not to belong to the General Government.

HON. MR. REESOR—I do not object to the General Government having the control of these works. It is, I believe, a wise provision to place them under such control. But

I do say that it is unfair that an express stipulation should be made to pay one province a large sum per annum for certain works, while, at the same time, we throw in our public works, such as the Welland and St. Lawrence canals, without any consideration whatever. This, I think, is paying quite too much for the whistle. Then the answer of the Commissioner of Crown Lands about the export duty on minerals in Nova Scotia is not at all satisfactory. Whatever dues may be levied on minerals in Canada—and Canada, although it may contain no coal, is rich in gold, silver, copper, iron, and other ores—in the shape of a royalty or otherwise, go to the General Government, while in Nova Scotia they accrue for the benefit of the Local Government.

HON. MR. ROSS—No, they will not go to the General Government.

HON. MR. REESOR—Well, there is nothing to the contrary in the resolutions, and you may depend upon it that whatever revenues the General Government may claim, under the proposed Constitution, will be fully insisted upon.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—My honorable friend, referring a moment ago to the Welland and other canals, objected to certain works being considered as belonging to the General Government, because they are local in their geographical position.

HON. MR. REESOR—I do not say that they should not go to the General Government, but what I do say is that they are a sufficient set-off for the works given by the Lower Provinces, without paying them a special sum from the general revenues of \$63,000 per annum.

A Message from the Legislative Assembly interrupted further discussion upon the subject, and the House afterwards adjourned without resuming it.

—o—

MONDAY, February 13, 1865.

HON. MR. REESOR—Honorable gentlemen, as the question now under consideration involves a change in the constitution, not only of this House but of the whole of the British American Provinces, I think that more time ought to be given to it; and my object in now rising, is to urge upon this Honorable House the propriety of adjourning this debate—say for ten days. (No! no!) Many new features have been developed since the

discussion opened that were not before properly understood. The question has not been sufficiently understood in the country, and even now I doubt whether the proposed changes are thoroughly comprehended in both branches of the Legislature. Constitutions are not usually made in a day, and they should not be passed in a week; they are matters of too grave a character. I trust, if we make a new Constitution, it will be one that will be sustained not for ten or twenty years, but for centuries. It is to be hoped that every change which is made will be of the right character, and in accordance with the interests of the country; not such a change as will have to be repealed again in a few years.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL.—Will the hon. gentleman make a motion on this subject, or shall we continue the debate without that motion?

HON. MR. REESOR.—I have in my hand a resolution, which I propose to submit to the House shortly.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL.—Does the hon. gentleman intend to choke off discussion now? Surely that is not desirable.

HON. MR. REESOR.—The hon. gentleman knows we do not desire to choke off discussion. If any persons are anxious that the discussion should be choked off, they are those who are desirous of pushing through this measure with undue haste. There are many reasons why the discussion of this question should be delayed. First, its very great importance; secondly, to enable us to obtain more information upon it. It is well known that very eloquent and effective speeches have been made in the other branch of the Legislature, which have not yet been published in full, and without which we cannot so thoroughly understand what arguments are made in favor of the measure, as is desirable. I beg to move that this debate be adjourned for ten days.

HON. MR. MOORE.—I agree with the hon. gentleman who has made this motion that the question now before us is a very important one, and should be fully considered in all its bearings, both by this House and the people of the province at large. I think, with him, that we ought to have the benefit of the perusal of the able and eloquent speeches which have been made in the other branch of the Legislature, and in this branch also; and inasmuch as they have postponed the discussion in the other branch of the Legislature, I apprehend there would be nothing improper in our doing so too. Again, there are other contracting parties to this measure, viz., the Lower Prov-

inces, which are equally interested with ourselves. In Nova Scotia the Legislature, I understand, is in session, and by telegraphic communication, from day to day, we could ascertain the feeling of the people there. This would not at all retard the action of this House, for it is known that business is usually despatched with more rapidity here than in the other. Nothing, it seems to me, will be lost, but, on the contrary, much gained by a temporary postponement of the debate. (Hear, hear.) I desire to place my views on the whole subject before this House, but I desire to give them only after the matter has been calmly and deliberately discussed. The question is one which concerns us all. I do not think the discussion of it should be entered upon with any party spirit or any party feeling. Our interests are all the same, whether for weal or woe. If the measure be a good one—if the project for our Confederation be a salutary one—if it be a panacea for all the existing evils of our body politic—a little time given for reflection can do it no harm. (Hear.) When we come to the discussion of the scheme, there are several important points to be cleared up. We have yet to ascertain the respective and relative powers of the federal and local governments, and it is desirable that ample time should be given to the Government for the answering of questions upon this subject. Then we have to receive explanations about the export duty on coal and other minerals—whether this export duty is to be levied by or on behalf of the Local Government of Nova Scotia after Confederation, and whether it is to be levied on all coal exported, or not upon coal exported to other sections of the proposed union. Again, in regard to the export duty on the lumber of New Brunswick, is it to be applied, as I understand it, to the local revenue of that province? Then, as to the stumpage duty on that portion of the Crown domain appertaining to Lower Canada, is that to be applied to the purposes of the Local Government of Lower Canada?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL.—I shall be very happy to give my hon. friend, from time to time, as the questions may be put, all the information he may desire.

HON. MR. MOORE.—It is certainly desirable that they should be answered, either by the hon. the Premier or the hon. the Commissioner of Crown Lands, and it does appear to me that it would be profitable for the House to postpone the debate, to afford time for doing so fully.

The question being put, the amendment was lost on the following vote:—

CONTENTS:—Honorable Messieurs Aikins, Archambault, Armstrong, Bennett, Chaffers, Cormier, Currie, A. J. Duchesnay, Flint, Leonard, Leslie, McDonald, Moore, Olivier, Perry, Proulx, Reesor, Seymour, and Simpson.—19.

NOX-CONTENTS:—Honorable Messieurs Alexander, Allan, Armand, Sir N. F. Belleau, Ferguson Blair, Blake, Boulton, Bossé, Bull, Burnham, Campbell, Christie, Crawford, De Beaneau, Dickson, E. H. J. Duchesnay, Dumouchel, Ferrier, Foster, Gingras, Hamilton (Inkerman), Hamilton (Kingston), Lacoste, McCrea, McMaster, Macpherson, Matheson, Mills, Panet, Prud'homme, Read, Ross, Shaw, Skead, Sir E. P. Taché, Vidal, and Wilson.—37.

HON. MR. REESOR—I shall be very brief in the remarks I have now to make to the House. I do not object to the objects of these resolutions, or to the measure *per se*, but I do object to some of its details. I hope to see a union of the British North American Colonies effected, but what I am anxious for is that the conditions of the union may be so satisfactory and well considered, that there will not be embraced therein the seeds of future disruption, or anything that will give rise to a desire on the part of any of the provinces to separate from the union, or prevent other portions of British North America coming in hereafter and forming parts of this proposed Confederation. I hope we shall be some day a great British North American Confederacy, but that is the greater reason why the terms of the agreement should be of such a character that we can all, or nearly all, approve of them. We must bear in mind, also, that one reason why those who were heretofore the exponents of the views of two great political parties are all on one side at the present time, arises from the very peculiar circumstances in which the country has been placed for the last eight or ten years. Those who support this measure have given as reasons for it that we have had so many political crises, and the changes have been so varied, that it becomes necessary for some great constitutional change to be made. They have at the same time carefully enumerated the political changes that have taken place during the past four or five years. First we had the CARTIER-MACDONALD Administration, which was sustained in the Assembly by a very small majority for two or three sessions. Then we had the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Government sustained by a very slim majority. Then the MACDONALD-DORION Government, scarcely any stronger. Then again the TACHÉ-MACDON-

ALD Government with an equally slim majority;—so that we were really in a state of political crisis like that of a merchant, who, having suffered many losses in business affairs, yet, with his credit still good, at last becomes confused, and, incapable of exercising his judgment, launches into some scheme that proves ruinous, whereas calmness and deliberation might have retrieved his situation. We had three governments formed within as many years, each failing in turn to administer affairs to the satisfaction of the people. We had, in the TACHÉ-MACDONALD cabinet, a Finance Minister on whom a vote of censure of the most serious character was passed, which amounted to a vote of want of confidence in the whole Government. At that time we had in opposition the gentleman who is now the President of the Council, who had contended for ten years for a change of the constitutional relations between Upper and Lower Canada. He failed to accomplish his object. He could not consistently ally himself with his opponents without some new scheme to lay before the country. To form a government, he could not. The Finance Minister being condemned, the government was bound to reconstruct or resign. Each party desired to rule, but neither was able. Out of political adversity grew political desperation. It was called by some a political millennium, and perhaps it was; but matters were just in that shape to induce parties to take up almost any new scheme, as in this case, in which I think they have gone on quite too rapidly. They have not deliberated sufficiently to propose a measure of that mature character which the country had a right to expect. Perhaps as good a measure has been brought out as could have been, considering the short time that has elapsed, and the disadvantages under which they labored during the discussion of the scheme. But it must be admitted that when this measure was agreed to by our Government, they adopted a hasty course. The country heard only one side of the question. (Hear.) They had the great daily newspapers, the chief organs of public opinion of both political parties, all on their side, and there was only a small portion of the country press, and that not widely circulated, that gave the opposite side of the question. And so it has been going on up to the present time; and now we have the scheme brought before us in its present shape. I consider that, under these circumstances, it is our duty to give very serious attention to the question, before we adopt it as it is. (Hear, hear.) I fur-

ther think, and I know many others agree with me, that these resolutions may be amended in some points, and yet without in the slightest degree endangering the whole scheme. But the Government say, "you must take the whole measure, or no part of it." I very much fear that the determination of the Government in this respect is, if I may so speak, father to their wish. That they have fallen in love with their scheme. It is their pet measure—their bantling—and they wish to get it through, without any amendment, just as it is. Suppose amendments are proposed that really can only affect Canada, and cannot affect our relations with the other provinces at all; what reason is there that these amendments should not be made? The Government can surely communicate with the other provinces, and get their assent. At the same time, while I am speaking on these particular points, I must express my dissent from certain other features of the resolutions, but they are features, I fear, that we can do nothing to alter now, for we shall be obliged, as the Government say, to adopt the whole of the resolutions or none.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—That is the point.

HON. MR. REESOR—Yes, that is the point in reference to certain of these resolutions, but not with regard to others. Two years ago the Government of Canada had a conference with members of the governments of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and in that conference agreed that upon certain conditions, if the money could be obtained, with the guarantee of the home Government, at a certain rate of interest, the Intercolonial Railway should be built, and they further agreed that Canada should only have to pay five-twelfths of the cost, which was then estimated, as it was stated, at twelve millions of dollars. I believe, on good authority, that a company offered to build the road for twelve millions of dollars, and undertook to run it, without any additional charge, for twelve years.

HON. MR. CURRIE—It was three million pounds sterling, or fifteen millions of dollars.

HON. MR. REESOR—Perhaps it was; but let us suppose that the estimates should be as high as they are at present; let us conceive the fact as possible that the company might fail to complete the road without more aid; and that it might have cost as much as is now estimated, namely, eighteen millions of dollars,—still Canada would only have had five-twelfths of this to pay. But here, in

the short space of two years, we have had such a change, such a sudden change, that one statesman of Canada, a man of very great influence, and who now presides over the administration of affairs in this country, the President of the Council, who opposed that scheme because it involved too large an expenditure for Canada to incur—

HON. MR. ROSE—He does not preside over the administration of affairs.

HON. MR. REESOR—We call president the man who presides, and he presides because he is president—who opposed that scheme because it was alleged Canada was paying far more than her just proportion but is now in favor of it. Had it not been so strongly opposed by a man in such a position, and had the Government not been so weak, I believe the scheme would have been carried out. He who opposed it was one who had been twenty years in public life; his opinion was justly considered valuable, and many were disposed to agree with it. Had the ministry gone to the country then, taking the Intercolonial Railroad on their backs, I venture to say they would have been totally defeated. They would have had a large majority against them in Upper Canada, and I think a majority against them in Lower Canada also. But how is it now? Why, this Intercolonial Railway is to be built out of the funds of the Intercolonial Government that is proposed to be established, so that instead of Canada having to pay only five-twelfths of the whole cost, she will have to pay ten-twelfths. (Hear, hear.) This will involve five to seven millions of dollars of an expense more than we had any occasion for incurring, for the other provinces were all willing to have been responsible for the rest, and there is very good reason why they should. The countries to be benefited by the Intercolonial Railway are New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, but especially the former. In that province there is an extensive wilderness, with some valuable timber limits, if not much farming land, through which this road will have to pass, and every acre of land within twenty or thirty miles of the road will be largely increased in value. New Brunswick would gain that advantage, while as for Nova Scotia, Halifax, its chief port, will be made an outlet by the construction of the line, and will of course be largely benefited, so that they were only proposing what was fair and equitable; but in coming down with a scheme which involves us in twice as great an expenditure as was formerly contemplated, they seem not to have been

satisfied, unless we handed over to the Federal Government our public works. These, hon. gentlemen, are of immense value to Canada. By imposing tolls on our canals to an extent which they would easily bear, and which would not prevent our carrying on the same immense trade as at present, we could readily raise half a million a year. The Welland canal alone has produced a revenue of \$200,000 a year. Well, all such sources of income are to be thrown into the hands of the Federal Government, while New Brunswick is to give us a railway which only pays three-eighths of one per cent. over its working expenses. This small sum, remember too, is what is paid now—two or three years after the construction of the line—but when the rolling stock gets out of repair, the rails want renewing, and other matters usual after a railroad has been some-time working have to be attended to—the expense of the line to the Federal Government will constantly increase. The road will be a drag; and I say to hon. gentlemen that we are opening an account without knowing when it will be closed. (Cheers.) By engaging in the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, and the assumption of the New Brunswick and Nova Scotia lines, we are entering upon indefinite liabilities—the whole being non-paying property in which we shall find a heavy bill of expense. (Hear, hear.) Then, as if not satisfied with this, we are giving a sort of *Regium donum* of \$63,000 for ten years to the Province of New Brunswick. Again, we are to purchase for \$160,000 a year the mines and minerals and Crown lands of Newfoundland. Now, I venture to say, we shall not realise \$40,000 a year out of these minerals and Crown lands. We have a large mining country ourselves, which we find no very fertile source of revenue, and though it is true we have no coal in Canada, we can get that from Nova Scotia by paying an export duty and the cost of freight. In the face of these disadvantages we are entering a union which, by judicious management, might have been brought about without involving us in this immense expense. As I said before, I desire to see a union, but I want to see it effected on fair terms. (Hear, hear.) Now, in regard to the increased trade which it is said we are likely to get after the union is effected, I think there will be much disappointment. It strikes me that it will be almost impossible to alter the present course of trade, except by imposing duties on articles imported from other countries. The Intercolonial Railway will be too long, and there-

fore freight by it will be too expensive to divert trade, unless it is run by the Government at the cost of the country, and people are allowed to carry their goods almost free of charge. It can hardly be expected that we shall send breadstuffs over this railway. Even now it is not pretended that the railway can bring breadstuffs down as far as Quebec.

HON. MR. ROSS—They get them by water in the autumn, and store them for winter use.

HON. MR. REESOR—They will be able in winter time to get their supplies cheaper at St. John or Halifax by water than by the Intercolonial Railroad. If they are to buy our produce, there must be some pecuniary inducement, for they will not give us half a dollar a barrel more because the flour comes from Upper Canada; and what that inducement is to be I fail to understand, unless it be the effect of a heavy customs duty on foreign breadstuffs. As the channel of trade now is, the Lower Provinces can buy their flour cheaper in Boston and New York than in Canada, and would it be right to compel their people to take our produce at a greater cost than they can purchase elsewhere? It has been said that they consume \$4,000,000 worth of breadstuffs in a year, and many other articles that might be produced or manufactured in great part in Canada, and is it likely the 60,000 fishermen of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick will consent to have a duty of 20 per cent., or any other high duty imposed on breadstuffs, for the sole purpose of driving them out of the American and into the Canadian markets? (Hear, hear.) I question whether they are not apprehending a difficulty of this kind now, and on that account unwilling to accept all the inducements we have held out; unwilling to take the revenue we have offered them; unwilling to yield to the temptations put before them; because they are afraid of the imposition of duties on breadstuffs, to which they would be liable if they were to place themselves in the power of a country represented by so large a vote in the General Government as Canada will have. (Hear, hear.) Leaving this question of trade, we come to the consideration of the constitution of this House. Now, no one has petitioned against the continuance of the elective system—no one has complained that it does not work satisfactorily. We do not see that many of the elected members are so very much inferior to the nominated members of this House—there has been no serious ground for fearing a dead-lock—yet there is to be a change in the constitution of the Legislative Council,

in conformity, we are told, with the desire of the Lower Provinces. But we must look a little further than this. If you canvass the views of the honorable gentlemen who represented this province at the great Confederation meeting, you will find that most of them were inclined beforehand to concur in the views of the representatives of the eastern provinces, for they have always entertained views in opposition to the elective principle as applied to this House. They acted quite consistently, but it does not follow that they are right in making this change. We know that in former times, when our Legislative Council was nominated by the Crown, difficulties did arise. In old times, bills passed by the Assembly were thrown out almost by the hundred.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—That was before responsible government was adopted.

HON. MR. REESOR—I was about to add that it was before the introduction of responsible government, and that responsible government is a cure for many evils, but not to such an extent as it should be. But under the system of appointment there is another evil—the government of the day is particular in appointing those who are political friends of their own, and have aided them either at elections or in ways which may not be very creditable. (Laughter.) My honorable friend (Hon. Mr. CRAWFORD) may laugh, but if he reflects he will remember that he has himself known men in high positions whose career was not creditable in all particulars. However patriotic and anxious to discharge their duties rightly they might be, their views were sometimes warped by circumstances. Looking across the ocean, my honorable friend will remember that during the Administration of WILLIAM PITT, who wielded almost the sole control of Parliament in England for seventeen years, he appointed, during this period, 140 members to the House of Lords, subservient to his own wishes and intent on carrying out his views. I will just read to this House a short extract relating to him, written by a man capable of judging. In MAY'S *Constitutional History* we read:—

When Mr. PITT had been eight years in power he had created between sixty and seventy Peers, the greater part of whom owed their elevation to the parliamentary support they had themselves given to the Ministry, or to their influence in returning members to the House of Commons.

Now, when motives of this kind can be attributed to Mr. PITT, we need not say that similar motives may prevail here.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—Does the honorable gentleman suppose that the members of this House will owe their nomination to the political services they can render in this House?

HON. MR. REESOR—Not solely, but rather to their political services at elections and otherwise, before their nomination. The honorable gentleman will remember a certain little domestic arrangement he made on the other side of the House, while in opposition, in which he had many warm friends. Does he expect to forget those?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—I hope not. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. REESOR—Well, there it is. The honorable gentleman acknowledges his determination to reward his political supporters. Is this the way to obtain an independent branch of the Legislature, one that will operate as a wholesome check on hasty legislation? Those who receive favors from a political party are not likely to turn their backs upon that party. I think we are not likely, under any circumstances, to have a more independent House under the proposed system than we now have, or one which will better advance the interests of the country. If you wish to raise the elective franchise, for elections to the Upper House—if you would confine their election to voters on real estate of \$400 assessed value, and tenants holding a leasehold of \$100 annual value, and thus place these elections out of the reach of a mere money influence that may sometimes operate upon the masses—if you think this body is not sufficiently conservative—let them be elected by a more conservative portion of the community—that portion which has the greatest stake in the community—but do not strike out the elective principle altogether. The late Duke of NEWCASTLE, than whom few British statesmen have had more to do in establishing new and liberal constitutions in the various colonies in the Empire, and whose opinions are very valuable on this point, wrote as follows to the Governor of Prince Edward Island, on the 4th of February, 1862:—

Nor do I think it any way objectionable, but the contrary, that the Council (as in Canada, Victoria, South Australia and Tasmania) be incapable of being dissolved by the Governor. An Upper Chamber is valuable as an element of stability, and the principal value of an elective Upper Chamber I conceive to be this,—that while in virtue of its elective character, it may claim equally with the Assembly to speak the voice of the community, it may yet be so composed as to reflect their settled wishes and principles rather

than their transitory impulses. But this advantage would be wholly lost if the whole body were chosen or could be removed under the influence of such an impulse. The first of these dangers is obviated (or intended to be so) by providing that half only of the Council shall be elected at one time. The second, by giving to each Councillor a fixed tenure of office, independent of any popular or governmental influence.

Thus, it will be seen, he would place the Council out of the reach of Government, while they should be under the influence of the settled convictions of the people and not their mere transitory impulse. He would have them elected by a conservative body of electors. The next clause of the instructions runs thus:—

In Prince Edward Island, I would enforce a tolerably high property qualification in the case of the electors, but of the candidate I would only require that he should be a British subject, resident in the colony, and thirty years of age.

This, I think, would be a wise provision here, because it would give the electors an opportunity, which they do not now possess, of selecting their candidates from any part of the country, so that they could choose the ablest and most trustworthy men in it, and being elected by a class who had a deep interest in the country, you might rely on their not being too vacillating, but on their proving a proper, healthy and valuable check on the lower branch of the Legislature. (Hear, hear.) Some honorable gentlemen have urged that the people should not elect their representatives to the Upper House, because it involves a very great expense on the part of the elected, and because they cannot judge who is worthy of their confidence so well as the Government of the day. Now, I argue that if the people are unfit to choose members of this House, they are unfit to choose members of the other House too. If three counties united are not able to make a good selection, how can one-third part of that constituency make a good one? And with regard to the corrupt influences that may be brought to bear, will it be for a moment said that a large constituency of three counties can be as easily corrupted as a constituency composed of only one county? I think not. I think a more independent vote is brought to bear on the election of a member of the Upper House than of the Lower. Yet the members of the Lower House want to assume the power of dictating who shall compose the Legislative Council. A few years ago, at the general elections, when two men were running, though they

were both conservative, we always found one taking the ground that no money should be spent by the Government of the day without the consent of Parliament, and all the liberal party, without exception, took that view; yet now we find that as some of these men have got into the Government they have unlimited confidence in the wisdom of the Executive; they say our very Constitution can be amended within a period of six months without the people having anything to say about it; they now think governments can do no wrong. Of course, this is in accordance with human nature—what they themselves do must be right; they themselves can do no wrong. (Hear, hear.) To sum up, honorable gentlemen, I complain that this arrangement for bringing about the Confederation of the British North American Provinces is being made on terms of great disadvantage to Canada, that a fair agreement has not been settled upon as between the several colonies. I complain that in making such an arrangement with the other provinces, the constitution of this House should have been interfered with; and I complain, finally, of the manner in which the whole measure is being forced through the Legislature, without first being submitted to the people for their sanction; and I cannot but feel that these proposed changes so rashly adopted, carry with them the seeds of their early dissolution—a result that all should regret who desire the permanent consolidation and well-being of these colonies. (Cheers.)

HON. MR. McCREA—Honorable gentlemen, so much has already been said on the subject of the Confederation of the British American Provinces during the course of this debate, which has now occupied the House for several days, both here and in the Assembly, by the ablest men in the province, that I do not hope to add anything of great weight or importance to what has been urged on the question now submitted to our consideration; still, I feel that I should neither do justice to my constituents, who have sent me here, nor to myself, if I do not upon this occasion state, with what force I may, the reasons which induced me to give my hearty approval to this measure for the Confederation of all these provinces under one government, upon the basis of these resolutions which Ministers have laid upon the table of this House. Very much has been said, by almost every speaker who has preceded me, upon the importance of the subject now before us, and the consequent responsibility which attaches itself to every

individual member of this Honorable House for the course which he may adopt. I quite concur with honorable gentlemen that the present juncture in our affairs is big with the future destiny of our country, and that our fate for weal or woe depends upon the course we shall now pursue, and I, for one, feel not the slightest desire to shift one single atom of the burthen of that responsibility from my shoulders. I am fully prepared to assume it at once upon the merits of the scheme as it is evolved in these resolutions, and I do not wish to shield myself behind either an adjournment, such as has been proposed by my honorable friend the member for the division of King, and which, I am glad to say, has just been rejected by an unmistakable vote of this House, or the larger motion, of which my honorable friend from Niagara has given notice, for an appeal to the people, and to which I shall presently again refer. An objection has been taken *in limine* by the honorable member from Niagara to the constitution of the Conference which sat at Quebec, that they were, in the first place, self-appointed; and, in the second place, that the great principle of representation based upon population was not carried out, because although the Lower Provinces possessed each, and even collectively, a much smaller population than Canada, yet they had a much larger number of members in the Congress than we had. As to the first objection, of their being self-appointed or self-constituted, some one had to take the initiative in the matter, and no one had better authority than the different governments to say who should represent their respective provinces in the Conference. Will honorable gentlemen contend that the delegates were self-appointed when they were appointed by the Ministry of the day, who are responsible to the Legislative Assembly, which, in its turn, is responsible to the people at large? Then, as to the second objection, that the numbers were unequal, the honorable gentleman ought to know that the principle of representation by population does not apply to the Conference in the same way that it does to the representation in this and the other House of Parliament. Here the vote of every individual member counts upon a division on any question, and so numbers become of the utmost importance. But in the Conference the votes were counted by provinces, and not by single votes, so that it was impossible that any one province could be swamped by the others by reason of their having a larger representation. The only effect of an undue

representation from any province would be to increase the difficulty the delegates from that one would have in agreeing among themselves to any single proposition, or to the propositions as a whole; and it could not, in any way, work any injustice to the other provinces. I have no doubt the Conference found their greatest difficulty in bringing the members of each section to agree among themselves. (Hear, hear, from the Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL.) If the delegates from any province felt that they could not agree to any of the questions submitted to them, they had but to say so, and the scheme of Confederation, so far as they were concerned, would have been at an end. The argument of unfair representation is, therefore, quite fallacious. There could really be no danger from the number of representatives not being in proportion, so long as each province had the power of protecting itself from any injustice which might be attempted to be perpetrated against it by the others. (Hear, hear.) It has also been objected that the present Canadian Administration was formed upon the avowed policy of forming a Federal union between Upper and Lower Canada only, and that the Government has exceeded their constitutional powers by substituting an union of all the provinces instead of what they had promised. Do we not all remember that the avowed policy of the Government was a Federal union of these provinces, I mean Upper and Lower Canada first, leaving it open to the Maritime Provinces and the colonies of the great west to fall into the union whenever they might find it their interest to do so? Ministers, no doubt, had not the slightest idea that the larger scheme could be accomplished as soon if not sooner than the smaller one. I told my constituents, on coming before them for re-election, that there was an urgent necessity for a different union between Upper and Lower Canada from that which now exists, and that there was not time to include the Lower Provinces in the first scheme. But the movement has outrun my expectation, and I believe that of every member of the House. And is the House to reject the larger scheme when it is the easiest of accomplishment, simply because it had a secondary place in the ministerial programme? I think the Charlottetown Conference was a good opportunity, and that the Government has acted wisely in putting themselves in communication with it, and in taking up the whole union first. But the honorable member from the Wellington Division complains

that sufficient time has not been given to the consideration of the resolutions by the Conference, and cites the case of the American Constitution, when its framers took, I (Hon. Mr. McCREA) know not how many months longer than our own Conference. But the honorable member should recollect that we had all their experience. We could commence where they left off. Their work was ready to our hands. We had also the experience of the working of their Constitution, and knew what to avoid. Besides, the honorable member should recollect that we live in an age of railroads and lightning telegraphs, of which the revolutionary fathers knew nothing; and there is no doubt that speed in travelling and communication has a great deal to do in quickening the perceptions of mankind. Instead of its being made a ground of accusation against the Government that they have accomplished so much in so short a time, it ought rather to redound to their credit. And yet the honorable member for the Niagara Division complains that the measure was not infallible.

HON. MR. CURRIE—I did not make that complaint.

HON. MR. McCREA—Well, the hon. gentleman said that it ought to have been "as infallible as fallible men could make it," and that "it should do complete justice to all and injustice to none." I took down the exact words of the honorable gentleman at the time, and if the last words do not imply infallibility, they certainly come very near it. I venture to assert that if the honorable gentleman were employed to draw up a simple document of a few pages, without the interference of any one to control him, and should refer it to the revision of any competent person, it would be found subject to some criticism. How much less then must we expect a State document like this, the work of so many hands—where so many conflicting elements were to be reconciled—where so much had to be insisted upon on one side and resisted on the other—should do complete justice to all and injustice to none, according to the notions of my honorable friend from Niagara? The wonder is, not that some fault can be found, but that the opponents of the measure can find so little. But it is a little singular that all the gentlemen who have yet spoken against the resolutions of the Conference have declared themselves in favor of Confederation, and yet, by their motions and their speeches, they are doing everything in their power to delay and embarrass the measure—certainly a very left-handed way of shewing their support. Honorable

members argue against the details from both a Canadian and the Maritime point of view, and still tell us they are favorable to Confederation. Some honorable members declare that the question is not opposed in Upper Canada because it is not understood. It is certainly paying a very poor compliment to the intelligence of their constituents. The question has been propounded by eminent statesmen both in the old country and on this side of the Atlantic both time and again since the commencement of the present century, and has been in the minds of the people ever since. The reason why it has not been consummated is that no opportunity has ever presented itself like the present. It had but to be mentioned to take complete possession of the minds of the people. Out of thirteen elections for both branches of the Legislature which have taken place in Upper Canada since the scheme of union has been proposed, every single one, with but one exception, has resulted in its favor; and out of six elections for members of this House, whose original term of office had expired, four, my own among the number, I am glad to say, were by acclamation—I believe chiefly on account of their declared sentiments in favor of the scheme. But it is a little inconsistent, I cannot help saying, that at the same time some honorable gentlemen complain of the ignorance of Upper Canada on the details of the measure—by their votes the other day they refused to allow five hundred extra copies of the resolutions to be printed for the use of members, that they might distribute them among their constituents, proclaiming their ignorance, and yet withholding the means of information. But honorable gentlemen attempt to frighten us with the expenses of the Intercolonial Railway; and my honorable friend from Niagara, arguing from the eastern provincial point of view, declared they would remember the Grand Trunk frauds, and avoid a union with those who had perpetrated them. The Grand Trunk used to be made an excellent stalking horse for gentlemen to ride into Parliament upon, and so pleased have honorable members become with the seat, that even after having arrived here, they find it very difficult to dismount. My honorable friend from the division of King, has just now told us that we Upper Canadians, by the scheme proposed by Ministers, will be compelled to pay tenths the cost of the railway. Well, I thought I had read the resolutions with a great deal of care, and I did not remember anything which said a single word about the

proportionate expense, or about the expense at all. But, thinking I might be mistaken, I have taken the trouble to turn them up, and find there is not one word in them about the railway except the following. It will be found in the sixty-eighth resolution, and reads thus:—"The General Government shall secure without delay the completion of the Intercolonial Railway, from Rivière du Loup through New Brunswick to Truro, in Nova Scotia." Is there anything here about Upper Canada having to pay ten-twelfths of the expense?

HON. MR. REESOR said he had not declared that by the resolutions Upper Canada should pay ten-twelfths, but that upon calculation, taking into account numbers and revenue, that would be the effect.

HON. MR. McCREA—Well, I take the honorable gentleman's explanation. Does he wish to enter into a compact with the Maritime Provinces by which we shall not pay our fair proportion of our expenses according to our numbers and our means? Is he so unjust as to ask so unfair an advantage? The fact is, that the talk about the expenses and stringing together long rows of figures, is only calculated to bewilder and frighten the friends of the scheme. Three millions of dollars a year, exclaims the member for Niagara, without making it very plain how, will be added to our expense for all time to come.

HON. MR. CURRIE—More than that.

HON. MR. McCREA—More than that. Well, what of that? The amount of debt is nothing to him who has the means and is willing to pay. It is only unpleasant to the bankrupt who cannot pay, and to the miser who hates to part with his gold. Some one has said that it was a very great drawback to the morals and prosperity of London, that there should be fifty-thousand thieves within its walls. But it was well replied, that it was rather a source of congratulation that the metropolis should be able to support so many. So instead of regretting that we shall have so much to pay, we ought rather to rejoice that we shall be able to pay it. Instead of complaining that in the construction of the railway, we shall have to pay ten-twelfths, according to the estimate of my honorable friend from the division of King, it ought to be rather a source of pride and satisfaction to us that we have a large population and greater resources than our eastern neighbors. I am as much opposed to needless and extravagant expenditures as any member of this honorable House, but if the Intercolonial Railway has become a necessity, we must

not be afraid to undertake it. I am free to admit there was much needless waste and expenditure in the construction of the Grand Trunk Railway, but I question whether there is a single honorable member of this House who would to-day, if he could, place us back where we were before the first sod was turned in that great undertaking. If war be imminent between us and the United States, and actually ensues, the railway will become an absolute military necessity. And who can tell but that, at any moment, the turning of a hand, looking at what has already happened, we may not be launched into the very midst of a war. It is, I believe, very well known, that as soon as it was learned in Washington that the St. Alban's raiders had escaped through the bungling and incompetency, to say the least of it, of the Montreal officials, the first order of Mr. SEWARD was one of non-intercourse, but it was afterwards modified to the passport system. What, honorable gentlemen, would have been our situation had that order been sent out, and what guarantee have we that it may not be sent out at any moment? But my honorable friend from Niagara says that the union of these provinces would not tend to strengthen our means of defence if, unfortunately, we should be invaded by the United States forces, because our frontier would be extended more than in proportion to the increase of our numbers. Does not every one know that it is the settled conviction of the military authorities of the States that their mistake in the last war was invading these provinces in different places at the same time, and that, in the event of a second war, their policy will be to concentrate all their strength on some one given point—Montreal for instance? And will my honorable friend contend that the union and the railway will not enable us to concentrate a greater force, and more rapidly, on whatever point danger may be threatened, and also that they will not enable us to obtain aid from the British troops more quickly at any season of the year? Then, as to the commercial necessity of the railway, it does seem to me plain that when our own Grand Trunk has a connection with Halifax; when the Cunard and other steamers will discharge their valuable freight and their passengers destined for the far west at Halifax; when Toronto will be brought, in point of time, as near to London and Liverpool as New York; it must not only increase the business of the Grand Trunk, but also the business of the railways in Nova

Scotia and New Brunswick, which are to be made the property of the General Government. When the connection becomes complete there must be a mutual advantage to all. I believe the child is now born in Canada who will live not only to see an Intercolonial but an Inter-oceanic Railway, if this scheme of union shall be honestly and fairly carried out. The necessity of the railway has time and again been admitted by the several governments of these provinces, but, owing to a want of some power to control all, and a natural jealousy of each other, together with our own political differences, the scheme for its construction has always fallen through. When visiting the Maritime Provinces last summer, I told our friends there that the railway could only be had by a union—the union first, and the railway was sure to follow. I come now to consider the amendment of my honorable friend from the Wellington Division, and to which, according to the strict rules of debate, this discussion should have been confined; but I have taken the same course as honorable gentlemen who have preceded me have done, namely, to consider the whole scheme. The amendment brings up the question of members being appointed for life by the Crown, or elected for a term of years by the people. I am among those of the reform party who think that making the members of this House elective was a step in the wrong direction; and though I am free to admit that but for the elective principle having been applied to this House, I should never have had the honor of a seat within its walls, yet I am prepared to re-affirm that opinion on the floor of this House by my voting, as I shall do, against this amendment of my honorable friend from Wellington, and to sanction a return to the nomination of members for life by the Crown, under the advice of Ministers responsible to the people through the Legislative Assembly. I deny that the extension of the elective principle to this House was ever sought for, or petitioned for by the people at the time of its consummation. It is quite true, honorable gentlemen, that before the union of Upper and Lower Canada, and during the palmy days of the Family Compact and the irresponsibility of the Government, when the Assembly had no control over the Executive, except by stopping the supplies, the Legislative Council was chosen for the mere purpose of opposing the public will, and they did it most effectually. Every measure calculated to elevate the people and promote their best interests was sure to be tomahawked, as the phrase went, by that

very obstructive body. Short-sighted politicians of those days, who did not very well understand the working of the British Constitution, fancied the only remedy was by making this House elective. But the memorable resolutions of the 3rd September, 1841, at Kingston, established the true British principle of responsible government, and I maintain that since that time the people never demanded that this House should be made elective. I apprehend that my conservative friends and I, who agree with each other on this point—the nomination of members to this House—come to the same conclusion by a very different process of reasoning. They hold that the elective principle applied to this branch of Parliament gives too much power to the people, while I, on the other hand, argue that they have not by it as quick and as sharp a remedy against a stubborn Council as they had under the system of nomination. The great beauty of the old system was the promptness with which at the critical moment it could be brought to bear, and the history of its operations, both in this country and in England, clearly shews its superiority. My honorable friend from the division of King has cited the case of the greatest commoner of England, the celebrated WILLIAM PITT, having appointed so many members to the House of Lords within the first few months of his ministerial career. Did not PITT at that time command the confidence of the people of England? Does not my honorable friend know, if he has read the history of those times, that this great statesman steadily refused to accept office until he saw that public opinion was ripe for his schemes? And was not PITT, at the commencement of his parliamentary career, the great advocate of parliamentary reform? It is true that subsequent causes, over which he had no control, led him to pursue a very different course. What if at the times of the achievements by the people of those two great victories of civil and religious liberty in England, I mean Catholic emancipation and the passage of the Reform Bill, the Crown, through its ministers responsible to the House of Commons and the English nation, had not had power to coerce the Lords into consent, but had been obliged to wait for two years for the doubtful issue of a certain number of elections. Such have been my opinions with regard to the comparative merits of the nominative and elective principles as applied to this House, and I have not hesitated to express them among my constituents, both before and since

they honored me with this seat. I admit that the proposed system is not the same as the old one, because it limits the numbers, and to this limitation I have the most serious objections; but I am not going to hazard the success of the union scheme, as I sincerely believe I would, by voting for the amendment, but I shall take it as it is, with the hope and belief that in the new Parliament, when the union is consummated, the constitution of this House may be set right. Honorable gentlemen seem to talk as if this scheme and the Imperial Act to be founded upon it, are finalities. I do not look upon any human act as a finality, and I have no doubt a way will be found by which this amendment may be made. Was not the Constitutional Act of 1840 amended? And will honorable gentlemen tell us that the act to be founded upon these resolutions cannot be amended in the same way?

HON. MR. LETELLIER—Will the honorable gentleman tell us how the Act of 1840 was amended?

HON. MR. MCCREA—Does the honorable member from Grandville not remember the increase of members in the representation of the other House, in 1853, and the amendment of the constitution of this House in 1856, the very question I am now debating? Surely these measures were amendments of that act, and who knows but under the new Constitutional Act—the favorite measure of my honorable friend—the election of members of this House, may not again be resorted to, if the nominative principle shall not be found to work well? But let us examine for a moment what the amendment of my honorable friend from Wellington is intended to effect. It will be seen by referring to the amendment itself, that the honorable gentleman proposes that the members of this House from Canada and from the Maritime Provinces shall have a different origin or, as it were, a different parentage, elected by the people with us, and appointed by the Crown from the eastern provinces. I take it that it is very desirable that in whatever way the members of this House may be chosen, there should be uniformity in the system. By the honorable gentleman's plan we shall have one-third of the members from below representing the Crown, and two-thirds from above, representing the people; a curious sort of incongruity which I think should by all means be avoided. I may be answered that our present House is constituted in that very way; but honorable gentlemen must remember that the life members are not the sole representatives of any particular section

of the province, but are chosen indiscriminately from all parts of the province. This is not likely to lead to a sectional collision like the scheme of my honorable friend, and besides that, the appointment of life members in this House is not to be continued after the seats of the present members shall have become vacant from any cause whatever. I think the scheme of my honorable friend the most objectionable of all. The honorable member from Niagara has given us notice that he intends to move a resolution to the House that this question shall be delayed until an appeal shall be had to the people—

HON. MR. CURRIE—The honorable gentleman is quite mistaken. I have given notice of no such motion.

HON. MR. MCCREA—What notice have you given?

HON. MR. CURRIE—If you read it you will see.

HON. MR. MCCREA—Will you give it to me that I may see what it really is? [Upon being handed the notice by the Hon. Mr. CURRIE, the Hon. Mr. MCCREA proceeded.] Ah! Here it is! It reads as follows:—

That upon a measure of such great importance as the proposed Confederation of this and certain other British colonies, this House is unwilling to assume the responsibility of assenting to a measure involving so many important considerations without a further manifestation of the public will than has yet been declared.

How is the honorable gentleman to get this manifestation of the public will unless it be through a dissolution of the other House and a new election? Surely the honorable gentleman does not mean to shelter himself from the legitimate consequences of his resolution by its technical phraseology. It certainly comes with a very bad grace and taste from any member of this House to propose a dissolution of Parliament and send the members of the Assembly packing to their constituents to undergo the wear, tear, expenses and turmoil of an election, while we can sit here firmly in our seats, and with folded hands look quietly on. As to the true state of public opinion upon this important subject in this province, it will be time enough to consider it, when my honorable friend from Niagara comes to press his resolution. If our own political situation required a remedy, I think this union is an excellent opportunity, but I do not mean to urge that our own political exigency should be the only reason for the union. We should settle our own political difficulties. But that and everything else

seems to conspire to this union. The imminence of war with the United States, the certainty of the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty, the danger of non-intercourse, the opportunity of the Charlottetown Convention, and the consequent necessity of the Intercolonial Railway—all point to this Confederation. But the expense is the bugbear of the opponents of this scheme. If the great social and political interests of the country are to be served, if we are to have laid broad and deep in the hearts of the people the foundations of a great nationality, as my honorable friend from Wellington has expressed it, the financial part of the scheme is but a secondary consideration. To-day, the balance of advantage may be against us; to-morrow, it may be in our favor. Who can say, when the railway shall be established, and when by the union we shall have incited new enterprises and energies, and developed the whole resources of the eastern provinces, with whom the financial balance may rest? I cannot close my remarks better than by saying, that had a union of all these provinces existed in fact as it has existed in the minds of statesmen since the commencement of the present century, the man who, in the face of our present critical position, with civil war raging in our vicinity, and even national war threatening ourselves, should now propose to dissolve that union and scatter us again into disjointed fragments, would be looked upon as an enemy to his Queen and a traitor to his country. (Cheers.)

HON. MR. OLIVIER—Honorable gentlemen, a French journal in Montreal, in reporting the proceedings of a meeting recently held at Berthier, to consider the proposed project of the Confederation of Canada and the Lower Provinces, and to which meeting, in the capacity of representative of the division in which the county is situated, I was invited, stated that I had expressed myself against that project, and I therefore take this, the first opportunity, of declaring that the journal in question was in error, and that I did not so express myself. I did, however, say at that meeting, that there were provisions in the project upon which I could not look with a favorable eye, but that I could not then pronounce an opinion, but would wait until I came to Parliament, when I expected the details would be placed before the members fully and in good faith. I must, however, say, honorable gentlemen, that in this I have been much disappointed, for until now, the information so much desired and asked for has

not been supplied, and the House is left in the dark in respect of several important matters upon which it is asked to decide. For instance, it was stated in the resolutions, that means would be taken to effectually protect the minorities and preserve to them the rights they now possess, but we were not informed as to what those rights were, or as to the means to be used for preserving them untouched and unimpaired. If we had known what these means would be, we would have come prepared to assent to, or to dissent from them, in an intelligent manner, and to express our opinions as we ought to do, but this information was not vouchsafed. I understand that a bill, to assure to the Protestants of Lower Canada the uninterrupted possession and enjoyment of their rights, is to be brought down and passed before the scheme of Federation itself is fully adopted and sanctioned; but I have not heard that any similar measure is to be passed in favor of the Roman Catholics of Upper Canada. I have no objection, whatever, to grant to the Protestants of Lower Canada, for all future time, the rights they now enjoy, or any other rights and guarantees which may be deemed reasonable and equitable, but I cannot vote to adopt the resolutions until I am informed whether the Roman Catholics of the west are to be dealt with in the same manner. By refusing us information on this important subject, the Government has placed us in a false position, from which, I think, it is their duty to extricate us. I shall not now address myself to the inquiry of whether the Confederation scheme be really desirable or not, but cannot help saying that the long-standing difference between the two sections of the province might have been arranged, if during the last difficulty between the respective parties the leading men on either side had been willing to sink their personal differences and make mutual concessions. But as it is of no use now to refer to that subject, I will not argue the matter further. I maintain again, however, that the House has a right to expect the Government will give us all the information in respect of the details of the Confederation scheme as may be necessary to understand thoroughly all its provisions. My opinion is, that as much power as possible should have been entrusted to the local governments, and as little as is consistent with the functions it will have to discharge to the Central Government, and my reason for entertaining this opinion is, that the Supreme Government, with its power of purse and its control of the armies, will always

be more disposed to stretch its prerogatives and to trench upon the domain of the local governments than to narrow down and retain its authority. The scheme then, in my opinion, is defective in that it inverts this order and gives to the General Government too much power and to the local governments too little. As it is now, if the scheme goes into operation, the local governments will be in danger of being crushed (*écrasés*) by the General Government. The tendency of the whole scheme seems to be one of political retrogression instead of advancement.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—Hear! hear!

HON. MR. OLIVIER—I am glad the Hon. Premier seems so strongly to approve of what I say.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—Ah! but it is exactly the contrary.

HON. MR. OLIVIER—Then I am sorry not to obtain his approval—(laughter)—but nevertheless I hold that the policy disclosed in the scheme is a backward policy. I want to progress, I want to see the country advance, I want to see the liberties of the country unfolding and expanding; but instead of this our rulers are narrowing them down and restricting their free exercise. (Hear.) They are now proposing to take away the elective principle in its application to this Chamber, and that too, without even having received a petition or sign of any kind from the people that such is their wish. If this is not a policy of retrogression I can hardly imagine what would be. I was not sent here to assist in doing any such thing, and am not aware that there has been any evidence of a desire in the country for a return to the old mode of appointment by the Crown. I am not aware of one complaint, or of any dissatisfaction whatever with the present constitution of the Legislative Council, and I therefore regard it as not a little strange that a few gentlemen, without mission or warrant, should have devised such a change, and should be trying to press it upon the Legislature and the country. I cannot say what is the general feeling in the public mind in favor of a Confederation of Canada and the Maritime Provinces, and so far, perhaps, from being opposed to it personally, I would be glad if it could be accomplished upon principles I can approve. I do not wish, however, to see the local governments crushed under a great central power, and I am sure the people cannot wish, and do not wish, to give up the principle of election in respect of this House. They had fought too long for the privilege to do that, and one

thing was quite clear, we were not sent to Parliament to destroy our present Constitution. There is a great difference between making machinery work and breaking it to pieces, and I maintain that we were elected to legislate within the Constitution, not to legislate away the Constitution. When I was elected I expected to go back to my constituents to give them an account of the manner in which I had fulfilled the duty entrusted to me, not to take advantage of my position to provide for myself a seat for life. No, my constituents never gave me this right, nor was any elected member entrusted with it, and whoever assume to vote away the liberties of the people in this manner, betray their mandate. If it was desired that the people should surrender this right they should have been informed of such desire in good time, so that they might have considered the question; but without warning them, or consulting them, this most highly-prized principle was bartered away to the Lower Provinces for a Confederation which could not last. The Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands had told the House that the repartition of Lower Canada according to the present electoral divisions had been retained for the purpose of protecting the British population of Lower Canada. I think that if, with the retaining these electoral divisions the elective principle was also retained, the French population of Lower Canada would also find in it their protection. For then each division would be free to choose for its representative in the Federal Legislative Council a man attached to the institutions of Lower Canada, while, in giving the nomination of the legislative councillors to the Federal power, the latter would be at liberty to choose whomsoever it thought proper, and, unfortunately—a circumstance which I do not anticipate, but which may occur—the General Government, when formed, might be surrounded by coteries inimical to Lower Canada interests, and be led by them to choose members for the Legislative Council hostile to the views of Lower Canada. I consider, therefore, an elective Legislative Council in the Confederation as essential to the interests of Lower Canada. Nothing is gained politically by the scheme any more than financially. The honorable member for Niagara has abundantly proved that all the results to Canada would be a sacrifice of principles and of money. To assure the advantages to themselves of the scheme of Confederation, the Lower Provinces had stipulated first for the construction of the Intercolonial Railway,

and we would in consequence have to expend twenty millions for that object, besides paying \$63,000 a year to New Brunswick for ten years, and \$150,000 a year to Newfoundland forever. To be sure, in the latter case we would have the produce of the mines of that island, but I would ask any one who knows the value of those mines, how much they would be worth to us?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL said, with respect to the Newfoundland mines, that he had had communicated to him a note from Sir WILLIAM LOGAN, the provincial geologist, which would probably throw some light upon the subject. The note was written unofficially and without the remotest reference to the question under debate, and therefore might be taken as good evidence in the case. It was as follows:—

There is no part of the whole surface, according to my present impression, which deserves more attention than Newfoundland. There is, in that island, a great development of the formations which promise so considerable a mineral result in the Eastern Townships. The coast of the island abounds with good harbors, and the available minerals would, in very many cases, extend to the coast. Newfoundland is the part of the area nearest to Europe. The surface of the island, not being in general very favorable for agriculture, mining might become the means of giving employment to labor and attracting population, while the island requires an increase of inhabitants to make the more available the important position it occupies for the defence of the St. Lawrence and the country beyond on its banks.

After the dinner recess,—

HON. MR. OLIVIER continued his remarks. He said: When the Council adjourned at six o'clock, I was speaking of the Island of Newfoundland, to which we grant a subsidy of \$150,000 per annum, and not for one year only, but for ever. I was saying, moreover, that I was apprehensive that some of us were ignorant of the facts which might have led the delegates at Quebec to grant that sum to the Island of Newfoundland. But it seems, if I perfectly understood what was said, that that sum was granted as an indemnity for giving up the produce of the public lands, mines and forests. We are told by the Honorable Commissioner of Crown Lands (Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL) that he had been informed by the provincial geologist, Sir W. LOGAN, that there really are mines in the Island of Newfoundland. I was anxious to learn from the Hon. Commissioner whether an official exploration of the country had ever been made, whether it had ever been ascer-

tained what kind of mines existed in Newfoundland. The information which he gave was not derived from official reports, and I am extremely anxious to know whether there is any documentary evidence of the existence of the pretended riches of Newfoundland, in woods, mines and public lands.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—The honorable member may go on; in the course of the debate he will receive satisfactory information.

HON. MR. OLIVIER—Very well; but I see by the statistics, on the contrary, that there is no timber on the island beyond what is necessary for the building of the huts or cabins of the fishermen who inhabit it, and that there is no land fit for cultivation belonging to the Crown; and, as to mines, I do not believe any official exploration has been made to ascertain their existence in the island.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—It is a well-ascertained fact that there are mines in the Island of Newfoundland of great value. As to the grant of \$150,000 yearly subsidy, I must observe to the honorable member that it was intended to make up for the revenue given up by Newfoundland to the Confederation, amounting at present to \$400,000.

HON. MR. OLIVIER—Another reason why I cannot approve of the plan of Confederation, as it is now presented to us, is that I consider it as a retrograde step in the political progress of the country. The spirit of modern society is to give to the people as much political liberty as possible; and it is my belief that by this plan of Confederation we shall sacrifice whatever liberty is already possessed by the people of this country. When I expressed this idea, a short time since, the Honorable Premier seemed to give an ironical assent to it, as if he considered my notions exaggerated. I am bound to tell him that I neither love nor approve of mob-rule any more than he does, but I have always held as a political principle, that as much political liberty as possible should be conceded to the masses, combined always with a Government strong enough to maintain order and administer the laws; and herein I consider that I conform to the principles of modern society, without giving in to the dictates of demagoguery. I am favorable to democracy, but not to demagoguery, and in this sense I spoke. I say, then, that in taking from the people for all time, the right which they acquired after long struggles of electing members to this House, we are retrograding, making a step backward, and I am sure the people will not look upon this project with a favorable eye. We are

told that Confederation is become necessary for the defence of the country. For one moment I will admit that it might increase our means of defence, but that is assuredly no reason for urging the adoption of the measure, as now attempted to be done. With Confederation, neither the number of men in the several provinces, nor the pecuniary resources now at their disposal, will be increased. I cannot see what vast increase of strength this Confederation is to give forthwith, for England is fully entitled at this moment to dispose, without let or hindrance, of all the resources, both in men and money, possessed by the colony, just as well as she will be after Confederation is effected. That is therefore no reason to make us urge on the adoption of the measure, especially as we risk nothing by giving the people time to study, examine and understand the new Constitution of which we are desirous to make them a present. They tell us that the Intercolonial Railway is to be a military road. But if it be so, how happens it that nobody has thought of another part of the country in which a military road is much more called for. I can hardly believe that anybody can be serious in this, while they overlook the real military road which would be wanted in the event of hostilities,—I mean a railway between Quebec and Montreal, on the north shore of the River St. Lawrence. In order to render the Intercolonial Railway of any avail as a military road, the North Shore Railway must also be built, for the present road on the south shore may be easily cut and occupied by the enemy. Leaving Quebec it takes the direction of the United States, and leaving Montreal it takes the same direction to meet the other branch at Richmond. In case of war the Americans would have but a short distance to advance to take possession of either one or the other of these branches. I shall now proceed to examine whether the plan of Confederation is really what it seems to be. I hear it said that Confederation, as it is proposed, will be a Federal union—but it seems to me that it will be rather a Legislative union, at least as far as regards the most important interests of Lower Canada. The 29th section of the scheme submitted to us says: "The Federal Parliament shall have the power of making laws for the peace, the well-being, and the good government of the Confederate provinces, and in particular in respect of the following matters." The powers of the Federal Government will be in reality unlimited. The fact of the enumeration of these thirty-seven heads does not in the least

restrain the power of the Federal Government from legislating on everything. The exceptions are few. I would ask the Honorable Premier, for instance, whether the Federal Government has not the power to enact that marriage is a civil contract? He cannot deny it, and I do not believe that that clause will in any way suit Lower Canada. In a matter of divorce, I consider that the power of legislating upon it ought to be vested in the Federal Government; but as to the passing of a marriage act, we have the authority of the past to convince us that Lower Canada will never be satisfied with what is proposed in the plan of Confederation. On a former occasion, when a member of the Parliament of Canada moved to enact that marriage should be made a civil contract, all the members for Lower Canada voted against the motion, and the whole country was opposed to it. I shall also inquire whether the Federal Government will not have the right to enact that religious corporations shall no longer exist in the country, or that they shall not be allowed to hold real property, except what is absolutely necessary for their lodging accommodation. According to the resolutions which have been submitted to us, the Federal Government would certainly have this right. It has been said that article 15 of the 43rd resolution replies to this objection, but I can see nothing in that article which restricts the right of the Federal Government to legislate on this matter. The 43rd resolution defines the powers of the local governments, and article 15 of that resolution declares that they may make laws respecting "property and civil rights, excepting those portions thereof assigned to the General Parliament." That article reserves to the local legislatures nothing relative to religious corporations, and the Federal Government would have full power to decree that those corporations shall not hold immovable property. The supreme power is that which has the right to legislate upon, and regulate the existence of, the corporations in question, and they can only possess civil rights so long as the Government permits them to exist. The same might be said of most of the institutions to which Lower Canada is attached. I am therefore right in saying that, so far as those things which Lower Canada most holds to be concerned, Confederation is in fact a Legislative union, because upon the Federal Government is conferred the right of legislating upon those subjects which Lower Canada holds most dear. It appears to me that it is the more important not to proceed

so rapidly as it is proposed to do, because it is extremely difficult to foresee what will be the bearing of the platform which it is proposed to erect. I have just cited the rights which Confederation would confer upon the Federal Government in respect of certain points; but there are other interests which may perhaps be imperilled by this measure—I will cite, for instance, the rights of the creditors of the provinces.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—They will have the guarantee of the Confederation.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—The rights of the creditors of the province will form the subject of an arrangement between Upper and Lower Canada at a later period, but the creditors will have the guarantee of the whole Confederation.

HON. MR. OLIVIER—I see nothing of that in the resolutions.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—All the details are not included in the resolutions; but as to the balance of \$5,000,000 which will have to be divided between Upper and Lower Canada, and which constitutes the difference between the \$62,000,000 of debt which will be assumed by the Confederation, and the \$67,000,000 which Canada owes, a division will be made before Parliament is dissolved.

HON. MR. OLIVIER—I understood that the debts were to be divided and that the indemnity to the seigniors, for instance, for the abolition of the Seigniorial Tenure was to be imposed entirely on Lower Canada. If there are any verbal explanations beyond what is contained in the resolutions, I am quite willing to receive them from the Government, but that is just the reason why we should not be in a hurry to adopt these resolutions until we have those explanations, for it might be dangerous not to have all these questions settled before voting for Confederation; who can say whether we can settle them as well after as before? These promises of explanations shew that, since all the facts are not submitted, we may easily mistake the meaning of the resolutions which we are called upon to adopt. In any case, I certainly see nothing in these resolutions which gives the seigniors the guarantee of the Confederation as security for their claim, and I can only judge of the resolutions by what they contain, especially in the absence of any explanation of the details. The Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. GALT) stated that the debt due to the seigniors would fall on Lower Canada alone, and this does not agree exactly with what the Prime Minister has just said. As I said a short time

ago, when speaking of the school question, I would not vote for a Constitution which would not confer on the Catholics of Upper Canada the same advantages as are possessed by the Protestants of Lower Canada, and I consider that this is a matter that should be settled before taking a vote on the resolutions, for when Confederation is once voted it may easily happen that we shall not be able to obtain what is promised us now. We therefore are in a position which may make us sacrifice the minority of Upper Canada by voting Confederation now, or make us vote against a principle which we might perhaps accept, if we were acquainted with all its details. For my part, I acknowledge that I would not cause the plan of Confederation which is proposed to us to miscarry, if it is possible to make it just, acceptable and useful to all parties. But for this I will not sacrifice the interests of a portion of the population. Another point upon which we require explanations, and respecting which we have none, is that relating to the constitution of the local governments. Now, for instance, some journals which usually express the views and opinions of the present Government, have stated that in all the local governments the system of responsibility of the ministers to the people or their representatives would not exist, but that an irresponsible system would be substituted for it. I ask which of you would accept such a system, and what part of the people would approve of such an alteration in our political institutions? You are told "vote for the plan submitted to you, and the details will be explained to you at a later period." But at a later period neither Upper nor Lower Canada will be master of the position, and able to obtain the system of government which may suit them, should that imposed upon them not meet their views. But, yet once more, why hurry you so much? Why, for instance, should this House be called upon to sit twice a-day on this question before even its details are known? Why depart from our custom of examining matters in a calm and deliberate manner. Certainly, up to the present time, not one valid reason has been given to justify the hurry in which it is proposed to carry this measure. Mention has indeed been made of defence, but this is no valid reason, for it is perfectly well known that all the resources of Canada are now at the disposal of England in case of need; this precipitate action is then neither justified nor justifiable. I ask whether we know the plan of Confederation which is submitted to us,

and, unfortunately, I must answer my question in the negative. Surprise has been expressed in certain quarters at the opposition which has arisen to this measure after all the advantages which we were promised should result from it. Thus it was said that under Confederation we should obtain coal from Nova Scotia without having any duty to pay. This reasoning might appear to carry a certain amount of force with it, but I must say that it is in fact captious, for we find at the present day that we can indeed get this coal, but by paying the export duty exactly like foreign countries. Would there, then, be no real free trade between the different parts of the same Confederation? Would the position of the provinces, in this respect, remain as it is to-day? The proof of what I state here is found in Hon. Mr. GALT's speech to his constituents:—

In Nova Scotia a considerable revenue was derived from a royalty on coal mines, and its representatives at the Conference stated that if the General Government imposed an export duty on coal it would annihilate one of their most important resources, and, therefore, Nova Scotia has been allowed to regulate herself the export duty on coal, precisely as New Brunswick enjoys that right as regards its timber.

This duty which Nova Scotia may impose on the export of its coal, whatsoever it may be styled, is then in reality an export duty, and the result, as regards ourselves, is to leave us still in the same position if we must pay the duty in order to get the coal of that province. The argument based on the fact that we could obtain coal from Nova Scotia without paying an import duty, is thus destroyed, since the duty will still exist. I have already stated that the plan submitted for our approval is exceedingly complex, and that it is not easy to foresee the difficulties that will arise between the local governments and the Federal Government. It may, perhaps, be asserted that these difficulties cannot be very serious, inasmuch as the local governments will not possess any large powers; but if it is designed to make them real governments, and not mere municipalities, they may be opposed to the Central Government on a host of questions. Take, for instance, the question of the fisheries. Article 17, of the 29th resolution, gives to the Federal Parliament the power of legislating on the "sea coast and inland fisheries." Under the 8th article of the 43rd resolution, the local legislatures will also have the right of legislating on the "sea coast and inland fisheries." Thus

the local legislatures and the Federal Legislature will have the right to legislate on the same subjects. And if the laws they make are in opposition the one to the other, what will be the result? And this may well happen, for we know that in the Gulf, for instance, there are fisheries which are of the highest importance for the people of Lower Canada, as well as for the people of the adjoining colonies, of which the latter have taken possession, and sought to exclude our people from them. Now, if the Local Government of Lower Canada made laws to protect its subjects and insure to them the right to these fisheries, would it not be in the power of the Federal Government to interfere and prevent it? And if this were to happen, would it not give rise to endless antipathies and struggles between the two governments? Lower Canada would not suffer such an interference without feeling it very strongly; and what I have just said with reference to the fisheries might also occur with reference to a large number of questions. And it is quite evident that if the Local Government, acting in the interests of a province, were arrested in its action by the Federal Government, the people would take sides with their Local Government and become disaffected towards the Central Government.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—This question of the fisheries is, no doubt, divided between the local governments and the Federal Government, but it is evident, that in order that justice may be done to each part of the Confederation in an impartial manner, the general legislation must be left to the General Government, while the application of the internal details within the limits of the fisheries of a province, must be left to the local legislatures.

HON. MR. OLIVIER—The argument I have brought forward, with reference to fisheries, is applicable to other questions, and is merely to show that the present plan is complex, that there are conflicting interests in the different colonies, and that the settlement of them, in one sense or in another, might be productive of discontent in the country, and create a spirit of dissatisfaction among the people. Some one has said that this project is viewed favorably in England, and that for that reason we ought to accept it in order to prevent the evil consequences that might arise from our opposition to the project. For my part, I do not believe that England would insist so strongly on the details as they are insisted on here, but I believe her desire is, that the plan should be just and acceptable,

and that it should be thoroughly understood by the people before it is adopted; she is less anxious to enforce the details of the project than to see the people of the provinces content and satisfied with it. If a large portion of the people were opposed to the project, I do not think that England would approve of forcing this project upon them without giving time to examine it or to pronounce upon it. The opinion of the country upon this plan is, to-day, quite unknown. I am quite aware that certain members can vote in favor of the project with the certainty of their course meeting the approval of their constituents; for instance, those whose elections have taken place since the plan was submitted to the country. But in those parts of the country where no elections have taken place, it is impossible to say that the people will be satisfied or that they will endorse the action of their representatives in voting for Confederation, because we have not been enabled to make it known. Thus when my constituents invited me to a public meeting to discuss the subject, I was compelled to admit that I could not tell them what the plan of Confederation was; that I could not communicate it to them, because the resolutions I had received were private. I also told them that I did not wish to form my opinion before hearing the discussion and learning the details; but to-day we are refused the details, and the adoption of the project is pressed without affording us time to study it as it is. An attempt will probably be made to injure us in the opinion of our electors if we vote against this project, and we shall be accused of having opposed Confederation; but I trust the people will see that we cannot vote for a thing with which we are not acquainted, and that we shall have their approval in the course we shall adopt. When the project of Confederation is submitted to the English Parliament, they will take it for granted that the people of this country approve of it; but they will never suppose that the measure has been forced upon the people without affording them the opportunity of pronouncing for or against it. But there is another thing; it is not surprising that this project should be looked upon with a favorable eye in England, for public opinion is composed specially of that of the industrial and commercial classes, and it is the interest of those classes to favor Confederation. But let us well consider whether the interests of those classes are ours also. I consider that our present political course should be to see to the interests of the agri-

culture, the trade and the industry of our country, before laboring to build up that of English traders and artisans. If by Confederation we unite provinces, the inhabitants of which find it their interest to have a very low tariff adopted, it might very well happen that the agricultural interest of Canada might not find itself so well off, and in such a case what would be the result? The result would be that we should very soon have an enormous debt, and that, should the customs revenue not suffice to meet it and provide for the expenditure, the deficit would have to be made up by means of direct taxation, which would weigh upon the agriculture and industry of the country. If we have a tariff of twenty per cent., it protects the industry of our native land, and is a source of revenue wherewith to provide for the public expenditure; but if we make it too low, real property will suffer, for on it will be laid the burthen imposed to meet the deficit. Confederation would appear to me to be very costly, for money is scattered on all sides in handfuls. Thus it is proposed to construct the Inter-colonial Railway, which will cost at least \$20,000,000; to Upper Canada is given \$16,000,000 to improve its canals; \$150,000 a year is given to Newfoundland, as a compensation for mines which perhaps do not exist, and \$63,000 to New Brunswick; and after all this the Local and Federal Governments have the power conferred on them of adding new taxes to those which already exist in order to meet the expenditure; and I have no doubt whatever but that they will avail themselves of that permission. All this is deserving of consideration, and these are reasons which should induce the Government to submit the question to the people, instead of wishing to have it decided at once; for, even allowing the measure to be absolutely a good one, the people will always regard it with mistrust if it is thrust upon them. What! we are told that we are perhaps on the eve of a war with our neighbors, and we run the risk of dissatisfying the people by imposing a system upon them to which they are perhaps opposed. It is not only in the district of Montreal that the submission of the question to the people is called for—the *Toronto Leader* says that the people ought to be consulted, and this appears to me to be most reasonable. For my part, I am in favor of an appeal to the people, and I cannot approve of Confederation being thrust upon them without their being consulted. Let it be well understood, if it is wished that the population should make sacrifices for its

government in case of war, we must not begin by rendering them discontented and disaffected. Let a fair and equitable system of Confederation be proposed, and let the people have an opportunity of examining into it and approving of it, and then no man will shrink from the necessity of making the greatest sacrifices to defend the Constitution which has been freely accepted by the people. It may be said that the people would be compelled to march at the point of the bayonet; but the risk of such a course is great, for the arm is but feeble when it is not animated by the heart, and to defend a country effectually the heart of the people must be in the cause. The Prime Minister stated that the object of Confederation was to strengthen the monarchical principle in this country. I do not see that it is necessary to confer upon the Crown greater privileges than it already possesses in England itself. In England the members of the House of Lords are not appointed by the Crown; succession in the peerage goes down hereditary from father to son; but here it is proposed that the members of the Legislative Council, which body corresponds to the House of Lords, should be selected by the Crown. Why should this be? Why go beyond what is done in England itself? Is it that the Crown complains that it has not sufficient power here? As to the statement that it is proposed to establish in America, by means of Confederation, a counterpoise to the influence and power of the United States, I would ask whether that would not in itself constitute the best pretext which the Government of the United States could wish for upon which to declare war against us. At the present time, I am not of opinion that the American people are desirous of seeking a quarrel with us; just now they have quite enough to attend to. But if their Government should think it to their interest to declare war against England, the best pretext which they could bring forward to excite the American people against us would certainly be this pretended counterpoise which it is sought to establish. It is well known that the MONROE doctrine is a principle to which all the people of the United States are attached, and, should we give them an opportunity, they would avail themselves of it to put that doctrine into practice. Since Confederation does not in reality increase the strength of the colonies, why should we give umbrage to the Government of the United States, and provide them with the means of animating their people against us in case of the breaking out of hostilities? If the means

for the defence of the country were increased, I would say, let us throw aside all these considerations, but such, in my opinion, is not the case. In conclusion, I would implore the Government to grant to the people the time and the opportunity of convincing themselves that the Constitution which it has prepared is a good one, and that it has really been planned with a view to their interests; and, in that case, I predict that when the time for defence comes, the people will march like one man. But if it is intended to thrust it upon them by main force, and without consulting them, we must not, we cannot, expect them to defend their land with the like zeal. I consider that this demand is no more than just, both to ourselves and to the people whom we represent. So far as I myself am concerned, I did not come here to fight against Confederation and destroy it at any price, but I certainly will not vote for it without being acquainted with it in all its details. [Cheers.]

The debate was then adjourned till tomorrow.

—o—

TUESDAY, *February* 14, 1865.

HON. SIR N. F. BELLEAU said—Hon. gentlemen, the discussion on the scheme of Confederation has already been protracted, and little really remains to be said, for all the objections to the scheme have been made by the one side and replied to by the other. I may, however, be permitted to offer a few remarks on one or two of the objections which were urged again yesterday. For the last three years the country has witnessed a state of things which by many persons has been designated governmental anarchy. Government after government in rapid succession have grasped the helm of state. A state of conflict existed between political parties which was hourly on the increase; a conflict which threatened to arrest the progress of public business, and which drew the minds of our statesmen to consider whether any means could be adopted to remedy this state of things. The men of influence throughout the country at length decided to unite, and have come to the conclusion that a remedy was to be found in a Confederation of the British American Provinces. It is not to be wondered at that this plan should have attracted the attention of the present Administration, for it was not a new one, and the question had already been brought before the country

on several occasions. In the Confederation of these provinces are to be found elements which give promise, nay, contain the germ of a power which will one day take its place among the nations of the world. And in considering this Confederation of the British North American Provinces, I am reminded of the fable of the bundle of sticks, which I learned in my childhood, and which so exactly applies to the present circumstances. This fable tells us that the sticks when bound together were strong enough to resist all the efforts made to break them, but that when separated they were broken one by one with but little effort. It seems to me that the lesson afforded by this fable may be well applied to the question of Confederation—separated we are weak, united we shall be strong. Commerce, population, manufactures, progress, in a word, all the elements requisite to constitute a powerful nation are contained in the united colonies; but these become of little consequence if allowed to be utilised by each separate colony. And not only would the union of these elements constitute the Confederation a great power amongst the other nations of the world, but there would be found amongst its population a number of sturdy arms, sufficient, with the aid of Great Britain, to repel foreign aggression. I do not belong to that school which pretends that in case of invasion on the part of the United States, the best thing we could do would be to remain passive with folded arms. That is not my idea. Such notions may flatter the opinions and desires of those who have republican leanings, of annexationists and of anti-Canadians, who are nothing less than enemies of the monarchical system in this country. I have no sympathy with those who place themselves at the head of the republican and annexationist school, for I see in them none of those national aspirations of which every man is always proud. With these few remarks to shew the necessity of Confederation, and that its first result will be the production of a new and powerful people, I propose to consider the terms and conditions of the scheme, and whether Lower Canada will find in them the protection its interests demand. The first point to which I directed my attention was to ascertain what guarantees Lower Canada would find in Confederation for its laws, its religion and its autonomy. I find the guarantee of all these things in that article of the

scheme which gives to Lower Canada the local government of its affairs, and the control of all matters relating to its institutions, to its laws, to its religion, its manufactures and its autonomy. Are you not all prepared, hon. gentlemen, and you especially members from Lower Canada, to make some few sacrifices in order to have the control of all those things to which I have just referred, and which are all to be within the jurisdiction of the local governments. Are you not ready to make some few sacrifices to see an end put to those struggles which have been constantly recurring during the last few years, to the imminent peril of Lower Canada and of its institutions—dangers which still exist and which might even now become only too apparent were the friends who have sustained the combat to grow weary, or to give way and leave the field to their adversaries? If we persist in striving to obtain too much, if we are unwilling to make any sacrifice, we may lose the whole result of these struggles and the advantages now offered for our acceptance. For my part the consideration that we shall have the control of our local affairs in Lower Canada, under the Confederation, is a sufficient inducement to vote in favor of the scheme now submitted to us, even although it offered us no other advantage. But, without entering into the details, I now propose to reply to certain objections which have been urged, and prove that it is for our interest to adopt this plan. One of the very first objections raised has been offered by the honorable member for the Wellington Division (Hon. Mr. SANBORN). He has stated that he could not vote for Confederation because he had not received the sanction of his constituents to change the Constitution of his country. Whilst, however, he makes this statement, the same honorable gentleman proposes, nevertheless, to change the Constitution which he declares his electors have not given him authority to change in any particular. This is the resolution which he proposes in amendment:

Upper Canada to be represented in the Legislative Council by twenty-four elective members, and Lower Canada by twenty-four elective members, and the Maritime Provinces by twenty-four members, corresponding with the twenty-four elective members in each section of Canada, of which Nova Scotia shall have ten, New Brunswick ten, and Prince Edward Island shall have four, and the present members of the Legislative Council of Canada, as well life members as elective members, shall be members of the first

Legislative Council of the Federal Parliament, the appointed members to remain for life, and the elective members for eight years from the date of their election, unless removed by death or other cause; their successors to be elected by the same divisions and electors as have elected them.

Well, honorable gentlemen, if the honorable member from Wellington has not received authority to change the Constitution of this country, certainly he has not the right to make the amendment which he proposes, an amendment which is full of contradiction. The honorable gentleman says that he has no objection to vote for Confederation after having consulted his electors. Well, although he may not have much faith in the maxim *Vox populi, vox Dei*, the honorable member has declared that the rule of his conduct has always been, *Salus populi suprema lex*. I have no doubt, however, that he would say, *Salus meus suprema lex est*, if he were appointed a life member, and that he would have no scruple as regards amending the Constitution. The same argument has been urged by the honorable member for Lanau-dière (Hon. Mr. OLIVIER). Well, I think that that honorable gentleman will not, without difficulty, extricate himself from the dilemma in which I am about to place him. He has also stated that he had received no authority from his constituents to alter the Constitution. If he has not received this authority, he ought to vote against the amendment which is now proposed, the object of which is to alter the Constitution. If this objection were a serious one, why do not members who are desirous of consulting their electors resign their seats, and seek re-election on this question, instead of setting the whole country in a blaze by a dissolution? But no, they fold their arms and say that a dissolution does not affect them, the Council would not be affected by it. They are not, then, serious in asking for an appeal to the people. The hon. member for Grandville (Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST) has also read something to the same purpose. I call upon him, then, to resign his seat and to consult his constituents; but as he has already tried the experiment lately in two important places in his division, he knows that the ground trembles under his feet. I do not think he would care to make the trial, as the result might be very far from gratifying.

HON. MR. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—
—I am ready to resign to-morrow, if you

will come and contest the division with me.

HON. SIR N. F. BELLEAU—I will not go myself, but others will, and I venture to predict that you will be left at home. I trust, then, that we shall hear no more about this want of authority to alter the Constitution, for it is only a roundabout way of defeating the scheme of Confederation, out of pure party feeling. It has also been said that the electors were taken by surprise, and that they did not know what was being done—that they did not know what the plan of Confederation was until it was discussed here; but those who have taken part in public affairs since 1858 cannot say this; for the question has been laid before the country for discussion several times since that period, and always by official acts. No one has forgotten the celebrated speech made by the Hon. Mr. GALT, in 1858, when he joined the CARTIER-MACDONALD Ministry, in which he declared himself to be in favor of a Confederation of the provinces. It has not been forgotten that Hon. Messrs. GALT, CARTIER and ROSS then made a voyage to England to lay before the Minister for the Colonies their views on the subject of Confederation. It is true that from that period up to last year, but little was said about it, because there had been a change in the English Government, and it was necessary to recommence all that had been done; but if the question was not talked about in England, it was not allowed to sleep here. No one has forgotten the Speech from the Throne, delivered in Toronto in 1858, by Sir EDMUND HEAD, in which he spoke of the necessity of enquiring into the matter, and laying it before the country. Most certainly no better means of submitting it to the people could have been adopted. Subsequently the question was mooted again and again in the House of Assembly up to the time when, governments succeeding each other like flashes of lightning, it became necessary to have recourse to a coalition, in order to put an end to the anarchy which prevailed in the political affairs of the country. The coalition in question was based on the principle of Confederation. The members of that Government, by a happy and unusual concurrence of circumstances, had an opportunity of meeting at the Charlottetown Conference to discuss the question, and enter slightly upon the subject of a general Confederation. They again met at Quebec,

together with all the delegates from the Lower Provinces, and the result of their labors is the plan which is now laid before us. But there is more to be said, for before the present Ministry had entered upon the consideration of the plan, with their colleagues of the Gulf provinces, His Excellency had alluded to it in his Speech, and had said that it was absolutely necessary that a conclusion on the subject should be come to. And besides, the leading papers of this province and of the Lower Provinces, have long been engaged in the discussion of the question. The details have been examined in all their bearings to satiety. In view of all these facts, I would ask how it can be said that the people do not know what the question is? No; this is merely a pretext which is made use of to overthrow the plan. But another fact which goes to prove that the people have not been taken by surprise in this matter is, that within the last ten months, there have been twelve elections of legislative councillors, and it cannot be said that when those elections took place, the question of Confederation was not before the public. This would be to state a falsehood in the full glare of noonday. The hon. member for Lanaudière (Hon. Mr. OLIVIER), yesterday said that a Montreal paper had stated that he had declared himself opposed to Confederation, and he hastened to contradict the assertion. But I must say that when he appeared before his constituents and talked of retrograde steps—when he said that, for his part, he should consider it a step back in civilization, if he voted against the election of members of this House, I consider that it was idle of him to say that he had not declared himself opposed to Confederation.

HON. MR. OLIVIER—The details.

HON. SIR N. F. BELLEAU—Details and principle. I say then that at the elections which have taken place, the members elected, unless they did not choose to do their duty, must have spoken of the Confederation, and above all, of the manner in which the Legislative Council would be treated in that Confederation. And if these details were entered into, the people are acquainted with the subject in question. And not only have there been elections, but there have been public meetings in large numbers throughout the whole country,—that is to say, wherever the opponents of Confederation could get them up without

danger to themselves; and at all these meetings they did not require to be forced to speak of Confederation, and that in the most unfavorable terms possible. It is true that matters were not represented on those occasions in their true light, but the people at any rate knew what subject was under discussion. The honorable member for Wellington (Hon. Mr. SANBORN) laid great stress on the danger which might be incurred by the Protestant minority in the local legislation of Lower Canada. He fears that they may not be sufficiently protected by the Catholic majority in respect of their religion, their schools and possibly their property. I am astonished to hear such language from the lips of a man who, like myself, represents a division more than one-half of the population of which is French Canadian and Catholic, for that fact in itself is a proof of the liberality of our fellow-countrymen. I heard that remark with pain; but I can tell him that the Protestant minority of Lower Canada have nothing to fear from the Catholic majority of that province: their religion is guaranteed by treaty, and their schools and the rights which may be connected with them, are to be settled by legislation to take place hereafter, and when that legislation is laid before the Houses, those members who so greatly tremble now for the rights of the Protestant minority will have an opportunity of protecting that minority; they may then urge their reasons, and insist that the Protestants shall not be placed in a position of the slightest danger. But even granting that the Protestants were wronged by the Local Legislature of Lower Canada, could they not avail themselves of the protection of the Federal Legislature? And would not the Federal Government exercise strict surveillance over the action of the local legislatures in these matters? Why should it be sought to give existence to imaginary fears in Lower Canada? I say imaginary, because the liberality of the inhabitants of Lower Canada—a liberality of which they gave proof long, long ago, by enacting the emancipation of the Jews before any other nation in the world had dreamed of such a measure—is well known. No; far from wishing to oppress other nationalities, all that the French Canadians ask is to live at peace with all the world; they are quite willing that they should enjoy their rights, provided that all live peaceably together. (Hear.)

I cannot refrain from saying a word as to the Protestants of Lower Canada, and as to the liberality evinced towards them by the French and Catholic population. It is feared that we may combine together in order to treat them unjustly. I may be wrong in referring to the fact, but it is true that the French Canadians have always lived on more cordial terms with the English Protestants than with the Irish, who are nevertheless of the same religion, and of the same belief as themselves. If this good feeling has always existed, what is there to fear? The hon. member for Lanaudière (Hon. Mr. OLIVIER) has said, that the plan of Confederation was not necessary, and in that he agreed with the hon. member for Grandville (Hon. Mr. LETELLIER). He has stated that it would have been possible to regulate the difficulties which we have witnessed, without having recourse to Confederation, from the fact that many of these difficulties arose from the hatred existing between certain individuals. Now, for my part, I do not believe that our political men were actuated by motives of mutual hatred. When I witnessed the struggles which occurred in the House of Assembly, the votes of want of confidence which were proposed, I always felt that those who proposed them gave good reasons for so doing. But I was not aware of the existence of hatred or personal jealousy between the parties, and that upon the removal of such feelings, the difficulties might be easily overcome. But the statement is made simply for want of any sound arguments against Confederation. The same hon. member also stated, that the minorities in Upper and Lower Canada wished to know the fate reserved for them, before voting for Confederation. If he had reflected a little, he would have learned that the fate of the minorities will be defined by the law, that their religion is guaranteed by treaties, and that they will be protected by the vigilance of the Federal Government, which will never permit the minority of one portion of the Confederation to be oppressed by the majority. The hon. member also contends that the local governments ought to have larger powers than those proposed to be conferred upon them, and that the Federal Government ought to have fewer powers. To hear him, one cannot help thinking that the experience of history is entirely lost on certain individuals. He must have been aware, however, that it is in

reference to the rights of particular states, that civil war now exists in the United States; nevertheless, he would implant in this country the same germ of discord. He would have more power below and less authority above. For my part I say the very contrary, if we wish to have a strong Government capable of enforcing respect for its authority when it shall be necessary to enforce it. The hon. member also stated that he has no confidence in the exercise of the powers of the Federal Government, because it would be surrounded by a clique.

HON. MR. OLIVIER—I did not say that would be the case, but that, theoretically, it might occur, and that if it were surrounded by a clique, the rights of Lower Canada would be in danger.

HON. SIR N. F. BELLEAU—That makes no difference; for he stated that he feared the Government would be surrounded by a clique. But is it not the national representation that will surround the Federal Government? Is that a clique? To say that our Government is a clique, is to vilify the institutions of the country. The Government will be responsible to the Legislature. Let us never lose sight of the fact, that our national representatives will always see that Lower Canada shall have in the Federal Government one, or perhaps two, representatives—the number is not of importance. What is of importance is, that such one, or such two members, should represent in her Executive Council the national representation, which will be composed of 65 members, in the Federal Legislature. And this, forsooth, is called a clique! I insist somewhat at length upon this point, because the operation of the principle of responsible government in the Federal Legislature is lost sight of. I beg to call the attention of Lower Canada members to this. Suppose it were proposed to adopt a law in the Federal Legislature calculated to injure Lower Canada, our 65 representatives in the House of Commons discuss the law, and decide that they must oppose it; they at once communicate with the members of the Government representing Lower Canada, and inform them that they cannot accept the measure, and that if it be passed, they will coalesce with the minority, which always exists under responsible government, and that they will overthrow the Ministry. Such is the weight of our influence in the Federal Government; and if this were not lost sight of, there

would be no grounds for fear. The influence of Lower Canada will enable her to make and unmake governments at pleasure, when her interests shall be at stake or threatened. And if the importance of this responsibility of the Federal Government were well understood, there would be no anxiety about our institutions. The hon. member also stated that he did not want to make a backward step in relation to the election of the members of the Legislative Council. In reply to that, I would state that the elective principle, as applied to the Legislative Council, becomes unnecessary in view of the numerical strength of Lower Canada in the Federal Parliament, for the House of Commons is the body that will make and unmake ministers. Why have the elective principle for the Legislative Council, since we shall have it for the House of Commons, since we shall have a responsible Government and a Federal Government, composed of members elected by the people? The hon. member has stated that he desired to advance with the intellect of the people, and not to take a backward step. These are great words—the intellect of the people! progress! But for my part, I do not hesitate to assert that the people will gladly sacrifice the election of the members of the Legislative Council, in view of the control of all the matters I mentioned before. The hon. member has said that the elective principle would have been the safe-guard of Lower Canada. I can understand this to be the case in a House which is able to make and unmake administrations, but in a House which is indissoluble, I cannot discover its importance. The safety of Lower Canada depends, not on the elective principle, but on the responsibility of the members of the Executive to the House of Commons. I may be permitted to say one word on the subject of the elective right, as it is the grand panacea for all the ills incident to humanity. We must not shut our eyes against evidence. Have we, since the union of several counties to form electoral divisions, seen persons of independent fortune and character, who do not seek to make a gainful pursuit of politics, offer themselves for election to the Legislative Council? I acknowledge that the elections to seats in the Legislative Council which have taken place so far have had excellent results: the members sent hither by their constituencies have added new lustre to the body; but has it not now become almost

impossible to get an independent man to stand? The contested elections in the large divisions have disgusted many who would do honor to the country, but who will not risk their fortune in an election; and if we see such a result already, what is it likely to be hereafter? We shall see political intriguers making their own of the electoral divisions as a living—living by politics and for politics only. We shall see what has been seen in other countries—people embracing political life as a shield against their creditors, sheltering themselves under its ægis against the law. Such men will fill this House, to the exclusion of honor and honesty. I say again, those who now compose this House are honorable men, who are a credit to their country—in time, their seats will be filled by political intriguers. Another, and a final objection to Confederation has been made, namely, that having it, we shall not have increased the means of defence, nor the resources of the country. If those who talk thus had taken time to consider the matter more carefully, they would not hold this opinion. It is evident that with the means of communication already provided, and the Intercolonial Railway, if a section of Upper Canada should be invaded by the enemy, the combined forces of the Confederation might be transported to the point threatened in a very short time, and we would be in a position to show the enemy that united we are strong. We should be wilfully blind not to see this. It has also been alleged that in order to increase our means of defence, we should build the North Shore Railway, and that the Government who do not this are inefficient and renegades to their country.

HON. MR. OLIVIER—I never made use of that expression.

HON. SIR N. F. BELLEAU—True, you did not make use of the expression, but what you said amounted to that in meaning. According to the hon. member, the North Shore Railway would be the salvation of the country. I believe the hon. member resides somewhere in the north, on the line of that road. (Hear, and laughter.) I believe that his motto is, *Salus mea suprema lex est.*—(All for myself, nothing for others.) The North Shore Railway has had, and may again have, its advantages; and as a channel of communication I should be glad to see it built, but at present the building of it would cost too dear. When the military defences

projected by the present Administration for the protection of the South Side Railway are completed, the north side road will not be required. The hon. member has also said that he is desirous of giving the inhabitants of the country time to reflect on and study the scheme of Confederation, and that he does not see why we should wish to urge on the passing of the measure so strenuously. I have already observed that a plan was submitted to the Mother Country some years ago, but that a change of ministers then had rendered the scheme abortive. The same thing may happen again; and if we consider the age of the Premier of England, and the uncertain position in which his Cabinet would stand if he should die, it will be plain that we have no time to lose. This is a very sufficient reason for urging on the measure in the minds of those who hold that it is destined to save the country. One more remark and I have done. The hon. member (Hon. Mr. OLIVIER) has adjured us not to wound the susceptible feelings of our neighbors,—not to give umbrage to their sensitiveness,—by entering into a Confederation which might give them a pretext for carrying out the Monroe doctrine. This is, I think, the most paltry reason that could be alleged in discussing the most important question of legislation which has ever arisen on this continent, so far as the fate of Canada is concerned. I think that the measure is in every respect suitable and advantageous to Canada. Any attempt to obstruct it by such considerations, is a proof of pusillanimity, and I almost feel ashamed to hear the expression of them from the lips of a French Canadian. (Cheers.)

HON. MR. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—Honorable Gentlemen, after the speech which we have just heard, I hope a few words will be allowed to me, for I have been, I must say, perfectly astonished to hear such statements fall from the lips of the hon. member who has just resumed his seat; and if my object was to reply to him, I might satisfy myself with saying:—

ORLANDO, in his frenzy, I saw,
Expend all his strength and toil,
From the hold of their mother earth to draw,
Trees that clave not to the soil.

It is most certainly my right, I consider, when I see an honorable member rise in his place, and say that we, the councillors elected by the people, are nobody because our

pouches are not so well lined as those of certain honorable members, to express my astonishment at the use of such language; for we should be permitted to hold the opinion, that the value of the man is not to be measured by the amount of money which he may happen to possess. There is such a thing as a nobility of education and of intellect, as well as a moneyed aristocracy, and for my part, I consider that the former is quite equal to the latter. In all countries in the world education has produced a feeling of devotion to the country, while riches alone have often produced but sordid avarice. The hon. member pretends that if the elective principle continues to be applied to the Legislative Council, the result will very soon be that all those adventurers who seek to live in political life and by political life, will drive from our midst all men of merit, and will then control the affairs of the country. For my part, I by no means stand in dread of such a result, for I know that there is too much good sense among the people to make it possible that they will ever consent to serve as a stepping-stone to political adventurers in pursuit of the advancement of their own personal prospects and fortune in public life. I am well aware that some political adventurers do occasionally succeed in imposing upon the people by means of fine promises and a hypocritical exterior; but the political life of such individuals has never been of long duration, and the results of the election of legislative councillors by the people remain to prove the complete absence of foundation for the fears expressed by the honorable member. I think, moreover, that the results which have hitherto obtained from the application of the elective principle to this House, and from the election of the members who now sit in it, are satisfactory and do no dishonor to this honorable House. At any rate I never yet heard such a thing asserted. The hon. member maintains that it is not necessary that the Legislative Council should be elective, because that body is intended, or has for its mission, to act as a counterpoise between the Executive and the Lower House. But that state of affairs exists at the present day,—and when all acknowledge it,—when none complain of the present system—we are told that this privilege is to be taken away from the people in order that it may be restored to the Crown! Now, I say that such a proceeding is a step in a backward direction, and a retrogression from

the advancement of the age. Is it because certain members of the Council have never been successful in their efforts to be elected for any county whatever, that they wish to deprive the people of the right of electing their representatives? But is it supposed that by giving the Crown the right of appointing legislative councillors, the services of more able, more upright, and more honorable men will be secured, than if the people were allowed to elect them? When the Legislative Council was made elective, those who prepared the law were of the same opinion as the honorable member (Hon. Sir N. F. BELLEAU) that a rich man must of necessity be a man of greater talent than one less blessed with this world's goods, and, in order that the people might not err in their selection, they enacted that every member elected to the Legislative Council should possess at least one thousand pounds in real property; but now, in the scheme of Confederation, that amount is reduced by one-half, and it is thereby admitted that the possession of riches is not an indispensable condition to the possession of talent. The honorable member endeavored to justify the haste with which it is sought to push the scheme of Confederation through, by declaring that Lord PALMERSTON is a very aged man, and that his Ministry is quivering in the balance. So, because the Prime Minister of England is old, we are to be compelled to swallow the pill without even being allowed time to enquire whether it is suited to our case or not. It must be acknowledged that this is a very poor argument. As to the fear of seeing the scheme of Confederation thrown out in England, in case of any change taking place in the constitution of the Imperial Government, I look upon it as entirely chimerical—for if Confederation is acceptable in England and to English interests now, it will be just as acceptable to them eight or ten months hence as it is at present. If the plan is a useful one, in an English point of view, it will be carried out, let what Government may be in power. Then let the people have time to consider of it. The honorable member has stated that there have been twelve elections to the Legislative Council since the question of Confederation has been mooted; but those elections did not take place at a period subsequent to the preparation of the scheme of Confederation, and consequently the people were not and could not be acquainted with the details. The result of

the twelve elections in question was neither favorable nor the reverse to the plan of Confederation, for that plan was not then known. It is said because the plan was distributed throughout the country, that therefore it must be known. But how could it be so, especially in its details, when we every day see the Government greatly embarrassed at giving explanations, or refusing to give them, on certain points?—when, for instance, we see a minister in one House state that the seigniorial indemnity will be paid by Lower Canada alone, whilst it is declared in another House that that debt will be divided between the two provinces?—when we see ministers asking for time to reply to each of the questions put to them respecting this scheme? How can the people be acquainted with the local constitutions and the legislatures, when the ministers themselves would appear to know nothing about them? How can the people know in what matter this five million dollars balance of debt, to be laid upon Canada, will be divided, since those who prepared the scheme themselves do not know? And there is a mass of other important details which ought to be known in order to be able to pronounce upon the merits of the measure, such as the proposed law in relation to education, measures of defence, the Intercolonial Railway, &c. We are told, indeed, for instance, that the Protestants of Lower Canada and the Catholics of Upper Canada will be protected, in so far as relates to their school system, but we have no guarantee of it; and if the scheme of Confederation is adopted before these questions are settled, who can tell us that the Government will have as complaisant a majority to settle those questions as to vote Confederation? There is another part of the scheme which is of the highest importance, and respecting which we are entitled to explanations before voting for it, and that is, the measures to be taken for the defence of the country. It is important that we should know what is to be the nature of the defence which it is proposed to organize and what debt we are to incur for the purpose. Why not let us have the why and the wherefore of the whole business in order that we may come to a sound decision as to the measure. These are details which we ought to have.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—You will soon have them.

HON. MR. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—It is stated that the federal union pro-

vides a means of forming a great people, and of raising us to a position in which we may take a place among the nations of the globe. But if into that people, by the Constitution itself, the seeds of discord are introduced, will any one believe that it would not be better to live apart, as at the present time, than to live together with disunion in our midst? It was also stated that on entering into the Confederation we should have to reduce our import duties in order that our tariff might agree with that of the Lower Provinces. But, as a sequence of that statement, we must enquire upon what the effect of that reduction of duties will fall. For my part, I am of opinion that the deficit which that reduction of our revenue will produce will have to be filled up by the agriculture and industry of Canada. By setting this Confederation going, in order to overcome secondary difficulties, we shall be working out the interests of the English dealers by reducing the import duties one-half. And who will provide the balance which we shall have to find in order to meet our expenditure? The agriculturist and the artisan of this country, who will be made to meet that balance by direct taxation. The Lower Provinces are not agricultural countries, and we are told that we shall barter our flour for the produce of their mines and their forests. But I am of opinion that it is not by enacting political measures that the course of trade will be changed. Let England abandon Canada at once, and even with Confederation, our products will always go to England, because it is our most advantageous market, and will always continue to be so. So also will it be with New Brunswick and Nova Scotia; that is to say, the products of their mines will continue to seek the United States markets, because those provinces now have commercial relations with the United States. Those Provinces will follow the general laws of commercial transactions in going to the United States, exactly as we go to Europe to obtain there the goods which we require, and to dispose of our products in return. But to return to the question of the tariff; I say that we must needs come to the conclusion that the deficit created by the lowering of the tariff will fall on the agriculture and industry of the country, and that an inferior position is ascribed to them in the Confederation. If the import duties are reduced from ten to eleven per cent.

our manufactures will be denuded of all their profit, and we shall prevent capitalists from establishing themselves in Canada. This will be an immediate consequence of Confederation. I have heard it said that the Protestants of Lower Canada ought to be satisfied with their prospects for the future, because we have always acted with liberality towards them. But that is no guarantee for them, for we would not content ourselves with a mere promise to act liberally, if we considered that our interest or our institutions were threatened by a majority differing in race and religion from ourselves; and in any case that is not the way to ensure the peace of the country. If we establish this principle, we should say to the Catholics of Upper Canada that they ought to be satisfied with the lot which we provide for them. When we make a Constitution, we must in the first place settle the political and religious questions which divide the populations for whom the Constitution is devised; because it is a well known fact, that it is religious differences which have caused the greatest troubles and the greatest difficulties which have agitated the people in days gone by. We must learn to prevent them for the future. When we observe a man like the hon. member (Hon. Sir N. F. BELLEAU) acknowledge that we do not agree with the Irish, despite the identity of our religious belief, it may easily be foreseen that difficulties will arise with populations differing from us in origin and belief. We are told to vote Confederation first, and that the details will be arranged at a subsequent period; that a measure will then be brought down to regulate the sectional or sectarian difficulties. I am quite willing to admit that such a measure will be presented; but, should not the majority choose to adopt it, we should then be compelled to remain with the seeds of trouble and dissension, which the House will not have succeeded in eradicating, implanted among us. It is also asked what kind of Local Government we shall have; but the Government will make no statement respecting it until Confederation is voted. What kind of a Constitution, and what Governor we shall have? What Governor? Perhaps that is where the great secret lies, for I believe that for some time past the idea or the hope of being governor has filled the head of more than one political man. What is to be the amount of the Governor's salary? These are so many

questions in respect of which we are in complete ignorance, and in relation to which the Government will say nothing whatever. And, with respect to the constitution of the local governments, are we, in case the Upper Canada majority choose to impose their ideas upon us, are we, I say, to submit to them? Such a proceeding would not be fair either to us or to the country. The hon. member (Hon. Sir N. F. BELLEAU) tells us that we were not sincere in asking for an appeal to the people, because we knew that dissolution would not reach us. Such expressions do not surprise me, proceeding as they do from a man who never had the honor to be the elected representative of the people, and who holds his seat by the favor of the Crown, but I fail to discover by what right he judges us in such a manner. In conclusion, I shall move the following amendment:—

That all the words after "That" in the first line thereof be left out, and that the following words be inserted in lieu thereof, viz:—"The debate on the motion for an Address to Her Majesty on the subject of a union of the British North American Colonies be postponed until such time as the Government shall have made known to this House: 1st. The measures it intends to submit to the Legislature for the purpose of organizing the local governments and legislatures in Upper and Lower Canada. 2nd. The bill on the subject of education which it intends to submit to the present Parliament for the protection of minorities in Upper and Lower Canada. 3rd. The correspondence between the Imperial Government and the Government of Canada, respecting the defence of the province, and what measure the Government intends to submit to us for the same purpose. 4th. In what manner the Government intends to divide between the Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada the balance of our present provincial debt, after deducting the \$62,500,000 payable by the Federal Government, and which will be the items assigned to each of those provinces. 5th. The report of Mr. Fleming on the survey for the Intercolonial Railway."

HON. MR. OLIVIER—Before proceeding to a vote, I will ask the hon. member (Hon. Sir N. F. BELLEAU) who proposed to my honorable friend (Hon. Mr. LETELIER) and myself to resign our seats if we did not now choose to vote for Confederation, and submit the question to our electors, whether the debate will be postponed until our elections are over?

HON. SIR N. F. BELLEAU—As I am not a member of the Government, it will be understood that I cannot reply to that question. I did not propose to them to resign

their seats, but I said that if they were serious in their objections they might resign and submit the question to their constituents by presenting themselves for reelection.

HON. MR. OLIVIER—I understand the object of the hon. member in giving that advice. He would wish to see us retire from the House during the contest; but that is a trap into which we will not fall. Surprise must have been excited that I did not correct all the inaccuracies of the hon. member when he spoke of what I had said; but I preferred not doing so, as I should have had to take up nearly every single word of his in order to correct it, as he distorted and altered the sense of nearly everything that I said. I conceive that a blush must have mantled his forehead as he concluded his speech.

HON. MR. LETELIER DE ST. JUST's amendment was then put to the vote, and lost on the following division:—

CONTENTS—Hon. Messieurs Aikins, Archambault, Armstrong, Bennett, Bureau, Chaffers, Cormier, Currie, A. J. Duchesnay, Flint, Leonard, Leslie, Letellier de St. Just, Malhiot, Olivier, Perry, Proulx, Reesor, Seymour and Simpson.—20.

NON-CONTENTS—Hon. Messieurs Alexander, Allan, Armand, Sir N. F. Belleau, Ferguson Blair, Blake, Boulton, Bousé, Bull, Burnham, Campbell, Christie, Crawford, DeBeaujeu, Dickson, E. H. J. Duchesnay, Dumouchel, Ferrier, Flint, Gingras, Guevermont, Hamilton (Kingston,) Hamilton (Inkerman,) Lacoste, McCrea, McMaster, Macpherson, Matheson, Mills, Panet, Price, Prud'homme, Read, Ross, Shaw, Skead, Sir E. P. Taché, and Wilson.—38

And the Council then adjourned.

—o—
WEDNESDAY, February 15, 1865.

HON. MR. BUREAU said—I should have refrained from addressing the House, had I not heard the astounding language made use of by the hon. member opposite to me (Sir N. F. BELLEAU). He has spoken to us of annexationists and republicans, and of the dangers with which they menaced the country. I am far from surprised at such language on his part, for an ardent supporter as he is of the present Government, who desire to effect Confederation with a view to strengthen the monarchical principle in this country, he is doubtless alarmed at the tendencies of some of the members of this

Cabinet, and at the republican sentiments to which they gave utterance. I, however, believe that the annexationists who are most to be feared are not those of whom he speaks, those who boldly and openly express their opinion on the questions which now agitate the country, but those rather who endeavor by all possible means, to sow the seeds of discord between us and our neighbors in the United States, and to plunge us into war. Surely those who boldly proclaim their opinions to the whole country, cannot be accused of disloyalty when they do it with the view of serving their country. I do not believe that there is a single member in this House who would wish to see our country annexed to the United States. I think, on the other hand, that all are striving to find the means of establishing a government and a political condition that shall bear equitably on all sections of the population without distinction of race or creed—a system which will secure the stability of our institutions and the general welfare of the country. The hon. gentleman has also referred to the dangers of the elective system as applied to this House, because scheming politicians without a stake in the country might acquire popularity, and work their way into the House. Let that hon. gentleman read the history of his country, and he will find that the principal men who have occupied the leading political positions were children of the people, who, thanks to their education, their talents and their perseverance, have attained to the control of the business of the country. Let him call to mind the history of the past, and he will remember that there was a time when the Legislative Council had become an obstacle to all reform and to all progress. But thanks to our energy and to our perseverance, a liberal ministry has been enabled to obtain the long-sought-for reforms. The LAFONTAINE-BALDWIN Administration, seeing that there was no possibility of obtaining reforms on account of the obstacles raised by the Legislative Council as then constituted, had recourse to the appointment of new liberal councillors; and by the adhesion of the older ones, they succeeded in carrying their measures. The times at which these appointments were made, were as follows:—In 1848, the SHERWOOD-BADGLEY Administration appointed the Hon. D. B. VIGER. In this case we had a Liberal nominated by a Tory Ministry. Afterwards, on the accession of the LAFONTAINE-BALDWIN Ministry, Sir

E. P. TACHÉ and the Hon. Messrs. JAMES LESLIE, QUESNEL, BOURRET, DEBEAUXEU, ROSS, METHOT, J. E. TURGEON, MILLS, CRANE, JONES and WYLIE, were appointed. Had it not been for the nomination of these members, and the adhesion given by some others, it would have been impossible to reform the Legislative Council. But what results may be anticipated from the proposed constitution of the Federal Legislative Council? By limiting the number of the members of this House, the prerogative of the Crown is, in fact, restricted, and a system is adopted, exactly the reverse of that which exists in England. And in the event of serious difficulties arising between the House of Commons and the Upper House, what would happen? The same thing would happen which has already occurred before, but with this difference, that the Crown would not have the power of infusing new elements, and legislation would thus be at a stand-still. The only course to be pursued under those circumstances will be to ask the Imperial Government to amend the constitution of the Council, as the people will be powerless from our having deprived them of the right of electing councillors. For my part, I am convinced that this new system will not be productive of beneficial results. I do not propose to repeat here all the arguments which have been already urged against the projected changes; but I must say, as holding my authority from the people, that the question of Confederation has never been adverted to during the two elections which I have passed through, and that, therefore, I do not think that my constituents expressed their opinion on this question when they elected me, or that they conferred upon me the right of changing the constitution of the Legislative Council, without consulting them in the matter. I am aware that in 1859 Confederation was referred to in a paragraph of the Speech from the Throne, but I also remember that at that time I combated the idea of Confederation, because the carrying out of the views expressed in that paragraph would have resulted in giving all the influence to one section of the province at the expense of the other section. At that period it was not the question of Confederation which was discussed, but the question of representation based upon population, and the Upper Canada Separate School question. I stated at the time, as regarded those separate schools, that the

minority of Upper Canada must not be abandoned to the mercy of the majority, and we succeeded in obtaining for them a system of separate schools which, however, does not appear to satisfy the minority. In Lower Canada the Protestant minority has always been satisfied with the school system, until quite lately; and they have now begun to agitate with the view of obtaining, as they pretend, a more equitable distribution of the moneys appropriated for school purposes. For my part, I know that they have no foundation for their claim, and I remember that when I was Secretary of the province, I drew the attention of the Superintendent of Education to the unequal distribution of the money, as it appeared that the Protestant minority of Lower Canada received a larger amount than they were entitled to. He replied that the distribution had been so made by his predecessor, and that he had not deemed it advisable to make any change. Thus we see that uneasiness prevails among the minority, both in Upper Canada and Lower Canada, and even among the majority in Lower Canada. But I was astonished to hear the remedy announced by my honorable colleague (Hon. Sir N. F. BELLEAU), in the event of the Federal Government endeavoring to prejudice the interests of Lower Canada. He tells us that as Lower Canada is to have sixty-five representatives in the Federal Legislature out of 194, these sixty-five members from Lower Canada will always be able to preserve their rights by taking sides with the Opposition to turn out the Government. Does the hon. member really suppose that all the members from Lower Canada would make common cause on any question? Does he not know that there will always be a minority among them of different origin and religion who will probably take part with the Government or with the majority? In such a case, what would the Opposition from Lower Canada avail about which he talks? Do we not know that the difficulties which gave rise to the plan of Confederation were produced by the coalition of an Upper Canada minority with the Lower Canada majority? And what happened to Upper Canada might very well happen to Lower Canada. By rejecting the principle of the double majority adopted by a liberal ministry, the apple of discord was thrown among the legislative body which originated the present difficulties. Another great error committed by the members from

Lower Canada was the overturning of a government which had maintained the principle of an equality in representation. We now see to what that has brought us. The hon. member (Hon. Sir N. F. BELLEAU) had said that our institutions would be protected under the Federal Government. But how? By the resolutions as they stand they would not be so guarded; and would not the General Government put its veto on every act of the local governments? And while on this subject, I should like to know what is to be the organization of the Local Government of Lower Canada. As far as I can see, it is this—that nearly all our local revenue is to be taken from us, and we are to be allowed a subsidy of eighty cents per head. And yet this is not all. There will be a debt of \$5,000,000 to be shared between Upper and Lower Canada; and how is this sharing to be brought about? If, as we are told, Lower Canada is to be charged with the payment of the debt contracted for the redemption of the Seigniorial Tenure, that alone will represent a capital of about \$4,118,202, including \$891,500 indemnity to the townships. Is Lower Canada to undertake the payment of that sum? Certain sources of revenue in Lower Canada are devoted to the redemption of the Seigniorial Tenure, but if the Federal Government absorbs these sources of revenue, who will assure us that the Local Government will not repudiate the Seigniorial debt now by the Federal scheme sought to be imposed on it? The Local Legislature will say, perhaps, that the Imperial Government has not the right of annulling the act which imposes on United Canada the payment of the indemnity to the seigniors, and will probably refuse to assume the whole responsibility of it, alleging that the General Government ought to pay it. And if the Local Government takes this course, what will the General Government do? On this question it will be easy to excite the passions of the people, prejudiced as they already are against the seigniors. Chiefly, and above all, we are bound to respect vested rights. We are recommended to vote with blind confidence, but we are refused the details, which might satisfy the country and the honorable members of this House. Why not lay the constitution of the Local Government before the House? We are told that the possession of her civil code is to be guaranteed to Lower Canada, but we are not informed how it is to be done.

Then the Federal Government will have the right of settling questions of divorce and marriage. With respect to divorce I shall make no remarks, because I think it best that the decision of such questions should be left to the General Government, an exception being made in favor of co-religionists. What shall I say on the subject of marriage—the basis of all our institutions? Is it not dangerous to have it at the mercy of the Federal Government? We shall soon be told probably that it is but a sounding affair, and before long, mayors will take the place of the *curés*, and will celebrate the marriages of their constituents. Our laws which regulate our marriages at present are very important to us, and are based on the Roman law. These are the only laws suitable to Canadians, and the wise provisions characterizing them were the fruit of the experience of several ages. We should not incur the risk of any change in them by a legislature, the majority of whose members do not hold our opinions on this subject. The hon. member (Hon. Sir N. F. BELLEAU) might have favored us with his opinion on this head, but he did not, and I regret that he did not. There is another question deeply interesting to Lower Canada, but it seems that on that neither must we permit ourselves to speak. That question relates to the interest of money. Do we not know that the question of the rate of interest has something to do with our civil laws? Is that also of no importance? An Upper Canada majority has already saddled us with a law abolishing the rate of interest. Free trade in money was not suitable to Lower Canada, and the right of legislating on the question is now sought to be entrusted to the Federal Government. What will be the result? Who will assure us that the law limiting the rate of interest will not be repealed as it respects all cases, and that banks and corporations will not be allowed to exact such rates of interest as they may think fit, as private persons may now. This might become the fate of Lower Canada. Why not allow the local legislatures to regulate the question according to the exigencies and the ideas of communities which they represent, as the same is now fixed and decided in the United States, where the rate of interest varies in the several states? Thus Lower Canada will be prevented from regulating a question which has been decided for us by Upper Canada against

our wishes. I confess that I am surprised at this, because I see in the present Administration men who have done battle at my side on that very question. The local legislatures will have the power of making laws on the subjects of immigration and agriculture; but the Federal Legislature will have the same power, and it is evident that it will have the upper hand on these matters; that the laws of Lower Canada, for instance, may be overridden by means of the veto of the Federal Government. But there is something yet more fraught with danger for us. The Federal Government will have the right of imposing taxes on the provinces without the concurrence of the local governments. Under article five of the 29th resolution, the Federal Government may raise moneys by all modes or systems of taxation, and I look upon this power as most excessive. Thus, in case it should happen, as I said a moment ago, that the Lower Canada Government refused to undertake the payment of the debt contracted for the redemption of the Seigniorial Tenure, the Federal Government would have two methods of compelling it to do so. First, by retaining the amount out of the eighty cents per head indemnity to be accorded to the Local Government, and secondly, by imposing a local and direct tax. The Lieutenant Governor of the Local Government will be appointed by the Federal Government, and will be guided by its instructions. We are not told whether the Local Government will be responsible to the Local Legislature; whether there will be only one or two branches of the Legislature, nor how the Legislative Council will be composed, if there is to be one; we are refused any information whatsoever on these points, which are nevertheless of some importance. I regret, therefore, that the amendment proposed yesterday by the hon. member for Grandville, should have been rejected, since it would have enabled us to obtain important information before voting on the question. I do not see that the reasons advanced yesterday by the Hon. Sir N. F. BELLEAU, to justify the haste with which it is attempted to pass this measure, are legitimate and conclusive. We are told that the present Ministry in England is in favor of this project. For my part I do not think the measure will be adopted without important amendments. Unfortunately the measure will, perhaps, be amended in England in a sense highly prejudicial to Lower Canada in

particular. We shall probably see influences brought to bear there, as occurred once before when the Legislative Council was made elective. The Lower Canada members will recollect that when the law was passed in England, under influences which to this day remains unearthed, the clause was blotted out from our Constitution which we in Lower Canada justly regarded as our only safeguard against the encroachments and the domination of Upper Canada; and in point of fact, for the striking out or changing of that clause, Upper Canada would never have demanded representation by population, and the difficulties which have resulted from this question would not have occurred, and we should have heard nothing of the Confederation measure which is now before us. Had the people of Upper Canada been well convinced that the Constitution could not be changed, they would have submitted to sacrifices rather than create a useless agitation. It is said that we are to have guarantees for our institutions. But who will say that the guarantees left to us may not vanish when the measure reaches England, in the same way as the guarantee we had against representation by population? At all events I still maintain that our institutions are not guaranteed in any way whatsoever, and this is clearly shown by Sir N. F. BELLEAU himself, as I have already had occasion to prove. We are asked to sacrifice the election of the Legislative Council; but is the system proposed a better one? I do not think so, for to my mind the mode in which it is proposed to constitute that House appears to be unsound in every way. Not only are the people to be deprived of an important right, but the prerogative of the Crown is to be infringed by limiting the number of members to be appointed. It is painful to take a backward step of this kind, and to abandon a reform, the fruit of the persevering struggles of so many eminent men; and I believe that if we consent to this change, the consequences of the act will soon be seen. In order to show that the defects of the system are very real, I will cite the opinion of the Hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies, set forth in his despatch to the Governor General, relative to the project of Confederation and to the new Constitution for the Legislative Council. This is what Mr. CARDWELL says:—

The second point which Her Majesty's Government desire should be reconsidered is the Consti-

tution of the Legislative Council. They appreciate the considerations which have influenced the Conference in determining the mode in which this body, so important to the constitution of the Legislature, should be composed. But it appears to them to require further consideration, whether, if the members be appointed for life, and their number be fixed, there will be any sufficient means of restoring harmony between the Legislative Council and the popular Assembly, if it shall ever unfortunately happen that a decided difference of opinion shall arise between them.

After this formal condemnation of the project of Confederation, and in view of our own experience, it seems to me that we are quite justified in opposing it, and in anticipating that the Legislative Council will become again, as it formerly was, an obstacle in the way of all reform and of all progress, unless the present plan of Confederation be amended. (Cheers.)

HON. MR. FERRIER said—Honorable gentlemen, I had almost resolved to give a silent vote for the resolutions now before the House, but having, especially since I have had the honour of a seat in the Legislative Council, been accustomed to take note of passing events in the history of Canada, I think I may be allowed to occupy a short time in speaking of what has transpired in this country in past years, and more particularly of what has transpired within the last twelve months. In past years there were two great questions which had agitated both Eastern and Western Canada. The one was the Seigneurial question in Lower Canada; the other was the Clergy Reserve question in Western Canada. These two questions, for many years, occupied the attention of the Legislature and of the statesmen conducting successive governments. At last a settlement of these important questions was arrived at—I believe satisfactory to the majority of the people. Since that time no great questions of public interest have occupied the minds of the people, or have been urged either by the Government of the day or by the leaders of the Opposition. The consequence has been that a political warfare has been waged in Canada for many years, of a nature calculated almost to destroy all correct political and moral principle, both in the Legislature and out of it. Has it not been the fact that any man who, through life, had sustained a good character, either as a private individual or a professional man, no sooner accepted office in the Government than the Opposition and the Opposition papers would attack him at once as having joined a very doubtful company?

Or, when a man of plain sense came and visited the Legislature, and took his seat in the galleries to listen to the debates, did he not hear so frequently the charges of political crime, bribery and corruption, that he left the House with very different views from those with which he entered it? Every member of Parliament has felt this demoralizing influence, and it has met him at the polls, and nothing but money, in some cases, could secure his election. (Hear, hear.) I come now to the period of 1863-64, when we find two political parties nearly equal in strength, with a majority supporting the Government of only two or three. That Government found it necessary to appeal to the country by a general election. After that election the Government of the honorable and gallant Knight (Hon. Sir E. P. TACHÉ) was formed. It existed only a very short time, and on the 14th of June of last year came what has been called the dead-lock. Then, honorable gentlemen, there was, for eight or ten days, a breathing time for the parties who had been engaged in this political strife. It was a breathing time to them, as it were, to reflect upon the past and to endeavor to look forward to the future. It had been thought by many that the spirit of patriotism in the hearts of our statesmen was a dead principle. In their strife they seemed to have forgotten the best interests of Canada. But, during these ten days, the spirit of patriotism revived. This was a memorable period in the history of Canada. The leader of the Opposition, the Hon. GEORGE BROWN—I speak it to his honor—was the first to declare what he was ready to do, and what he proposed was so reasonable that very soon the acceptance of his propositions was brought about. I have pleasing recollections in referring to that period, particularly as having had an opportunity of giving a word of advice on the evening of the day these propositions were made. I may refer to it, as the name of the gentleman I allude to, Mr. MORRIS, a member of the Legislative Assembly, was incorporated in the documents that were submitted to this honorable House, when the result of the resolutions was laid before us. Meeting Mr. MORRIS one evening, he informed me of what the Hon. Mr. BROWN had proposed. I thought it was so reasonable, and looked so like a deliverance from the dilemma we were in, that I recommended him at once to communicate it to the leading members of the Government, and I accompanied him to a member of the Government, who is also a member of this House, now present. He told that honorable gentle-

man what Hon. Mr. BROWN had communicated to him, and he (Mr. MORRIS) was authorized to make an arrangement for the other members of the Government to meet Hon. Mr. BROWN. We all very well remember the time I am speaking of, and the astonishment of many that a reconciliation could have taken place between gentlemen who had been so long opposed to each other. I do not know that I ought to repeat what was the *ordis* of the day with reference to it. But, I think I can remember this being said, that, when Hon. Mr. GALT met Hon. Mr. BROWN, he received him with that manly, open frankness, which characterizes him; and that, when Hon. Mr. CARTIER met Hon. Mr. BROWN, he looked carefully to see that his two *Rouge* friends were not behind him—(laughter)—and that when he was satisfied they were not, he embraced him with open arms and swore eternal friendship—(laughter and cheers)—and that Hon. Mr. MACDONALD, at a very quick glance, saw there was an opportunity.

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—Saw his advantage.

HON. MR. FERRIER—That Hon. Mr. MACDONALD saw there was an opportunity of forming a great and powerful dependency of the British Empire; that the gallant Knight, the Premier of the Government, with his liberal, cautious, and comprehensive mind, did not object; and that the Commissioner of Crown Lands, with his usual courtesy, his vigorous and acute mind, agreed. (Hear, hear.) To the best of my recollection, that was the way in which it was said out of doors the propositions of Hon. Mr. BROWN were received by the gentlemen composing the Government of that day. You all remember how delighted we were to find that political bitterness had ceased. We all thought, in fact, that a political millennium had arrived—and the Opposition was nowhere. (Laughter.) The business of the session progressed very rapidly, and we were soon relieved from our responsible duties here. Immediately after the close of the session, the agreement entered into was fully carried out. Hon. Mr. BROWN and the other two honorable gentleman who entered the Government with him, were added to it, according to the agreement. These honorable gentlemen went to the country, and they were all returned, except one, and he very soon afterwards found a place. The Government thus formed, had, I believe, a majority of two-thirds of the population of Canada in their favor; and, so far as my observation has gone, two-thirds of the press

also, have supported them in this scheme of union. The Government, thus sustained, soon began to act, and their first movement was to take the provincial steamer and go off to Prince Edward Island. I remember well standing on the bank of the river at Rivière du Loup, seeing the steamer pass down, and I wished them God-speed. They went to the Conference at Charlottetown, and I have no doubt they acted in a manner worthy of gentlemen going to propose a union. We know too that they were well received. There had been a growing love in these provinces towards Canada for some time. This was manifested when they gave an invitation to this Legislature to visit them, after the close of last session. And I only regret that the Legislature—every member of it—did not accept that invitation. Those who did, came back much better informed than when they went there. We had the satisfaction of seeing those who probably are going to be our partners in this union. And I do assure you, that for one, I can speak of the people of the Lower Provinces, as an energetic, active, industrious people, quite equal to ourselves. (Hear, hear.) And, as regards the resources of these provinces, I had no idea of them approaching the reality, before I paid that visit. We saw farms there on the banks of the River St. John, quite equal to any farms in our western peninsula, which is called the garden of Canada. The members of the Conference at Charlottetown, as I understood, after discussing the whole question, and arriving at something like an understanding, returned to their respective governments, and arranged to have a Conference, representing in a more official manner all the provinces. Some gentlemen have objected that this was an unauthorized, self-constituted Conference. But I believe, it can be shewn that they had the express authority of the British Government for entering into these negotiations. The Lower Provinces sent members of their several governments, and they did more—they appointed the leaders of the Opposition to accompany them—so that the people of those provinces were fully represented. They did, in fact, what was equivalent to that which has been done in Canada, where our coalition Government represents both classes of politics. The able statesmen, composing the Conference which assembled at Quebec, thus represented the whole people of these provinces. It has been objected that it was impossible that a Conference, meeting only for a few days, could have devised a measure that would be of a

character which we could accept. But, honorable gentlemen, when men meet together honestly to carry out a purpose, they can do a great deal in a very short time. (Hear, hear.) And I believe the gentlemen composing the Conference which assembled here in this city were men of honest purpose, and earnestly bent on framing a Constitution that would be for the best interests of our country. We cannot expect it to be infallible, because no human act is such; but it is of such a character that I do not think we can ever have another opportunity, if this is let slip, of receiving again a document so well calculated to answer the ends designed. There could be no merely party government either here or in the Lower Provinces which could produce a document that would be so acceptable, or ought to be so, to the whole people. (Hear, hear.) I think it is unfair to make comparisons between Upper and Lower Canada and the Lower Provinces. When we take partners for life we take them for richer or poorer, and endow them with all our worldly goods, and I think we should go on the same principle in carrying out this union with the Lower Provinces. I have been surprised at some of the arguments which I have heard some of the opponents of this scheme bring against it. I was assuredly surprised at the course taken the other day by my honorable friend from Niagara (Hon. Mr. CURRIE), who, in trying to make out a point, spoke of our commercial and agricultural interests here as being very small, and in speaking of our shipping and the amount of tonnage employed in doing the business of Canada, said, "Oh! that only exists on paper."

HON. MR. CURRIE—I beg my honorable friend's pardon. In any remarks I made I certainly did not say that either the commercial or agricultural interests of Canada were small. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. FERRIER—When my honorable friend makes this statement, I have nothing further to say about it. I supposed I was correct in the impression I gathered from his remarks, but I must have misunderstood him. But I must say this, that I thought he was exceedingly unkind when he took up newspapers and read from them a catalogue of the supposed political sins of his own friends, the party he formerly acted with. As these honorable gentlemen are now devoting themselves to what I regard as being for the best interests of the country by carrying out this scheme of union, I think really my honorable friend would do better to support them.

HON. MR. CURRIE—That is a matter of opinion.

HON. MR. FERRIER—I am giving my opinion—nothing more. But my honorable friend proceeded to refer to the Grand Trunk Railway—(hear, hear)—that monster corporation which, one would have inferred from my honorable friend's remarks, had really laid desolate every district of Canada through which it had passed. For my own part I cannot understand what damage the Grand Trunk Railway has done to Canada. We have had thirteen millions sterling of English capital—(hear, hear.)—expended in building the Grand Trunk Railway and the Victoria Bridge, which is the greatest work in the world. Canada has paid somewhere about three millions to complete the Grand Trunk—about one-fifth part of the sixteen millions that have been spent, and it is the cheapest bargain she ever made. (Hear, hear.) We have the benefit of the whole of this expenditure. If there has been extravagance in it, those English stockholders have been the sufferers. We can only have suffered a fifth part of what they have done, and we have the benefit of the whole of it. That I think is the view we ought to take of the Grand Trunk Railway in connection with Canada. (Hear, hear.) Then the Intercolonial Railway has been referred to. That road has become, I think, even at present a necessity. It should have been made some years ago, and it would have been made but for the political incapacity of the Government of that day, which prevented it. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. CURRIE—Let me remind my honorable friend that two members of that Government—Hon. Messrs. McDougall and Howland—are in the present Government.

HON. MR. FERRIER—It is fortunate that some men see the error of their ways, and do better, and I trust it has been so in the present case. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) If we had had this road to the sea-board at the present time, it is very likely the Reciprocity Treaty would not have been repealed. (Hear, hear.) We want the road at the present moment for the business of the country. Some honorable gentlemen say that, if the road were made to-day, we would have nothing to send over it. The fact is, these honorable gentlemen, when they make such a statement, shew that they have not taken the trouble to enquire what the position of the trade of the country is. For the last ten days we have had about 100 cars standing loaded at Point St. Charles, and no way of getting them off. These

cars are full of produce for Boston and New York, and the two roads leading to these cities have so much to do, that they are unable to do the business of their own country and of ours too. And, while these cars are thus detained, they are wanted for Western Canada, where the people are evermore crying for cars, and we cannot get rid of the produce we have.

HON. MR. SIMPSON—Will my honorable friend state what kind of produce these cars are loaded with, and where it came from?

HON. MR. FERRIER—The whole, I believe, is the produce of Canada. (Hear, hear.) One portion of it is for the supply of New York and Boston, or for shipment there; and another portion is to be distributed along the routes by which these railways run. I was so particular as to make these enquiries of Mr. BRYDGES the day before yesterday.

HON. MR. SIMPSON—I saw Mr. BRYDGES too.

HON. MR. FERRIER—We have also a large accumulation of cars standing full of produce at Portland, and no ships to take it away. Such is the present state of the Grand Trunk Railway, and it is a very awkward position to be placed in. As the gallant Knight (Hon. Sir E. P. TACHÉ) told us the other day, it is just as if a neighbor's farm stood between us and the highway. That is the position of the United States, they stand between Canada and the sea board, and they have now been pleased to say, "we will not allow you to pass through our farm"—because, although the Reciprocity Treaty is not yet repealed, they have put a check on intercourse by this passport system, and by the way in which they work the present law with reference to the produce we are taking along. For instance, if pork is sent on, an affidavit must be put in that that pork is the produce of Canada. Now, it is a difficult thing to make such an affidavit. At this season of the year loads of pork come from all quarters, and after it is all packed into a barrel, it is almost impossible for any man to make an affidavit where it was raised. (Hear, hear.) It is the same with flour. A miller frequently mixes flour brought in from the United States, and how is an affidavit to be made whether that flour is mixed or not? There may be four-fifths of it the produce of Canada, and yet the other fifth prevents it from going. Hence, the trade is so hampered by all these obstructions put in the way by the United States Government, that it is very seriously interfered with. And, that being the position of our trade, I beg to ask whether

the Intercolonial Railroad is not now wanted? I have some memoranda here taken from some statements I have had an opportunity of looking at, and I find that the Lower Provinces require 600,000 barrels of flour and grain annually beyond what they raise themselves. Now that they take flour from Boston and from Portland, a considerable quantity of it is carried down by the Grand Trunk Railway to Portland. It is then taken round to St. John, and is taken up the St. John river, and distributed all the way along, until within sixty miles of our own Canadian frontier at Rivière du Loup. Now, I would ask any sensible man whether it would not be as easy for the Intercolonial Railway to take this produce and distribute it along the line, just as the Grand Trunk is now doing in the State of Maine? St. John is just 600 miles from Montreal—the same distance that Portland is from Sarnia. Well, to move this quantity of flour that I have mentioned, 600,000 barrels, would occupy one train every working day through the year. I think that is a sufficient answer to any honorable gentleman who says there is nothing to do for this Intercolonial Railway. (Hear, hear.) In 1862, New Brunswick sold goods to the United States to the value of \$880,000, and purchased \$2,916,000—thus paying to the United States \$2,000,000 in hard cash. Nova Scotia exported \$1,879,000 to the United States, and purchased from the United States \$3,860,000—thus paying them another \$2,000,000. These two provinces, therefore, paid to the United States in one year, the sum of four millions of dollars. There is a trade now between the United States and those provinces of ten millions of dollars a year. The proposed abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty discards that trade, and should we not here in Canada lay hold of it? (Hear, hear.) Is not every mercantile man wide awake and ready to lay hold of it at once, if there was a possibility of doing so? but there is no such possibility, excepting by the Intercolonial Railroad. Another thing I wish to point out is, that half the importations of tea into New Brunswick and Nova Scotia are supplied from the United States. Now, that is precisely an article which we could send along the railway at a very low figure—and every honorable gentleman is well aware that Montreal and Quebec compete with New York and Boston in the tea trade. Upper Canada merchants know that they would never go to Montreal to purchase the large cargoes of tea sold there if they could do better in New York. And I

maintain, therefore, that Quebec and Montreal are in a position, as soon as they have the opportunity, to do the business of those provinces, better, in fact, than the United States can do. (Hear, hear.) Under the Reciprocity Treaty and the bonding system, in about the period of fifteen years, the trade between ourselves and the United States has increased from \$9,000,000 to \$37,000,000—being four hundred per cent. In 1862, the Canadian imports passing through the United States in bond amounted to \$6,000,000. And, unless we are careful in looking into the progress of trade here as well as in the United States, we may lose what is absolutely necessary for the prosperity of our country. It requires men to be wide-awake in these days of rapid progress to keep pace with the march of events. (Hear, hear.) And I am prepared to shew, as I have already to some extent endeavored to shew, and my own mind is made up on it, that, before the Intercolonial Railroad can be made, we will have enough business for it to pay expenses—(hear, hear)—so that no loss can accrue to the provinces when the road is made—that is, three years hence, if it were set about now. But, I suppose, if this union is brought about, some time will be taken, after the Confederation is formed, to decide upon the mode of proceeding with the construction, and, if it is gone on with even in the most rapid manner, it would take at least four years before it was in full working order. I think it is much to be regretted that we have been so long in commencing it. In view of the present state of our relations with the United States, it ought to have been in existence now, and I say that in another year it would have paid expenses. (Hear, hear.) Honorable gentlemen object to the scheme of union because it was not published sufficiently to make the people of these provinces acquainted with it. I do not understand that objection. Every clause of the document now under consideration was published in Quebec, before the delegates left the city.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—And in the papers in Upper Canada.

HON. MR. SIMPSON—But it was denied that it was a correct copy of the resolutions of the Conference.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—It was merely denied that it was the official document.

HON. MR. SIMPSON—The copy of the document I got was marked "Private," and I could not, therefore, make use of it.

HON. MR. FERRIER—I dare say honorable members, in receiving the document, un-

derstood very well what the word "Private" meant. (Hear, hear.) I was invited to attend a very large meeting, comprising nearly all the leading merchants in Montreal, just after the delegates left for home. We spent a whole night over it; I believe it was early in the morning before we parted. A third part of those present, I think, came apparently determined to oppose the scheme. Fortunately we had a gentleman there who had made himself thoroughly acquainted with it, and who was able to go into explanations and deal with all the whys and wherefores that were urged by the various objectors. The result was, that when we closed the meeting there was only one man who declared himself positively opposed to the scheme—(hear, hear,)—and this man said he opposed it, because, in his opinion, it would give the French Canadians power to crush us British out of the Lower Provinces. I maintain, honorable gentlemen, that the public opinion of Canada is not opposed to the scheme of Confederation. (Hear, hear.) If it had been so, we should have petitions against it poured in upon us from every quarter. I do not think the scheme is perfect, but we should try with an honest purpose to work it out, and if it is found defective, it is not, of course, like the laws of the Medes and Persians—it can be altered. We have had the Constitution of 1841 altered more than once—twice at least—since the union. If we find that some parts of the machinery do not work—if, after the establishment of the Confederation, we find some little error has been made—we will then, no doubt, have power and authority also to alter it. I trust this scheme of Federation will be carried by a large majority in this House, as well as in the Legislative Assembly, and that the legislatures of the Lower Provinces will also adopt it. If so, honorable gentlemen, we shall enter on a new era in the history of British North America. (Hear, hear.) I believe that a Divine Providence guides the destinies of nations, and I believe a Divine Providence has directed the statesmen who were present at that Conference in their deliberations, and has brought conflicting interests into harmony in a most wonderful way. (Hear, hear.) What was our political condition on the fourteenth of June last—only about eight months ago? What was our political condition then, and what brought the leaders of the political parties who were then fiercely contending with each other, almost as

in a death struggle, for power, into relations of intimate friendship? What led the Governments of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, and Prince Edward Island to send their leading statesmen, representatives of both their political parties, to meet our Coalition Government? I say it was an over-ruling Providence. A party government could never have arrived at such a scheme of union as this. If we reject this proposed Confederation, we refuse to lay the foundations of a great nation, as a dependency of the British Empire. When I came of age I considered what country I should adopt. I adopted Canada. I have now lived in it for forty-four years. I have been identified with the progress of its institutions—of those at any rate of Lower Canada, and particularly of Montreal. I have had the pleasure of taking part with others in organizing some of them. I have seen some of them prosper, and others that will probably fail, as we may expect will be the case in a new country. I have, during these years also, travelled over a large part of Europe. I have travelled too over parts of Asia and Africa. I have seen people under monarchical governments—some of them tolerably prosperous, others of them less so. I have seen people under despotic governments—some of them pretty comfortable, and others crushed down to the lowest depths of slavery. I have seen republican governments in Europe, and of course I have seen the great Republic here on this continent. I have seen people, too, living under the government of the Church. But I have seen no people like those living under the government of Great Britain, or enjoying such perfect freedom, and such complete protection for life and property, as those living under the flag of Old England. (Hear, hear.) And had I my choice to make to-day, after an experience of forty-four years, I should still choose Canada as my home. I feel that at my age I have not long to live; but, during the time that I shall be spared on earth, I would be willing to devote all my energies to the carrying out of this scheme—and I do pray it may succeed—because it is laying anew the foundations of one of the most important dependencies of the British Empire. I trust I shall not live to see it in any other condition than as a dependency of the British Empire. Honorable gentlemen, I shall have pleasure in voting for the resolutions of the honorable and gallant Knight. (Cheers.)

HON. MR. SEYMOUR said:—Honorable gentlemen, I desire to make one or two remarks in reply to something which fell from my honorable friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands, in reference to the objections I took on a former occasion to the details of this scheme. That honorable gentleman, after explaining one or two minor points, disposed of the others by saying that I opposed everything. As that statement might imply, if honorable members of this House were not acquainted with me, that my course had been factious, I desire to state what I have opposed. Having been always a strong advocate of retrenchment and financial reform, I have opposed the exorbitant expenses of the Government. I have opposed the extravagance which has made the expenses of the civil government of Canada exceed those of any other country on the face of the globe, in proportion to the revenue. I have always opposed the expenditure of money without the authority of Parliament. (Hear, hear.) I have always opposed the extravagant grants and subsidies to the Grand Trunk Railway Company. (Hear, hear.) My honorable friend opposite (Hon. Mr. FERRIER) has spoken of the benefit of the Grand Trunk Railway, and of the great expenditure of English capitalists in the work. It is true the work was undertaken by them, but Canada has borne her full share—has fulfilled every agreement. And more than that, Canada has paid at the rate of thirty thousand dollars per mile for her railways; Canada has contributed \$15,142,000 in principal, and \$5,400,000 in interest, without taking into consideration a large number of smaller matters. If a calculation be made from these amounts, it will be found as I have stated, that Canada has paid at the rate of \$30,000 for all the railway which was required, namely, from Quebec to Toronto, which would have connected with the Great Western, and formed a Trunk line through the province to Sarnia. If large sums have been expended; if large sums have been squandered, have not English contractors benefited? Are the people of Canada to be blamed? The scheme was planned by English capitalists, and Canada fulfilled every obligation. (Hear, hear.) Now, there is another matter which I have opposed. I have always opposed the loose system of management of the Crown lands, a system by which our splendid domain has been frittered away. I do not mean my remarks on

this subject to apply to my honorable friend, the present Commissioner of Crown Lands. He has only been in office a few months, and I have not read his report. But I refer to the past, and I say that the whole of that domain has been squandered away in useless expenses. There is another matter which I have opposed—the Militia Bill of 1862. I admit that I opposed that measure. That was a measure which was going to entail upon the country an enormous expenditure, which would have exhausted our resources at a time when that expenditure was not required. Why, honorable gentlemen, was not the *Trent* difficulty settled at the time? Had not the American Government complied with the demands of Great Britain, and what threatened us to authorize that expenditure? There is one expenditure which I opposed, which might perhaps be questioned. I opposed the Supply Bill in 1858, and I had then voting with me my honorable friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands. (Hear, and laughter.) Whether that vote can be defended from a constitutional point of view, I cannot say; but every vote I have given in this House, or the other branch of the Legislature, has been given in accordance with what I conceived to be the interests of my native country. (Hear.) My honorable friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands, alluded the other day to the conservative feature of the Senate in the United States, in allowing the same representation to small states as to the larger states. But this does not at all affect the general arrangement, because the large majority are large states. But while my honorable friend approves of this portion, he should have expressed an opinion on the whole system. In the United States, no change of Constitution can be effected without the consent of two-thirds of both branches of the Legislature, and that must afterwards be sanctioned by three-fourths of the state governments. This is a conservative feature also. Then, what are the constitutions of the state governments? I have here a clause taken from the Constitution of one of the states (Connecticut), which provides that:—

Whenever a majority of the House of Representatives shall deem it necessary to alter or amend this Constitution, they may propose such alterations and amendments, which proposed amendments shall be continued to the next General Assembly, and be published with the laws which may have been passed at the same session, and if two-thirds of each house, at the next ses-

sion of said Assembly, shall approve the amendments proposed, by yeas and nays, said amendments shall, by the Secretary, be transmitted to the town clerk in each town in this State, whose duty it shall be to present the same to the inhabitants thereof, for their consideration, at a town meeting legally warned and held for that purpose; and if it shall appear in a manner provided by law, that a majority of the electors present at such meetings shall have approved such amendments, the same shall be valid, to all intents and purposes, as a part of this Constitution.

That is the way one of the oldest states guards the rights and liberties of its people. Then here is another extract from the Constitution of the State of Mississippi, one of the new states, showing how the people there are protected against hasty innovation:—

Whenever two-thirds of the General Assembly shall deem it necessary to amend or change this Constitution, they shall recommend to the electors, at the next election for members of the General Assembly, to vote for or against a convention; and if it shall appear that a majority of the citizens of the state, voting for representatives, have voted for a convention, the General Assembly shall, at their next session, call a convention, to consist of as many members as there may be in the General Assembly, to be chosen by the qualified electors in the manner, and at the times and places of choosing members of the General Assembly; which convention shall meet within three months after the said election, for the purpose of revising, amending, or changing the Constitution.

Now, in addition to this, what have we seen? Have we not seen changes in the Constitution latterly in respect to slavery, and have they acted upon this till they have been ratified by the state governments? Now, compare this mode of procedure with that adopted in regard to the scheme—and very properly called a scheme—of Confederation submitted to this House. How were these delegates called into existence? Are they not self-appointed? (Hear.) Did not the members of the Executive Council of Canada constitute themselves delegates? (Ories of “no, no,” and “yes.”) And the members of the Executive Councils of the Lower Provinces, did they not also constitute themselves delegates? They prepared a scheme which they have laid before Parliament, and what is that scheme? It was embodied in resolutions sent to members of the Legislature before the meeting of the House, marked “Private,” both on the outside and inside. Did any honorable member feel himself at liberty to go before his constituents and explain it to them? Did any

honorable member feel himself at liberty to call his constituents together, and say, here is a scheme on which I will have to vote at the next session of the Legislature? No, he could not do it. Some of the newspapers did publish what purported to be the resolutions, but were they copied all over the country so that the people might see and judge of them? No, they were not, and what was the reason? Did not the Provincial Secretary write his mandate to the press, that any newspaper that did not support Confederation, was not to receive the Government patronage? Not being an elective member, I did not feel myself at liberty to address the people on these resolutions. Did any member take them to his constituents and explain every detail of them?

HON. MR. MACPHERSON—Don't let the honorable member endeavor to create a false impression. I, for one, held two meetings a day for some time, and fully explained the scheme to my constituents.

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—Did my honorable friend tell them how much this Intercolonial Railway was to cost, or how much Upper Canada was to pay for it? That it was to be established by the Government, and kept up as a public work? I should be glad to hear my honorable friend on these points before a popular assemblage. (Hear, hear). We have been told by my honorable friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands, that concessions had to be made, but how were these concessions made? Unfortunately they were all made one way; they were made to the Lower Provinces. No concessions to Canada, east or west, but all in favor of the Lower Provinces. And could you expect anything else would be the result of the Convention, when the small province of Prince Edward Island, and the small province of Newfoundland, sent representatives in the same manner and the same number as the whole province of Canada? Could it have been expected that the delegates from Canada would supply all the talent? However much I esteem the talents of the members of the Executive Council, I believe there are those in the Lower Provinces who possess the talent necessary to arrange a scheme of this kind. When Canada, with its 3,000,000 of population and \$11,000,000 of revenue, was represented there by twelve, and the Maritime Provinces, with only 800,000 of population and a revenue under \$3,000,000, was represented by nearly two to one, could it be expected that a favorable

arrangement could be made. (Hear.) My honorable friend says that they voted by provinces, but it was all the same. Now, what was the first concession? The first concession was in granting twenty eight members of this House to those provinces, with only 800,000 inhabitants and paying a small amount of revenue, whereas in Upper Canada we have 1,500,000 of population, and contribute \$7,000,000 or \$8,000,000 to the revenue, and yet have only twenty-four members. Here is the first concession to make the Lower Provinces come in to support the scheme. And is it not a fact that this House will have the control of the legislation to a certain extent, and are we not entitled to it? Then there is another point in connection with the Lower Provinces, which I will here notice. The franchise is lower there—it is almost universal. Persons entered upon the assessment roll for a small amount of personal property may vote for members of the Confederate Parliament. Here members are elected by persons assessed for real property to a certain amount. This is another matter which should have been attended to. It is not right that members should be sent to the General Parliament on these terms. (Hear, hear.) The whole scheme is, in fact, a history of concessions, and all on one side. The arrangement of the public debt at a rate per head, instead of according to revenue, is another mistake. My friend, the honorable member for Saugeen Division, (Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON), stated the other day that my arguments were fallacious; that in this case the rate per head of population was the one which ought to be adopted. Is not the revenue the means of payment of the debt? Is population to be considered? I will satisfy my honorable friend that his reasoning was not correct, at least it is not what I would expect from a gentleman occupying the position he does in the country. Is population always wealth? No. It is wealth when it can be profitably employed; it is wealth when you can employ it in manufactures, or in the cultivation of good farming lands; but look at the case of Ireland, where population has been a source of poverty.

HON. MR. MACPHERSON—What I said was, that past revenue was not a fair criterion of what each province was to pay. In future we would have a uniform tariff. I am sure that my honorable friend will not

say that in this country population is a source of poverty.

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—My honorable friend says he adopts one plan for the past and another for the future. What justice is there in that? We have only to look at the proposed system to see the effect it has. If New Brunswick, with a million revenue, be allowed to put her debt of seven millions upon the Confederation, then, upon the same rule, Canada should enter into the Confederation with all her debt and more. The estimated revenue of Canada is eleven millions. Any one could figure that out and see that Canada should have had no debt left for the local governments to pay; but on this principle of concession, why, of course, Canada must suffer. Now, to shew the working of the system, look at the effect of the rate of 80 cents a head. Upper Canada will pay \$1,540,000 to the General Government, and receive back \$1,120,000 for the Local Government,—that is, supposing Upper Canada contributes two-thirds of the revenue of the united provinces. That has been admitted by one who now holds a high position in the Government. This is the fine scheme which my honorable friend from Saugeen lauds. You pay according to wealth, and the difference against Upper Canada is \$420,000, or in other words, Upper Canada pays \$1,540,000 out of one pocket and receives back \$1,120,000 in the other. This is the working of the system which has been carried out, very much against the interests of not only Upper Canada but all Canada. The third concession is the amount to be paid to Newfoundland, as a set-off against her not being indebted. There may be, I admit, a show of fairness in this, but the sum is a great deal too large. Canada will go on increasing, whereas from Newfoundland we can expect very little. The fourth matter is that of the 80 cents a head, to which I have just alluded, and I have shown the working of that, and it is decidedly against it. Then comes the \$63,000 a year to New Brunswick, for ten years. I was very glad to hear my honorable friend from Saugeen (Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON) disapprove of that. I am glad to find him, so strong a supporter of this scheme, admit that that was wrong. I have made my calculation in an Upper Canada point of view. So long as the union was maintained, however, my voice was never raised by way of comparison. I desire to maintain that union. (Hear, hear.) But

now we are forced to take this scheme as it is, without any amendment in any particular. I only now wish to point out that of the principal which this \$68,000 represents, and which my honorable friend from Saugeen cannot endorse. Upper Canada will have to pay \$367,000. Then \$150,000 a-year to Newfoundland is a sixth concession, made for worthless lands. This is equal to a capital of three millions. The lands of the other provinces are well taken care of; but those in Newfoundland, what are they worth? They are entirely valueless. When my honorable friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands has all these lands to control, I am sure he will have his hands full. The lands of other provinces were worth retaining, and they were left under their own management; but as these happened to be good for nothing, they were put upon the General Government. Had they been good for anything, they would also have been reserved. There is another question. It is proposed to take the government railways of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and make them provincial works. I suppose we shall be told that the canals of Canada are also taken, and made public works of the Confederation. But there is a very great difference between these. The railways had only an existence of a few years, they would be worn out soon, and must be kept up at the expense of the Confederate Government. What advantage could they be to the Confederate Government? What are our expenses now for public works? Have we not seen the tolls removed on our canals, and will it not be a part of the policy of the Confederate Government to remove the rates paid on these railways, and they will be kept up, as all public works are, at an enormous loss to the Government. (Hear, hear.) My honorable friend from Niagara the other day, I thought, on one point, was not quite correct in what he said in respect to Upper Canada. (Laughter, and hear, hear.) From the census of 1861, I find that the cash-value of farms in Upper Canada was \$295,162,315, and in Lower Canada, \$168,482,546, making a total of \$463,594,861. The live stock in Upper Canada was valued at \$53,227,516; in Lower Canada, \$24,572,124. Wheat, Upper Canada, \$24,640,425; Lower Canada, \$2,563,114. Other grains, Upper Canada, \$38,123,840; Lower Canada, \$23,584,703. Now, in timber, mineral wealth, manufactures and fisheries, Upper Canada is quite equal to

Lower Canada and the Maritime Provinces. I believe that if Upper Canada could be left alone, if it was not to be burthened and its back broken by these concessions, the whole of Canada would become still more prosperous, provided we did not enter into any further useless and wasteful expenditure. Compare these resources with those of the Lower Provinces! The gallant Premier, the other day, stated something with respect to the wealth of those provinces—with respect to their mines and timber. But the timber must become exhausted, and consequently that country cannot grow richer; whilst in Canada, with a good productive soil and an industrious population, we must go on increasing in wealth. What is the value of the mines which we are to get? In Nova Scotia the royalty on coal is only \$28,000, and the revenue derived from the gold fields, \$20,000; and what else have we to obtain from these provinces? Why, in Nova Scotia they have no timber, and consequently their revenue cannot increase; whilst we in Canada must inevitably go on and grow in prosperity, because the elements of our wealth are in the soil and climate. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—Surely my honorable friend does not pretend to say that the revenue of Nova Scotia cannot increase? Why, it has doubled in one year.

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—What else have they besides their coal fields? It is not pretended that they have any timber. If you increase the tariff, you will increase the revenue; but it must not be expected that the revenue can be doubled. They will lessen their consumption if you increase the tariff. It is fallacious reasoning to say that when you double the tariff you double the revenue.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—For the year 1859, the revenue of Nova Scotia was \$689,000, and it increased the next year to \$1,249,000, and went on increasing, and yet my honorable friend says that it cannot increase.

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—I have not the statements which the honorable gentleman has quoted from, but the figures I have given are those of 1862. There are excise duties, but I believe that the local duties will be paid to the local governments. The complaint which has been made by Upper Canada has been, that although they contributed two-thirds or three-fourths of the revenue,

they did not possess a corresponding contro of the legislation, and that they did not receive back in proportion to the amount they paid. Will this be remedied by this measure? Draw a line east of Montreal, and do you not find the control of the Legislature there, in consequence of the concessions made to the Maritime Provinces?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—The balance will be restored when the Red River Settlement comes in.

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—I am afraid that no one here will live to see that country come in. I have listened with a good deal of attention to the speeches of my honorable friends, and I have read the reports of the debates in the other branch of the Legislature, and the only argument I have heard brought forward in favor of this scheme, is that it will strengthen the connection with the Mother Country. (Hear, hear.) Now, honorable gentlemen, I yield to no one in saying that that connection ought not to be broken. I say we are infinitely better here under the flag of Great Britain than under that of the United States. (Hear, hear.) But no reason is assigned; we are not told in what way the connection is to be strengthened. Can you alter the geographical position of the country? Will you have any more people or means? Your revenue is not increased, nor is your population, nor is your geographical position altered. Is it because the people of the Lower Provinces are ready to expend a large sum for the defence of the country? Why, to show you what those provinces consider it necessary to do in this direction, I will read a short extract from a statement of the Financial Secretary of Nova Scotia:—

As regards the sum proposed to be granted for the militia—\$20,000—honorable gentlemen might think it a large amount in the present state of the finances; but, looking at the large sum already expended, and still being expended in Canada—the efforts being made in New Brunswick for a similar object—would it be creditable to us as Nova Scotians, particularly considering the efforts put forth by the British Government to protect us, to expend a less sum?

The large sum of \$20,000 was to be expended, and that at a time when the expensive Militia Bill, to which I have alluded, was before this House. (Hear, hear.) Twenty thousand dollars was the sum that was proposed by the Legislature of Nova Scotia, the next important colony to Canada, at a time when we were told here that we were in

danger from our neighbors across the line. But something more was said by the Financial Secretary. The present Premier was pressing to strike out this item and put \$8,000 instead, and the Financial Secretary said:—

Under ordinary circumstances he would agree with the honorable member as to striking out the \$12,000 extra grant for the militia; but considering the large sum about to be expended on this service by New Brunswick, the enormous expenditure of the Home Government for our protection, and what they expected of us, he considered the appropriation necessary. He would be ashamed of the Government if they had not proposed this vote, and he was prepared to stand or fall by it, as he felt that the honor of the country was at stake.

The honor of the country was at stake in this \$20,000. New Brunswick the same year spent \$15,000. Now, I opposed the expensive Militia Bill submitted to this House; but then the Government had expended over half a million dollars a year in militia expenses; and I admit they are going on very properly now. (Hear, hear.) Then we have been told that this Confederation scheme is going to raise the credit of the country. My honorable friend from Saugeen ventured the statement that on the intelligence of the adoption of these resolutions in the Conference reaching England, funds rose fifteen to seventeen per cent. Now, does any honorable gentleman suppose for a moment that that was the cause for this rise? (A voice—It was.) I have here from the files of the London Times, the quotations of Canadian Securities, and on the 7th of November,—the date of His Excellency's letter, conveying information of the adoption of the scheme,—the inscribed stock was 86 to 90.

HON. MR. MACPHERSON—I stated a fact when I said that that rise took place in consequence of the resolutions. I would like my honorable friend to explain it in any other way.

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—We know that there are various causes which operate in raising or depressing stocks in England, the rate of interest of the Bank of England, &c. Well, on the 7th of November as I said, the quotation was 86 to 90, and I find that on the 25th November, giving time for the news to reach England, it was only 88 to 92. And now, with a strong probability of the measure passing, what is the price? The last quotation is 81 to 88.

HON. MR. MACPHERSON.—I suppose the honorable member knows the reason of this decline. Soon after what was done in the Conference was known in England, the St. Alban's raid took place, and the consequence of the events connected with that was a fall of 17 or 18 per cent. in our securities.

HON. MR. SEYMOUR.—In consequence of the wise policy of the statesmen of England friendly relations had been maintained with our neighbours. It is true the passport system was put on, but it is to be removed again, and all things are to become as they were before, with the exception, perhaps, of the Reciprocity Treaty. Every man of business knows that that rise in stocks was not caused by anything connected with the Confederation scheme. Why should it? What is it that increases the value of stocks and depreciates them? Is it not the confidence of capitalists who have invested in them, that the interest will be paid. But under this Confederation scheme will not our expenses be increased? This Intercolonial Railway must be built and kept up, and this must be at the cost of Canada. You have got your local governments to keep up, and you have got your Confederate Government to keep up, and if we look at the experience of the past, is it likely there will be any reduction in the future? (Hear, hear.) I have got figures here to shew what the cost of the two governments was before the union of the provinces. The whole expense of the government of Lower Canada, with the salaries of officers, &c., was £57,618. In Upper Canada we were as economical. We were then under the rule of the Family Compact, and a worse compact we might have. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) They were high-minded, and they did not stoop to matters of corruption, as others have done since. (Hear, hear.) The whole expenses of the two governments were only a little over £100,000 a year. What are they now? Some two years ago the expenses of the civil government alone, not including the cost of the militia, were \$3,000,000. Here, in a little more than twenty years, the expenses have increased seven-fold, notwithstanding that we have only one Government. Now, what are we to expect from the Confederate Government? Every honorable member knows that things must be made pleasant for everybody, and when you are forming a Confederate Government, these expenses must be continued. You cannot turn people adrift,

and you must either employ or pension them. Are we to suppose that because there is a Federation, these expenses will be lessened? I admit that in the Lower Provinces they have managed their affairs with less expense than we have. But now we will have the local governments to pay for. We will have another staff to keep up for each province, which will add very materially to our expenses. The money must come out of the pockets of the people, who will have to pay it either by direct or indirect taxation. What possible difference can it make to the people of this country, whether they pay it directly by taxation or in duties? Direct taxation must be imposed, and that to a large extent, by the local governments.

It being six o'clock, the SPEAKER left the Chair.

After the dinner recess,—

HON. MR. SEYMOUR, continuing his remarks, said—I think, honorable gentlemen, that, taking into consideration the vast importance of this scheme—its importance in a financial point of view alone, without saying one word about the principle of changing the Constitution without consulting the people—there should be an appeal to the country before it is carried into effect. A point which I did not enter fully into before the recess was the argument that Confederation would strengthen the connection with the Mother Country. Now, do we not see all the financial reformers in England, with the *Times* and other influential organs of the press, which on financial grounds were desirous of separating the colonies from the parent state, all advocating this measure in the warmest possible manner? Undoubtedly the imperial government will sanction the scheme, but it is the policy now of that Government to sanction anything of a local character that the colonies desire. Well, in addition to the press that is favorable to the separation of the colonies from the Mother Country, and financial reformers like GOLDWIN SMITH and others who have favored the same views, what was stated a short time ago by the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies to his constituents? In speaking of this scheme, he said it was favored by the Imperial Government for the purpose of preparing us for a change in our relations; for the purpose of educating us to defend ourselves. (Hear, hear.) Was it not very strong language, coming as it did from no less a personage than the Under Secretary for the

Colonies, that the Imperial Government is ready to favor a separation whenever we asked for it? (Hear, hear.) Now, I am not one of those honorable gentlemen who wish to see the day arrive when the colonies will ask for such separation. I am not one of those who wish to educate the people to that idea, but would rather impress upon them the paramount importance of endeavoring to maintain the union and connection with the Mother Country. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. DEBEAUJEU—What is the opinion of the foreign press with regard to us? Has it not threatened us, so that it is our duty to be prepared?

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—I suppose my honorable friend alludes to the press of the neighboring republic. We have certainly seen some of those newspapers, but very few of them threatening to invade and overrun us, but have you heard anything of that kind from the Government of the country, and are not our relations with it of the most friendly character? Are you to be governed in your conduct by the rash utterances of a few newspapers,—perhaps sensation newspapers?

HON. MR. MACPHERSON—Has not Mr. SEWARD threatened us?

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—Not since he entered the Government. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—Yes, just before the last presidential election.

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—Well, that is a matter of very little importance. (Laughter.) Now, honorable gentlemen, I have shown that this scheme has no precedent, even on the other side of the line. Among all the wild republican theories of our neighbors, they have never proposed to change the Constitution in this manner—never changed it, at all events, without the consent of the people, obtained in some form or other. Reference has been made, I think, by my honorable friend in front (Hon. Mr. ROSS) to the union of England and Ireland. Well, every honorable member knows the means employed to bring about that union. MAY, in his *Constitutional History*, states that £1,500,000 sterling were spent in carrying it. But how was the representation dealt with in that case? Did England, being the richer country, possessing the largest share of wealth and capital, give a preponderance of the representation to Ireland, as we propose to give to the Lower Provinces?

HON. MR. ROSS—That was a legislative union, while in this the representation will be based on population.

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—That does not affect the case. After the Irish union was effected, what was the representation of Ireland in the House of Commons? It was 100 members in a total number of 656; and in the House of Lords 28 Peers, in a House of 450 members. And although it was considered by England an absolute necessity that the union should be brought about, she did not give a preponderance, and scarcely a fair share, of the representation to the sister kingdom.

HON. MR. ROSS—That is because in the English Parliament they do not recognize the principle of representation by population.

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—My hon. friends will say that this proposed change is neither American nor English.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS—It is Canadian. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—No, it is neither one nor the other; it is a mongrel Constitution. (Laughter.) In England no important change in the laws is ever carried without being discussed in Parliament, session after session, followed by an appeal to the people upon it. Even so unimportant a change—or what would, in comparison with this scheme, be here regarded as so unimportant a change—as the extension of the franchise, has been discussed in Parliament for years, and submitted to the people before passing into law. Now, I would like to enquire of honorable gentlemen, what are the legitimate functions of the Legislature of this country. Do we not assemble here for the purpose of enacting good and wholesome laws for the people? (Hear, hear.) Those laws may be repealed, if they chance not to meet public approval; but here you propose to change the Constitution—to change the whole fabric of society—in fact to revolutionize society, without asking the consent of the people, and without the possibility—at any rate, the reasonable possibility—of this important change ever being reconsidered. Does not this important subject affect every freeholder in the country as much as it affects us, and are there not thousands of people in the country who have as great an interest in it as the members of the Executive Council of Canada? And yet, forsooth, these gentlemen prepare a scheme, bring it down to this House, and tell the representa-

tives of the people that they are not at liberty to ascertain the wishes of the people respecting it, nor to alter it in any manner, but that they must take it as it is. Still we are told, notwithstanding all this, that this is freedom, and that we are a free people.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—You are at liberty either to accept or reject it. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—Well, that is all very well, but we are told we must accept the scheme as it is; and all the influence that the Government can use—which I fear will be successfully used—(hear, hear)—will be employed to carry it through without the people having an opportunity of saying yea or nay upon it. We are told it is not British to permit this—even to pass a short act allowing the people to vote upon it; but if this is not British, neither is the proposition itself. (Hear, hear.) I entreat honorable members not to pass a measure of this importance without delaying it some little time, at all events, for the purpose of obtaining an expression of public opinion upon it. The people who are to be governed by it, who are for all time to come to live under this Constitution, certainly have a right to be consulted before it is consummated; and for the special well-being of the country, I hope and trust it will not pass without affording them that opportunity. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. BENNETT said—Honorable gentlemen, after the many able and eloquent speeches we have heard on this subject, it may be presumptuous in me to offer any remarks—(cries of "go on.")—but I cannot consent to give a silent vote upon the question before the House, and I think I would be wanting in my duty to those who sent me here if I did not make some observations upon this important subject. (Hear, hear.) I think honorable gentlemen will agree with me that this project is one of the most important—indeed, the most important—that has ever been brought before the Legislature of Canada. (Hear, hear.) We are about to witness a great change in the Constitution of the country, the like of which has not been seen since the union of the provinces; and I am free to say that a change of some kind or other is imperatively demanded, for I think that if the present state of things were allowed to continue it would be difficult, if not impossible, to carry on the Government as it has been carried on for the last three or four years. (Hear, hear.) We have been told by

the honorable and gallant gentleman at the head of the Government that we have been on an inclined plane, and I am sure that if some remedy had not been proposed we would have found ourselves sliding into a state of anarchy from the bitterness of feeling which prevailed in the country. I am not so sanguine, as some honorable gentlemen seem to be, that when we get Confederation we shall have a sort of political millennium, that we shall have no more political storms and agitations, but that we shall then enjoy nothing but the calm and sunshine of political life. But I think we will find ourselves pretty much in the same position as before with regard to parties—that we shall have a Government party and an Opposition, for in all free constitutional governments it is better to have an opposition than to be without one. I object, not to a healthy opposition, but to a factious one. (Hear, hear.) From the difference in the laws, language and institutions of the several provinces it is clear that a legislative union of them is out of the question. The principle of the double majority, as a remedy for our difficulties, has proved to be a failure; representation by population, which would have satisfied Upper Canada, has been persistently denied by Lower Canada; and, therefore, I see no resource but to fall back upon the project of the Confederation of the provinces. (Hear, hear.) I would like to remark upon the peculiar position in which the elected members of this House stand in reference to this subject. It has been said that, if they vote for the resolutions, they vote to make themselves members of the House for life; that this was not contemplated by the constituencies when they were elected; and that it would be destroying the franchise and taking away a right from the people which the House had no authority to do. Well, all I can say is, that I have heard no such objections from the people of the constituency which I have the honor to represent. All I have heard from them is a call for delay in the consideration of this question, and I maintain that delay is not fatal or injurious to it. (Hear, hear.) We have delayed it already for weeks; in New Brunswick it has been postponed till after the general election; and can any one show me that it will injure the measure to put it off for a short time longer? Surely if it is good now, it will be just as good twelve months hence. (Hear, hear.) The resolutions have been drawn up by able, talented, but fallible men; and therefore we ought to weigh them care-

fully before finally passing them. (Hear, hear.) I have no doubt it is the opinion of every man—even of the delegates who framed these resolutions—that if he had the power he would change them in some particular. If I had the power I have no hesitation in saying that I would change them; but we must take them as a whole or reject them altogether. When I hear of amendments being moved by different honorable gentlemen, therefore, I am reminded of the looker-on at a game of chess. He imagines that he could improve many of the moves made by the players, but it would be found, if his suggestions were followed, that the end would be that he would find himself checkmated and the game lost. (Hear, hear.) In looking over the resolutions I have found some things that are good, and some that are open to objection; but, upon a careful balance of both, I have come to the conclusion that the good preponderates. (Hear, hear.) I would, therefore, hesitate to take upon myself the responsibility of risking the defeat of the measure by voting for any amendment to them. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. ALEXANDER said—I shall not now trespass at any length upon the indulgence of this House. My honorable friend from Port Hope (Hon. Mr. SEYMOUR) possesses the esteem and respect not only of the Legislative Council, but of the country, from the straightforward and consistent course he has ever pursued on the floor of Parliament in regard to all great questions of public interest, and it is with very great diffidence and reluctance that I venture to challenge the figures, generally, stated by my honorable friend, in the position he took, and the deductions he drew from them, in reference to the proposed Confederation. But my honorable friend took surely a most gloomy view of the subject. He apprehended the worst consequences and results from the proposed alliance. The reply to that is that it just depends upon ourselves—it depends upon the members of the new Confederate Legislature whether good or evil shall flow from it. (Hear, hear.) If they proceed to work out the Constitution with reasonable frugality and care, determined to keep down the public expenditure, and prevent all jobbery in the carrying out of public improvements, then, I am satisfied that the Confederation may be carried out without materially increasing the public burdens; or, at all events, that our position will be such, that they will not fall more heavily upon us as a whole. The honorable gentleman

particularized certain instances of alleged injustice, such as the financial arrangements with regard to Newfoundland and New Brunswick. Why, surely there can be no great injustice to Canada, in our agreeing on the one hand to allow certain subsidies, not of large amount, while we take the whole of their excise and custom duties with the power of levying a uniform tariff. As regards the probable adequacy of the revenue of the proposed General Government to meet all the items of ordinary expenditure, I will leave my honorable friend from Port Hope to disprove the correctness of the figures given by the Minister of Finance at Sherbrooke. For my own part, I would not presume to challenge the statements of so able a Minister of the Crown. But it is said that to meet the expense of the Local Government, we would require to have recourse to heavy direct taxation upon Upper and Lower Canada. I shall proceed to show that this would not be necessary, unless the Local Legislature ran out. Let us see what will be the position of Upper Canada, which is to receive upon the basis of 80 cents per head, \$1,120,000. The local items which will have to be met out of that appropriation will be as follows:—

Education.....	\$274,112
Hospitals and charities.....	125,000
Penitentiary and reformatories.....	76,000
Agricultural societies.....	52,000
Roads and bridges.....	80,000
Police.....	15,000
Literary and scientific institutions.....	7,000
	<hr/>
	\$629,112
Legislation.....	100,000
Civil Government, Lieut.-Governor and staff.....	120,000
	<hr/>
	\$849,112
Leaving a balance for other purposes...	270,888
	<hr/>
	\$1,120,000

The prevailing desire in my section of Western Canada is, that the Local Legislature shall only be one Chamber of thirty members, with a very limited inexpensive Executive—a sort of large municipal deliberative body—which would involve a small expenditure, and if such views are carried out, there are no reasonable grounds for apprehending the necessity for direct taxation. But I did not intend when I rose to enter again at length upon such details. I was only desirous to explain the course which I shall be obliged to pursue in reference to the amendment of the honorable member for the division of Welling-

ton. After the leader of the Government, in another quarter, has declared that they will look upon any amendment of an important detail as a defeat of the whole scheme, I am not prepared to take the responsibility of voting for an amendment which would have such an effect. (Hear, hear.) But while I am satisfied that I am acting in accordance with the views of my constituents in voting in the negative, I do think that an opportunity should be afforded to any of the members of this House to record the views of their constituents upon this or upon any of the other details to which they take exception, and I therefore beg to move in amendment, seconded by the Hon. MR. SKEAD,—

That it is proper that any members of this House should be afforded an opportunity of recording their views in regard to the proposed change in the manner of appointing the members of the Legislative Council. But that the way to effect this in the most satisfactory manner, without endangering the safety of the Confederation as a whole, will be to enter a memorial or protest upon the Journals of this House, embodying their views upon this important detail of the Confederation. A copy of such memorial or protest to be transmitted to the Imperial Government along with the resolutions now before this House.

HON. MR. AIKINS—I should like to know in what position I would be placed if the amendment of the honorable gentleman was carried. (Hear, hear.) If I support the amendment of the honorable member from the Wellington Division (Hon. MR. SANBORN) it would appear, from this amendment, if it were adopted, that I would have to support the substantive resolutions also. I would like to know how these two things can be done at the same time.

HON. MR. BOSSÉ—I do not think the amendment is in order, and I raise that objection to it.

HON. SIR N. F. BELLEAU—The rules of the House provide for protests being made by members, and the amendment is, therefore, unnecessary.

HON. MR. CURRIE—I would like to hear some further explanation from my honorable friend from the Gore Division, respecting this amendment.

HON. MR. REESOR—Is it in order?

THE HON. THE SPEAKER—The amendment is not in order. The effect of it would be simply to affirm the 23rd rule of this House, which provides that any member may enter his protest against any action on the

part of the House. This amendment is simply a reiteration of that rule, and I must, therefore, declare that, in my opinion, it is out of order. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. AIKINS—As the honorable member from the Gore Division particularly desires to express an opinion upon the question whether the elective principle shall be abolished or not, I will, with the permission of the House, give notice of a motion which I intend to move, in amendment to the main resolution before the House:—

That the legislative councillors representing Upper and Lower Canada in the Legislative Council of the General Legislature, shall be elected as at present, to represent the forty-eight electoral divisions mentioned in schedule A of chapter first of the Consolidated Statutes of Canada, and each such councillor shall reside or possess the qualification in the division he is elected to represent.

HON. MR. CURRIE—At this stage of the debate I will take the opportunity of referring to some figures just used by the honorable member from the Gore Division, who gave us the impression that the local governments would have much more than sufficient means to carry on their local affairs from the subsidies granted to them by the General Government. Now, it is very easy to make this statement, but if the honorable gentleman will look back to the time of the union of Upper and Lower Canada he will find that, immediately before that union, the cost of governing Upper Canada by its separate Legislature, with a population of 450,000, was \$770,000 a-year; and we have heard it stated to-day that the people were then governed cheaply, honestly and properly. If it cost \$770,000 to govern 450,000 people in Upper Canada in 1839, how much, in the same proportion, will it cost to govern 1,396,000 of people now in that section under the Confederation? The answer is, \$2,170,000 a-year, or, in other words, just about double the amount of the local subsidy.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—The honorable gentleman forgets that the Federal Government will incur a large part of the expenditure of that province formerly borne by the Local Legislature.

HON. MR. CURRIE—I am quite well aware of the burdens the General Government will bear, and also aware that powers will be given to it over certain subjects formerly dealt with by the Local Legislature. As to Lower Canada, it had at the time of

the union, 650,000 inhabitants, 200,000 more than the population of Upper Canada, although its government cost only \$573,348; and in the same proportion, provided the new Local Legislature is equally economical as the old, this sum will be increased to \$1,230,000—some \$400,000 over and above the local subsidy, which excess will, of course, have to be raised by direct taxation. These figures, taken from the Public Accounts, are easily accessible by the honorable member from the Gore Division, and are, of course, entirely reliable.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—The figures I presented to the House are also reliable, and I challenge the honorable gentleman to dispute them.

HON. MR. ARMAND—I have listened attentively to the honorable members who have spoken to the question before the House, some of whom have manifested fear in regard to the changes proposed to be introduced in the Constitution, and I am far from blaming them, but it is to be observed that none of them have proposed a remedy for the difficulties of the situation. Two or three said that the measure had taken the Legislature and the country by surprise, but it seems to me that those honorable members have forgotten that the question of Confederation was discussed both in Parliament and in the country in 1859, and that since then the Legislature and the press have occupied themselves with it often enough. Did not the Legislative Assembly last year name a committee to inquire into the difficulties which seemed to be hurrying us on to anarchy, and did not that committee report that the remedy for those evils was Confederation? Those honorable members also seem to forget that since the Government disclosed its policy through the magnificent speech of the Minister of Finance to his constituents at Sherbrooke—a speech circulated in all parts of the country by the press of the various political parties—24 elections have taken place, 13 for this honorable House and 11 for the other. Of the 13 for this House three candidates only declared themselves opposed to Confederation, and of those three, but one was elected. Of the 11 for the Assembly, one only objected to it, and it is said that he will now vote for the measure. Relative to that provision in the resolutions of the Conference, having regard to the elective principle in the Legislative Council, I have already stated my opinion, and I would tell the honorable member for the Wellington Division that it seems

to me that the delegates, who are all eminent men, could not have come to such a conclusion except after mature deliberation. I can well understand that before England permitted us to adopt its Constitution—gave us responsible government, allowed us the control of our own affairs; and when its governor swore not advised by ministers responsible to the people, but were surrounded by advisers who were more like clerks, who to preserve their salaries were often obliged to submit to the arbitrary will of their master—I can easily conceive, I repeat, that it was expedient to seek a remedy for the wrongs under which we then labored. But to-day, when the parent state requires that its governors shall choose advisers responsible to the people, the elective system is no longer needful in relation to finance or to the tranquillity and safety of the people. As to finance, I will certainly not say that officers of the Government take advantage of their position to speculate in setting up ephemeral candidates—most assuredly not; but I will say that many citizens, little careful of their true interest and of the future of their country, convert election days into days of speculation, by giving rise to corruption, violence and perjury; and I shall be ready, whenever required, to prove as clearly as that two and two make four, that in several divisions the election resembled civil warfare more than proper election contests. I know that many persons, I will not say urged by an inordinate liberalism, degenerating into demagoguery—for I do not believe we have in our young country any of those fierce demagogues—but I will say, that there are persons who wish that all the offices under the State should be submitted to universal suffrage, because they know that in such circumstances they could impose upon the sympathy and the judgment of the people. But I would say to such persons—gentlemen, do not suppose yourselves wiser statesmen than those of the Mother Country, who have established their Constitution after centuries of efforts and contests, and who work it after the experience of centuries. I would further tell them “do not suppose yourselves better able to appreciate the British Constitution than Monsieur MONTALEMBERT, one of the great *litterati* of the day, the historian and eminent statesman; or than M. BERRYER, the prince of the French bar, both of whom proclaimed but recently that that Constitution was one of the most beautiful and free that could possibly be desired.” I congratulate the Government upon desiring to preserve so

much of this law as may appear rational and good. I refer to the territorial divisions and the propriety of causing them to be represented by persons who have vested interests therein; and indeed how could any one represent with equal devotion and advantage a division, as the man who had sacred rights therein, whether by personal residence or the ownership of the property upon which his qualification rests, and who clings to it because it has descended to him from his ancestor, or because he has acquired it by the sweat of his brow, his vigils and his toils? I hope it will not be said that I intend by my remarks upon this law to disparage the residents in the towns, for the division which I have the honor to represent embraces part of the most populous city in Canada, and I only accepted the charge after the refusal of two of its most eminent citizens—eminent equally by their large fortunes and their social position. But probably those gentlemen had learned by their own experience or by that of others, that public life did not present sufficient charms to cause it to be eagerly coveted. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. CURRIE—Before recording my vote on the amendment before the House, I feel it my duty to say a few words in reference to that amendment. I cannot say that I altogether concur in the manner in which it is drawn, but at the same time I feel called upon, as an elected member, to support it. I feel that it would ill become me—that I would be hardly discharging my duty to my constituents—if I were to sit silently by and give my vote to change the Constitution under which I was elected. (Hear, hear.) I feel that there is something extraordinary in the fourteenth of these resolutions before the House, and I would like to hear the Government give a full explanation as to the manner in which that resolution was arrived at in the Conference. Bear in mind, honorable gentlemen, that the eleventh resolution declares that “the members of the Legislative Council shall be appointed by the Crown under the great seal of the General Government, and shall hold office during life.” Thus the House will see that by this resolution the Crown has the right for all future time to select the legislative councillors in Upper Canada from any part of the country which the Crown sees fit; but in Lower Canada there is this difference that, according to the sixteenth resolution, “each of the legislative councillors representing Lower Canada in the Legislative Council of the General Legislature, shall be appointed to represent

one of the twenty-four electoral divisions mentioned in schedule A, of chapter 1st of the Consolidated Statutes of Canada, and such councillor shall reside or possess his qualification in the division he is appointed to represent.” Then the fourteenth resolution declares that “the first selection of the members of the Legislative Council shall be made, except as regards Prince Edward Island, from the legislative councils of the various provinces, so far as a sufficient number be found qualified and willing to serve.” Now, honorable gentlemen, I have always understood—my reading of books on constitutional law has given me to understand—that the greatest of England’s statesmen who have spoken on the question of the Royal prerogative, have always broadly laid it down as a rule that the prerogative should never and could never be limited. How is it then that these thirty-three individuals, talented, able and gifted, as no doubt they were, who met in the room behind me and sat with closed doors, saw fit to hamper and cripple the operation of that good rule? (Hear, hear.) Should the prerogative of the Crown in the selection of members of this House be limited? It may be true that, residing in many of the divisions in Lower Canada represented in this House, there may be good men, competent men, well qualified men; but it is equally true that there may be just as good, able and talented men, outside of them as in it. Why, then, should the doors of this House be closed against these men? Why is it, I would like to know, that the prerogative of the Crown is to be restricted so as to prevent the choice of these men?

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—I can give explanations to the honorable gentleman. He must be aware that Lower Canada is in a different position from Upper Canada, and that there are two nationalities in it occupying certain portions of the country. Well, these divisions have been made so as to secure to both nationalities their respective rights, and these, in our opinion, are good reasons for the provision that has been made.

HON. MR. CURRIE—I do not think my honorable and gallant friend sees the point of my remarks. I would ask why in the first selection the choice of the Crown is restricted to the members of this Chamber, when probably others out of it could be found whose presence here would be of more advantage to the public?

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—I do not know what advantage would be derived if the Crown

had the right of making selections from all over the country. If that had been proposed, I think many honorable gentlemen would have found fault with it. (Hear, hear.) It was due to courtesy that the members of this House should not be overlooked, and not only that, but there were acquired rights which had to be respected. My honorable friend appears to dissent from this statement. Well, the last choice of the people are now in this House, and by the fact of their election they have acquired a right to a seat; and I think those gentlemen who have been appointed for life have gained rights which should not be overlooked. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. CURRIE—The honorable and gallant gentleman says we have an acquired right. I admit we have a right to sit here during the term for which we have been elected; but what right have we to seat ourselves here for the remainder of our lives? The people did not send us here to make this change in the composition of this House. (Hear, hear.) And what right even have the appointed members of this House to seats here during their lifetime? I have a despatch here, written by the late Duke of NEWCASTLE, who will be considered pretty good authority upon the point, to the Lieutenant-Governor of Prince Edward Island, on this very question. I need not read the words of the despatch, but the sense of it is, that legislative councillors have no right of property in their position, but simply a naked trust which the Legislature may at any time call upon them to surrender to other hands, if, in their opinion, the public interest shall require such transfer.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—That is merely a matter of opinion. That may for a time have been the view of the Imperial authorities, but previous to 1856 they held and said directly the contrary. (Hear, hear.) They then said that they had granted certain privileges to certain gentlemen for life, and that they would not commit the injustice of withdrawing those privileges when the gentlemen had done nothing to forfeit them. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. CURRIE—I am surprised at the honorable and gallant Premier questioning the ability of the distinguished gentleman who wrote the despatch to which I have just referred. Whatever may have been the opinion of the Colonial Office in 1856, this is a later opinion, for the despatch is dated the 4th of February, 1862. The honorable and gallant gentleman says they do not propose to take from any honorable gentleman the rights

he now enjoys. I could understand this argument if they did not propose to take away the rights of any honorable member of this House; but I cannot understand it when you propose to drive from this House faithful subjects who have served their country honestly in the Legislature, and I am afraid we have not yet had from the gallant Premier that explanation to which the House is entitled. (Hear, hear.) Why is it that the legislative councillors from Prince Edward Island are excepted? In that province, as we know, the Legislative Council is elective, and it is an elected Chamber that is now in existence there, but the members of it are excepted from the provisions that apply to the legislative councils of the other provinces. Why is this? I think there must be some reason, in the first place, for breaking the good rule that in no way shall the prerogative of the Crown be restricted; and, in the second, for making an exception in regard to one that does not apply to the others. I think a reason may be found for this in the fact, that it was doubted whether the resolutions in a different shape would have passed through some of the chambers that compose the legislatures of the different provinces. (Hear, hear.) I would like to know what justice will be done if this change is carried out? What, for instance, will be done with regard to two honorable members who come from the city of Hamilton? One of them (the Hon. Mr. MILLS) is an appointed member; the other (the Hon. Mr. BULL) was the almost unanimous choice of the people only a few months since. Under the working of the resolutions, one of these honorable gentlemen will forfeit his seat.

HON. MR. ROSS—Why? (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. CURRIE—If it does not follow that one of these honorable gentlemen will lose his seat, it must follow that some other portion of Upper Canada will be unrepresented in this House. (Hear, hear.) Let honorable gentlemen take either horn of the dilemma they please. It may be quite true that the gentlemen who have been sent here possess the confidence of their constituents, but it does not follow that they will be retained in their seats. It is plain that a great injustice will be done these honorable gentlemen, some of whom have served their country faithfully, without, in any way trenching upon the rights of the Crown or infringing on those of the people; and I think the conclusion this House and the country, as well as the other branch of the Legislature, will arrive at, is that those re-

solutions were devised because they were better calculated in this shape to be palatable, if not to this Chamber, at least to other houses of the legislatures of British North America. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. CHRISTIE—Like other hon. gentlemen who have preceded me, I am overcome with the importance of this subject; and I would fail in my duty were I to give a silent vote on the very grave question now before the House. I feel that, in the language of my hon. friend from the Eastern Division, it is a question of the greatest possible importance; and I think the House has great reason to congratulate itself on the manner in which the discussion of it has been approached—in the way in which it has been treated, both by the friends of the resolutions and by those who have opposed them. (Hear, hear.) Difference of opinion there must be on all great public questions. (Hear, hear.) It is idle to expect that we should all be agreed on this any more than on any other great public question; and after all, the most correct judgment, which can be formed on any occasion, is but an approximation to the truth. (Hear, hear.) All those who have preceded us in the work of constitution-making, have left, on the structures which they have erected, the impress of that attribute which prevades humanity—imperfection. We have a very lamentable instance of this in the case of our neighbors on the southern side of the line. As was well said, by a prominent member of the Government in another place, the Constitution of the United States “was one of the most wonderful works of the human intellect—one of the most marvellous efforts of skill and organization that ever governed a free people. But to say that it was perfect would be wrong.” The wonder is that men with the limited amount of experience which its authors possessed, should have framed such an instrument. It has stood many rude tests, and but for the existence in the social compact of our American friends, of an element in direct antagonism to the whole genius of their system—negro slavery—the Constitution of the United States would have continued to withstand—yes, and after the extinction of that element, will continue to withstand—all the artillery which their own or foreign despotism can array against it. Their institutions have the same features with our own. There are some points of variance; but the same great principle is the basis of both—that life, liberty and the

pursuit of happiness are the unalienable rights of man, and that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. This is the secret of the strength of the British Constitution, and without a free and full recognition of it, no government can be strong or permanent. I am free to admit that the scheme before us has some defects, which, in my judgment, will mar its well-working; but, at the same time, I am confident that, if it should become law, those defects can and will be remedied. The gentlemen composing a majority of the Conference, who were the authors of these resolutions, honestly thought that their views were right, but the time will come when they or their successors will see that they were wrong, and the errors will be rectified. We are told the resolutions must be either accepted or rejected. Therefore, the question which we must solve is, whether those defects are so serious as to render it our duty to reject them, or are the advantages likely to result from their adoption more than equivalent to the drawbacks. I hold that the substitution of appointment by the Crown for the elective principle, in this Chamber, is a great objection. I have always been an advocate of the elective principle; still I shrink from the responsibility of voting against the scheme because of that objection. (Hear, hear.) We had reached a condition almost bordering on anarchy; and I am sure from the conflict of passions that prevailed—and it is not my design to blame one political party or the other for it, I simply state a fact, freely conceded by both parties—that a state of things existed for which a remedy of some kind must be found. And it is a cheering fact that in the midst of this state of things we have found men patriotic enough to merge former differences and unite together for the purpose of framing a Constitution which will secure exemption from the evils under which we have labored. And although it may entail—I am not here to state that it will not entail—additional cost upon the country, yet that is not a valid argument against the adoption of the scheme. (Hear, hear.) The House and the country have to take this into consideration, whether, if it be rejected, we can devise a plan better fitted to extricate us from our present difficulties, and which will command the support of all the parties to this compact. It seems to be unnecessary to go into the discussion of the question as to

whether union of the British North American Provinces is desirable. Every hon. gentleman who has spoken, has given his assent to that proposition. But objections have been urged against the resolutions before the House, and some of those objections have assumed a tangible shape. They have been presented in the amendments moved by my honorable friend from Wellington and by my hon. friend from Niagara. My vote shall be given for the resolutions, notwithstanding their defects, because I believe that the benefits which we shall derive from their adoption will far outweigh them. (Hear, hear.) We have been told that this scheme is new, that the country is not informed upon the subject, and that the people do not understand it. There was a time in the history of this country—and that time has not very long gone by—when this plan of government, or at any rate the leading principles embodied in it, were discussed and approved by a very large number of the people. In 1859, a numerous and respectable body representing the Reform party of Upper Canada, met in the city of Toronto. That convention was composed of, I think, 560 members, who substantially adopted it as the policy of the party. Among other resolutions which the convention agreed to were two which I shall take the liberty of reading to the House. The 4th resolution was to the following effect:—

That without entering on the discussion of other objections, this assembly is of opinion that the delay which must occur in obtaining the sanction of the Lower Provinces to a Federal union of all the British North American Colonies, places that measure beyond consideration as a remedy for present evils.

The object of this resolution was clearly not to ignore the larger project of Confederation of all the British North American Provinces, and I think I shall be able to convince the House, from what fell from myself on that occasion, that it was not so considered. But the difficulties then surrounding us were of a grave character and an immediate remedy was desired; and, as the resolution expresses it, the obstacle in the way of a Federal union of all the provinces, and which prevented its acceptance as an immediate remedy, was the delay which would necessarily occur in obtaining the consent of the Lower Provinces. But the 5th resolution adopted at that meeting embodied in it some of the main features of

the resolutions of the Conference. It runs thus:—

That in the opinion of this assembly the best practicable remedy for the evils now encountered in the Government of Canada is to be found in the formation of two or more local governments, to which shall be committed the control of all matters of a local or sectional character, and some joint authority, charged with such matters as are necessarily common to both sections of the province.

HON. MR. ROSS—Or, in other words, there was a hope at that time that Confederation would be accomplished. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. CHRISTIE—Yes; and I was going on to show that that was the sense in which I and others in that body viewed the resolution at the time; and my hon. friend from the Niagara Division was a member of the convention. I shall quote from a speech I made upon that occasion, which will show at all events the sense in which I regarded the resolution I have just read. It is sometimes an advantage in advocating measures to have no embarrassing antecedents. This is my lot on this occasion, or I should, perhaps, have been reminded of them by my hon. friend from Niagara. It will be remembered by those who were present at the meeting, that Mr. SHEPPARD moved a resolution, in amendment, affirming the propriety of dissolving the union between Upper and Lower Canada; but in doing so, he said, that if our object was to establish a large nationality, he would withdraw it, and support the main resolution. In reply to him I said:—

Mr. SHEPPARD has stated that if he could see that the tendency was towards the acquisition of a national existence, then he was with us; he could see the propriety of a course of that kind. Now I, for one, have no hesitation in saying that such is its tendency, and that that man is blind to the future of this country, nay, more, that he is not a true patriot, who does not believe that some day or other this great British North American continent will have a nationality. I think every man, looking at the history of the past and judging from that what may be the history of the future of this country, must feel that one day or other—and this, perhaps, at no very distant period—we shall have a great North American nationality. It is no part of our scheme that there shall not be a Federation of all the British North American Provinces. We admit the possibility of that in one of the resolutions already passed, but we say that we cannot afford to wait for it, for the extravagance of our present system is so great that the country cannot stand it much longer. With regard to dissolution of the union,

pure and simple, we say you can't get it—it is not advisable that you should have it, because it is a step in the wrong direction. It is going back. We adopt the principle of Federation, as a step in the right direction, which will, in the meantime, relieve us from the pressing difficulties under which the country labors, and which also looks to the future—to a Federation of all the British North American Provinces first, and beyond that to the admission of other territories into the great North American Confederacy.

Having thus shown the views which were entertained at that time, I feel, honorable gentlemen, that we are perfectly consistent in supporting the main features of this scheme. (Hear, hear.) I think it will be in the recollection of honorable gentlemen, that while this meeting in Toronto took place on the 9th of November, 1859, there was also another meeting in the city of Montreal, on the 25th of October preceding, the proceedings at which to a great extent influenced the decision of that convention. The meeting at Montreal, composed of Lower Canadian Opposition members of Parliament, gave forth to the world a very important and able document—a document which on its face was partly advisory to the members of the Reform party of Upper Canada, who were about to meet in Toronto. It was signed by the following gentlemen: the Hon. Messrs. A. A. DORION, L. T. DRUMMOND, L. A. DESSAULES, and THOMAS D'ARCY MCGEE. If the House will bear with me, I will quote from it as briefly as possible, because it is impossible for me to present, in any language of my own, arguments so cogent, and so satisfactory, in support of the scheme now before the House. (Hear, hear.) After setting forth the necessity of immediate action and deprecating dissolution of the union pure and simple, these gentlemen—who formed a committee of the Liberal party of Lower Canada to prepare this manifesto—say:—

Neither can we comprehend how the re-adjustment of representation could effectually prevent the recurrence of the conflicts and collisions arising out of the distinct character of our two-fold population. In each section there would still be minority and majority parties; and unless the principle of a double majority could be enacted as a fundamental law, we should be exposed to an endless round of the same complaints that we now hear, of one section ruling the other contrary to its well-known public opinion, and to see reproduced in our politics the same passions, the same intrigues, the same corruption and insincerity. The enactment of the double majority is not advocated in any quarter.

I am sorry that my hon. friend from the Grandville Division is not in his place, for I think the remedy he proposes is so ably shown in this document to be insufficient to meet the exigencies of the case, that even he would be convinced of the inadequacy of the views he has just now announced. The language I have quoted is just what we say now, that representation by population *per se* would not afford sufficient means of extrication from our difficulties, and would not give us the hope which the new constitutional system, of which it forms a main feature, does afford, that we will be rid of the evils which have distracted the country. (Hear, hear.) Upper Canada, were that principle engrafted into our legislative union, would undoubtedly have greater power and weight, but as the manifesto justly says:—

We should be exposed to an endless round of the same complaints that we now hear, of one section ruling the other, contrary to its well known public opinion.

We should still have Upper Canada *versus* Lower Canada; because local difficulties, arising out of real or supposed interference with the customs, laws, religious institutions, or sectional questions of any kind, would provoke and perpetuate the same bitter and hostile feelings which have so long annoyed and vexed the people of both sections of the province. (Hear, hear.) The Federative system is the only cure for this great evil. (Hear, hear.) The manifesto of the committee proceeds to say:—

Your committee are impressed with the conviction that whether we consider the present needs or the probable future condition of the country—the true, the statesmanlike solution is to be sought in the substitution of a purely Federative for the present so-called Legislative union. The former, it is believed, would enable us to escape all the evils, and so retain all the advantages appertaining to the existing union, while by restricting the functions of the Federal Government to the few easily-defined subjects of common or national concern, and leaving supreme jurisdiction in all other matters to the several provinces, the people of each sub-division would possess every guarantee for the integrity of their respective institutions which an absolute dissolution of the union would confer.

It is impossible to state in stronger or more appropriate terms than these the advantages set forth in the leading features of this scheme—they are in exact accordance with the principles here so luminously and powerfully stated. One would suppose that

the hon. and gallant Knight, or the hon. the Commissioner of Crown Lands, had written the paragraph; even they could not offer a better defence. (Hear, hear.) But I wish to call to the next paragraph of this manifesto the attention of my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. AIKINS), who thinks that these resolutions have not been long enough before the public to enable them to form a correct judgment upon them. I trust the House will bear with me while quoting from this State paper; but really I feel that the arguments which it urges are so good that they are the best defence of the resolutions that can be offered:—

The proposition to Federalize the Canadian union is not new. On the contrary, it has been frequently mooted in Parliament and in the press during the last few years. It was, no doubt, suggested by the example of the neighboring States, where the admirable adaptation of the Federal system to the government of an extensive territory, inhabited by people of diverse origins, creeds, laws and customs, has been amply demonstrated; but shape and consistence were first imparted to it in 1856, when it was formally submitted to Parliament by the Lower Canada Opposition, as offering, in their judgment, the true corrective of the abuses generated under the present system.

Thus it appears that the gallant Knight and his confrères of the Conference have not the credit of originating this scheme—the honor belongs to the Liberal party of Lower Canada; and it is somewhat surprising that these gentlemen, who not only adopted it themselves but recommended it to Upper Canada, are the only parties who now oppose it. (Hear, hear.) Now, mark the significance of the paragraph which follows:—

The discussion now going on in Upper Canada justifies the hope that the Liberal party of that section of the province will at the approaching convention pronounce in favor of Federation. It, therefore, now becomes imperative upon the Liberals of Lower Canada to determine whether they will sustain the views enunciated in Parliament in 1856, and urged upon every subsequent occasion when constitutional changes were discussed.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Hear, hear!

HON. MR. CHRISTIE—The hon. gentleman says “hear, hear,” but what was recommended in this paragraph has been done. Our friends called on the Liberal party in Upper Canada to adopt their scheme at the convention of 1859. It was then adopted. It has now been adopted by both parties in Upper Canada; nay more, it has

been adopted by the Conservative party in Lower Canada, and shall the country now be told that the only party who oppose it, are the Liberal party of Lower Canada, who claim the credit of being its authors. The arguments are so cogent that I must continue to quote them:—

If Lower Canada insists on maintaining the union intact,—if she will neither consent to a dissolution of the union, nor consider the project of a Federation, it is difficult to conceive on what reasonable grounds the demand for representation according to population can be resisted. The plea for such a resistance has hitherto been, that danger might arise to some of her peculiar and most cherished institutions; but that ground will be no longer tenable if she rejects a proposition the effect of which would be to leave to her own people the sole and absolute custody of those institutions, and to surround them by the most stringent of all possible safeguards, the fundamental law of the land, unalterable save by the action of the people affected by them.

Could there be anything stronger or more to the point than this. He will not admit it, but no doubt this document has contributed largely to the conversion of my venerable and gallant friend at the head of the Government. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) I have such faith in the efficacy of it, that in the hope of making more converts I will go on with it:—

Your committee will not be expected, it is presumed, to do more than indicate the conclusions at which they have arrived with respect to the more prominent features of the proposed system of Federation. They are clearly of opinion that whatever be the number of the provinces into which it may ultimately be thought advisable to divide the Province of Canada, the old division line between Upper and Lower Canada must be preserved. In the distribution of powers between the Local, or State, and the Federal Government, the controlling and pervading idea should be to delegate to the Federal Government such authority only as would be essential to the objects of the Federation; and by necessary consequence to reserve to the subdivisions, powers as ample and varied as possible. The customs, the post-office, the laws concerning patents and copyrights, the currency, and such of the public works as are of general interest to the whole province, would form the chief, if not the only subjects with which the General Government should be charged; while everything relating to purely local improvements, to education, to the administration of justice, to the militia, to laws relating to property, and generally all questions of local concern; in fine, on all matters not specifically devolving on the Federal Government, would be lodged in the governments of the separate provinces. * * * In conclusion,

your committee strenuously recommend to the Liberal party of Lower Canada the propriety of seeking for a solution of the present difficulties in a plan of Confederation, the details of which should be so matured as to meet the approbation of a majority of the people of this province, and, in order to further this, and to promote the most ample discussion of the subject as well in Parliament as throughout the country.

It may be said in reply, that this document refers only to the Federation of the Canadas. The scheme before the House provides for that most fully; but if the principle be good as regards Canada, it will be equally beneficial as regards the other British North American Colonies. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member from Wellington, in the very able speech which he delivered the other day, and to which all who heard him must have listened with very great pleasure, enunciated his views in his usual forcible and lucid style; and whether there is a coincidence of opinion with him or not, one cannot but respect the intelligence, moderation and candor with which he expresses his views. (Hear, hear.) I trust that in giving my opinion upon some points of his remarks I shall be guilty of no want of courtesy although differing from him. (Hear.) The hon. gentleman, at the outset of his remarks, said that this Constitution, in order to be strong, "must be planted deep in the hearts and affections of the people," and that "there would be no good hope of its permanency without this." So true and correct is this position, that if I did not believe, honestly believe, that the Constitution which we are now discussing commanded the approbation of a large majority of the people—I am speaking now more particularly of the section of the province to which I belong—I would be one of those to advocate our delaying its passage until we ascertained beyond all doubt what the feelings of the people are; but I think there is no reasonable ground to doubt what their views are. (Hear, hear.) They were shown, in the first place, as pointed out by my honorable friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands, in the fact that nearly all the elections of members of this and the other branch of the Legislature that have taken place since the formation of the Government, have resulted in its favor. That, I think, is very strong testimony of the popular approbation. (Hear, hear.) Then we have no petitions against it. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. CURRIE—And none for it.

HON. MR. CHRISTIE—"None for it," the hon. gentleman says. Why, the country has demanded the scheme for years. (Hear, hear.) What have I been proving to the House but that the very party of which the hon. gentleman is a member resolved upon this in 1859. I do not think the feelings of that convention in its favor could have been more distinctly expressed. I certainly so understood it, and a large majority of the 560 gentlemen present so understood it. (Hear, hear.) It has been before the country in Lower Canada since 1856, when our friends from Lower Canada formally brought it before Parliament. Are there any petitions from Lower Canada now against it? (Hear, hear.) Are there any from Upper Canada? Has there been a single public meeting in either section against it? (Hear, hear.) In Lower Canada, an hon. member says, there have been two or three. It has been said—I do not declare it, but make the statement on public rumor—that they were failures, small demonstrations of opposition. But in Upper Canada we have had no demonstration whatever against it. An indirect attempt was made the other day at Toronto by an effort to condemn the Inter-colonial Railway in connection with Confederation, but it was a manifest failure. (Hear, hear.) I think, then, that we are justified in assuming—and, indeed, are bound to assume—that the people do not object to it, and that they fully understand its character; for in spite of what may be said to the contrary, it has gone through the length and breadth of the land, having been widely circulated by every newspaper in the country; and it is a flimsy argument for honorable gentlemen to use, that because the resolutions addressed to them were marked "Private," they could not be communicated to the public. (Hear, hear.) They have been spread all over the country; but we are told the entire press has been subsidized by the Government. To say that the press was influenced in any manner by the circular to which allusion has been made, is absolutely ridiculous. (Hear, hear.) There are a few newspapers in either section of the province—certainly there are few in Upper Canada—that have spoken against the scheme; but nine-tenths of them in both sections are in favor of it, and have discussed it in all its bearings—yet we are told that the public has not been sufficiently informed upon it, that in fact there is no public opinion in

respect to it, and that hence there are no petitions or demonstrations against it. I think this is a mode of reasoning which my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. CURRIE) ought not to adopt—it is an argument unworthy of his intelligence. (Hear, hear.) My hon. friend from Wellington the other day attacked the character of the Conference, and the attack has been repeated since, by styling it a “self-elected body.” This designation was not correct. So far as Canada is concerned, we were represented by the Canadian Government, formed for the express purpose of carrying into effect a plan of Federal union—union of the Canadas at all events, and if possible of all the British North American Provinces. It will not be denied that the Government possesses the confidence of large majorities in both Houses of Parliament, and of the people of the province. (Hear, hear.) The representatives of Canada, therefore, could hardly be called a self-elected body, that is in the sense in which my hon. friend has applied the term, namely, that they represented nobody but themselves. To maintain this is indeed to go a great length, for it is practically to ignore both Houses of Parliament, and the very principle of representation. (Hear, hear.) Then, as regards the representatives of the other provinces, they were appointed by the sanction of the Crown, on the invitation of the Governor General, and were selected from various political parties, to consider a question of the utmost interest to every subject of the Sovereign, of whatever race or faith, resident in these provinces; and they have arrived at a conclusion destined to exercise a most important influence upon the future condition and welfare of the whole community. My honorable friend from Port Hope (Hon. Mr. SEYMOUR) referred to-day to the American mode of revising their constitutions. The honorable gentleman very correctly stated the manner in which the Federal Constitution may be amended, but he is in error as to the mode in which state constitutions may be revised. One of the most important of the States revised its Constitution in 1846. I refer to the State of New York. The *modus operandi* on that occasion was as follows:—An act was passed in the State Legislature authorizing the electors at large to choose delegates to a convention, for the express purpose of revising the Constitution. The instrument passed by the convention was then submit-

ted to the Legislature for approval; but the Legislature had no power to alter it. It had either to be rejected or accepted as a whole. It was so accepted, none of the details being altered. My hon. friend will see that while the Conference was composed of leading representatives of the people in the various provinces, those conventions are composed of gentlemen elected by the people for that special purpose; and that the only difference between them is in the mode of selection. However, in both cases, all political parties are represented. My hon. friend from the Home Division (Hon. Mr. AIKINS) in speaking of this Conference the other day, said he would have preferred if it had been a party matter, and he took the ground that if it had, it would have been better for the country.

HON. MR. AIKINS—I beg the honorable gentleman's pardon. What I said was, that I regretted very much that the measure had not been taken up and discussed as a party measure; for although I was of opinion that it could not be carried as a party measure, if it had been so taken up it would have been more thoroughly scrutinized and discussed before the people.

HON. MR. CHRISTIE—I think the explanation of my hon. friend quite bears out what I stated, that he thought it should be made a party measure.

HON. MR. AIKINS—I thought the country would be the gainer if it were.

HON. MR. CHRISTIE—In what way?

HON. MR. AIKINS—By the fuller discussion we would have.

HON. MR. CHRISTIE—Where can the hon. gentleman find an instance of the revision or change of a constitution being made a party measure?

HON. MR. AIKINS—The hon. gentleman can find it on reference to the action of the Toronto convention and the Lower Canadian Liberal party, to which he has just alluded.

HON. MR. CHRISTIE—The hon. gentleman, I see, has not changed the ground which he took the other day, and which is precisely as I stated it. He thinks it would have been to the public advantage if this question had been taken up and discussed by a party. In this, in my judgment, he is entirely wrong; and I say he can find no instance of a constitution having been revised by a party.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Well, I submit an instance—the amendment to the United

States Constitution, prohibiting slavery, which was passed last month, and which was proposed by a party.

HON. MR. CHRISTIE—A number of the representatives in the Federal Congress who voted for it were democrats, and without their concurrence and support it could not have been carried. Besides, that was only an amendment, not a revision of the Constitution. The Constitution of the United States was not the work of a party. The revision of the Constitution of the State of New York, in 1846, was not the work of a party. It is not desirable that any Constitution should be the work of a party; in so important an undertaking all party spirit should be laid aside. (Hear, hear.) Why? Because men of all parties are alike interested in the formation of a Constitution, and because in the construction of such an instrument, the collective wisdom of the leading men of all parties is needed. Besides, a Constitution so framed will be more likely, as my hon. friend from Wellington has so well said, to live in the hearts and affections of the people. (Hear, hear.) To shew the good sense of our neighbors on this point, they do not give the revision of a Constitution—and the work of the Conference was a revision of our Constitution—to any party, but to men specially chosen for the purpose, from all parties; and I think the Governor General, and the Lieutenant-Governors of the Lower Provinces acted most wisely when they selected men of all shades of political opinion to compose this Conference and to prepare this Constitution, because all party views and feelings being laid aside, the whole object and motive of the members of the body was to devise a scheme which would best tend to promote the good of their common country. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member from Wellington has suggested a very important objection to the scheme; and I am free to admit that, if the position he took were a correct one, then it would not be my duty, or that of any elected member of this House, to assent to the measure. In order that I may not misrepresent the position taken by the hon. gentleman, let me quote his language, as reported in the newspapers. He held:—

That the elective members had received a sacred trust to exercise; that they were sent here by their constituencies to represent them, and to do that only. Under these circumstances, how could they conceive they had the power to vote away the rights of their electors? That

was not their *mandat*, and if they did, they would be doing that which they had no authority to do; they would be doing that which they could not do without going beyond the authority confided to them.

Now, it must be frankly admitted that if the hon. gentleman's position be correct, then his objection would be fatal to any elected member giving his concurrence to the scheme of the Conference. But, hon. gentlemen, let us enquire what is the position of a representative. Two elements enter into the idea of representation—namely, power and duty. A representative derives the former from his constituents acting by their majority, under the Constitution. From what source does he derive the latter? Obviously not from his constituents, because even the majority are not agreed on all points connected with the discharge of his duty. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. SANBORN) has spoken of the position of a representative, as being that of a trustee. I shall quote from a very able work on the British Commonwealth, in which that position is, to my mind, very fully and very satisfactorily proved to be incorrect. COX says:—

Any trust, to be obligatory in conscience, must be defined by the self-same persons who appoint the trustee, or the person who is to fulfil the trust. His powers and duties must be derived from identically the same authority, for it obviously would be contrary to morals, as it is to law, that a man would be bound in conscience to exercise, in a particular way, powers delegated to him by several others, when they themselves, while delegating those powers, differ as to the mode in which they are to be exercised. For, which of the different ways is the trustee to choose? By whom of those who appoint him is he to be guided in preference to the rest? At the most he is bound to exercise his trust in a particular way in those particulars only respecting which the trust makers are agreed. Let us now apply this abstract principle of equity to the relations between a representative and his constituents. Regard him as their trustee. With respect to the source of his power there is no ambiguity; it is derived from his constituents acting by their majority. But from whom does he derive the duty of expressing this or that opinion in Parliament? In what particular are the trust-makers agreed? The very majority who voted for him are rarely, perhaps never, all agreed on any one point on which their opinions have been compared with his. Some of them differ from him on some points, some on others, but they all voted for him, from personal consideration, or because of their agreement with him on those points which they respectively deemed most important. In the minority, also, are probably some electors who assent to some,

and dissent from others, of his opinions. The essential conditions of a valid trust to express particular opinions in Parliament are then wanting. The persons nominating him to his office, do not concur as to the opinions which he is to express. How then can a trust exist which it is impossible to define. The real trust imposed on the representative is co-extensive with those obligations, which alone the trust-makers can generally confer on him,—namely, to exercise his representative power honestly and discreetly. This argument, of course, assumes that the candidate has not defined his parliamentary obligations by unconditional pledges.

The only other possible limitation might exist in the Constitution. I shall look then at the instrument from which we derive our powers as legislative councillors, and shall quote from the Imperial Act of 1854, intitled "An Act to empower the Legislature of Canada to alter the Constitution of the Legislative Council, and for other purposes." The first section is as follows:—

It shall be lawful for the Legislature of Canada, by any act or acts to be for that purpose passed, to alter the manner of composing the Legislative Council of the said province, and to make it consist of such number of members, appointed or to be appointed or elected by such persons, and in such manner as to the said Legislature may seem fit, and to fix the qualifications of the persons capable of being so appointed or elected, and by such act or acts to make provision, if they shall think fit, for the separate dissolution by the Governor of the said Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly respectively, and for the purposes aforesaid, to vary and repeal in such manner as to them shall seem fit, all or any of the sections and provisions of the said recited act, and of any other Act of Parliament now in force which relates to the Constitution of the Legislative Council of Canada.

Then, in the 3rd section it is provided—

That it shall be lawful for the Legislature of Canada, from time to time, to vary and repeal all or any of the provisions of the act or acts altering the Constitution of the said Legislative Council.

These are the powers given us by our Constitution. (Hear, hear.) They are of the most ample character. We were elected, pursuant to an act passed in consequence of the exercise of these powers. And, coming from the people, the members of this House were put in possession of these powers the moment they were elected. None of them at their elections pledged themselves not to exercise the powers granted by the Constitution. They were not asked by their constituents to do so. How then, by voting for this or any other measure altering the con-

stitution of the Legislative Council, can they be said to betray the trust reposed in them by their constituents? My hon. friend from Wellington admits that under the Constitution we have the power to alter the constitution of this House in so far as it relates to Canada, but he says we are not authorized to extend our action to the other provinces, in a scheme of Federal union. That is begging the question. I answer his objection that any change affecting the elective principle is a breach of trust. Besides, we do not propose to enact a system of Government embracing all British North America. We have not the power to do so. We merely propose to address Her Majesty on the subject. The Imperial Parliament alone has that power; but if we have power without a breach of trust to alter the constitution of the Legislative Council of Canada (and my hon. friend admits this), then, certainly, we cannot be guilty of a breach of trust in suggesting a change embraced in a Constitution for the various provinces. I will not yield to my hon. friends from Wellington and Niagara, in attachment to the elective principle, as applied to this House. I have always been an advocate for it, and I am so still, but we cannot get it inserted in this instrument; and much as I deplore its absence from our proposed Constitution, I am not on that account prepared to reject the resolutions. This scheme, like all other constitutional compacts, is a compromise between the conflicting opinions of its framers; and on the whole, it is a fair compromise. This feature is not peculiar to our plan of Confederation. My hon. friend will find in the *Federalist*, and from the correspondence of the able men who framed the "Articles of Confederation," that compromise and concessions of opinion were submitted to. But out of them all grew the wonderful fabric of the American Constitution. In the resolution which my hon. friend proposes, there is, according to his own admission, compromise. He admits that he cannot in its integrity procure the application of the elective principle to the Legislative Council. He even proposes to add to the opposite principle; why, then, does my hon. friend object to similar concessions on our part, when we believe that the probable advantages of the whole scheme far outweigh its defects? (Hear, hear.) As regards limitation in the general powers of Parliament contended for by my hon. friend, I hold that it is not to be found in the

unwritten Constitution, made up of historical and parliamentary precedents, any more than in our written Charter from the Imperial Parliament. That great commentator, BLACKSTONE, says of Parliament:—

It hath sovereign and uncontrollable authority in making, confining, enlarging, restraining, repealing, revising and expounding of laws.

So, Justice STORY, in speaking of the American Constitution, says:—

Where a power is granted in general terms the power is to be construed as co-extensive with the terms, unless some clear restriction upon it is deducible from the context.

Chief Justice MARSHALL says:—

The Constitution unavoidably deals in general language, hence its powers are expressed in general terms, leaving to the Legislature, from time to time, to adopt its own means to effectuate legitimate objects, and to mould and model the exercise of its powers as its own wisdom and the public interest may require.

The only other authority I shall quote is from DUER's *Constitutional Jurisprudence*:—

No axiom is more clearly established in law or reason than that, wherever an end is required, the means are authorized; wherever a general power to do a thing is given, every particular power necessary for doing it is included.

But my hon. friend's motion is utterly inconsistent with the position which he has taken. He takes ground in his speech which is upset by his motion. According to that position he is bound to the elective principle, and he is therefore on principle bound to do all in his power to remove obstructions to its well-working. He is bound even to remove the present nominated members from the House. What does his resolution propose? It proposes not merely to allow the nominated members to remain for life, but to add ten to their number! This is surely not giving free scope to the elective principle. Were the Lower Provinces to have the power which my hon. friend proposes to give them, they would appoint ten of their youngest men to seats in this House, who might be here for years after those to whom they were an offset had been removed from the House. (Hear, hear.) Besides, he proposes to give the present elected members seats for eight years, and then, of course, the whole of them would go back for re-election at

once. I am not convinced by any argument which I have heard that the elective principle, exercised in some way, is not the best mode to compose this House. It has worked well so far. All the fears which were entertained in reference to it have proved groundless, and I believe it would continue to work well, and therefore, I disapprove of the change proposed in the resolutions. But I am not on that account prepared to reject the whole scheme. With all its defects (and I believe those defects will be remedied) I accept it, because it will be productive of good to the country at large. Therefore, I shrink from the responsibility of rejecting it. (Hear, hear.) I have to apologize for having detained the House so long—(cries of "no, no," "go on")—but, before sitting down, I must refer to the amendment of which my hon. friend from Niagara Division (Hon. Mr. CURRIE) has given notice. It is as follows:—

That upon a matter of such great importance as the proposed Confederation of this and certain other British Colonies, this House is unwilling to assume the responsibility of assenting to a measure involving so many important considerations, without a further manifestation of the public will than has yet been declared.

My hon. friend does not tell us, in this resolution, which he intends to move—

HON. MR. ARMSTRONG—I scarcely think it is in order to discuss a resolution which has not been moved yet.

HON. MR. CHRISTIE—It forms part of the general subject brought before the House. It is on the notice paper, and I think I am quite in order in referring to it. I was about to say that my hon. friend, in that notice does not tell us whether he intends to propose that public opinion shall be tested by an appeal to the people in the way of a dissolution of the Legislative Assembly, or by submitting the scheme in its integrity to a popular vote. If we recommend the former course, we should place ourselves in rather a strange position. If we advised His Excellency to dissolve the House of Assembly, while we sat quietly by to see what was going on, it would be in effect saying—"We have scruples as to whether public opinion has, or has not endorsed these proposed constitutional changes; but, if your Excellency will be so kind as to dissolve the House of Assembly, those scruples will be resolved by a general election." (Hear, hear, and laughter.) I think

that would be an extraordinary course for this House to take—and a course which I think would not be considered by the country at large a very becoming one. (Hear, hear.) If the other plan be what my hon. friend intends by his notice, then I say it is a process of ascertaining the popular sanction entirely unknown to the British Constitution. It is a process unknown even to our friends on the other side of the line, except in those cases where the general or state Constitution expressly provides for it. Where such provisions are not contained in the state constitutions, it is invariably held that submission to the popular vote, in order to give the force of law to any legislative act, is unconstitutional and void. In reference to the practice, SEDGWICK, an eminent American authority, says :—

Efforts have been made, in several cases, by the state legislatures to relieve themselves of the responsibility of their functions, by submitting statutes to the will of the people, in their primary capacity. But these proceedings have been held, and very rightly, to be entirely unconstitutional and invalid. The duties of legislation are not to be exercised by the people at large. The majority governs, but only in the prescribed form. The introduction of practices of this kind would remove all checks on hasty and improvident legislation, and greatly diminish the benefits of representative government. So when an act to establish free schools was by its terms directed to be submitted to the electors of the state to become a law only in case a majority of the votes were given in its favor, it was held in New York that the whole proceeding was entirely void. The Legislature, said the Court of Appeals, have no power to make such submission, nor had the people the power to bind each other by acting upon it. They voluntarily surrendered that power when they adopted the Constitution. The government of this state is democratic, but it is a representative democracy, and in passing general laws the people act only through their representatives in the legislature. In Indiana, the principle is now framed into a constitutional provision which vests the legislative authority in a Senate and House of Representatives, and declares that no law shall be passed the taking effect of which shall be made to depend upon any authority except as provided in the Constitution. And under these provisions it has been held that so much of an act as relates to its submission to the popular vote was null and void.

That is the general principle, according to American practice. And as I have said, the process of submitting any statute to the popular vote, in order to give it the force of law, is unheard of in British constitutional practice. (Hear, hear.) I shall not detain

the House by going into the question of expense, as I promised to do. I will simply say in conclusion, that I do think it is our duty as patriotic men, as men actuated by an honest desire to extricate our country from the difficulties in which it is placed, to deal fairly with this scheme, and as no other has been presented—as those who oppose it have not presented for our consideration any other—have not even suggested the possibility of any other to extricate us from the evils of our position—and believing that in the main this scheme, as regards its great leading outlines, will effect that purpose—then, I say, it is our duty as honest and patriotic men, to approve of it and to sanction it by voting for the resolutions in their integrity. (Hear, hear.) I have resolved, like my honorable friend from the Western Division, and my hon. friend from the Brook Division (Hon. Mr. BLAIR) to vote against all amendments which may be offered to it. We have been told distinctly by the members of the Government that we must either accept or reject it as it is—that amendment is impossible. I can very well understand the reason of that. It was adopted as a compact between the representatives of the different provinces who had assembled in Conference for the express purpose of framing this Constitution. Were we to make any inroads upon those resolutions, then the other provinces might claim and might exercise the same right. This instrument is not perfect. We all admit that there are points in it to which we object; and there are points in it, I dare say, to which our friends in the Lower Provinces object. It is a compromise, and I think it is a very able, and in the main a very fair compromise. It is such a compromise as ought to commend itself to every reasonable and candid mind. I think, therefore, that all amendments should be vetoed. And I am not afraid that, in taking that course, we shall not be justified by the people at large. (Hear, hear.) The people understand the meaning and effect of these amendments perfectly well. Perhaps I should not call them “buncombe,” but they savour very much of that kind of thing. I think the members of this House need have no fears of public opinion in this matter. As regards the people of Upper Canada—for whom I am in a better position to speak than for the people of Lower Canada—I am satisfied they will endorse our approbation of the resolutions; although, as we do, they may objec,

to some of the details. I have not hesitated to state my own disapproval of some of them.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. CHRISTIE—I disapprove of some of the details, just as strongly as my hon. friend from the Home Division (Hon. Mr. AIKINS,) or my hon. friend from Niagara Division (Hon. Mr. CURRIE). But I look at it in this light: here we are offered a Constitution which will deliver us from many of the great evils under which we have been laboring. I feel that in the main it will have that effect; and that this will be the result, could not have been stated more clearly or forcibly than we find it in the document which I read, as coming from the Lower Canada Opposition, and signed by Hon. Mr. DORION, Hon. Mr. DRUMMOND, Hon. Mr. DESSAULLES, and Hon. Mr. MCGEE. I think that document contains arguments in its favor which are unanswerable. (Hear, hear.) In the circumstances, then, in which we are placed, and in the absence of any other more feasible scheme, I believe that, in spite of all its objectionable features, the good which will result from it as a whole, will more than counterbalance all the difficulties and all the evils which may possibly grow out of it. (Hear, hear.) And besides, it is not a finality. We have every reason to believe that those principles, which, I think, should have been embodied in it, are such as will ultimately prevail. I have confidence enough in the representatives of the people, and in the members of the Upper House to be nominated by the Crown, and who will compose that branch of the new Legislature formed under this Constitution. I say I have confidence in them to believe that, if the opinions which I hold in respect to those details shall prove to be correct, the defects referred to will be removed from the Constitution. There will be no more difficulty in excising the nominative principle from the future Legislative Council, than there was in excising it from the former body. I might say there were greater difficulties in the one case than in the other. (Hear, hear.) Looking then at the advantages likely to result from the adoption of the resolutions—the establishment of peace and harmony among the people of this country—the getting rid of those terrible difficulties and conflicts which have beset our path, we ought not to hesitate. Whatever hon. gentlemen may say now, they did not

estimate them slightly when they were complaining of the conduct of the governments of the day, and my hon. friend from Niagara (Honorable Mr. CURRIE) inveighed against the evils which then existed as strongly as any man could do. Looking, then I say, at the abuses and difficulties which have arisen under a legislative union; and, thence arguing the impracticability of going on with that kind of union, and believing that the great advantages likely to result from this scheme of Federal union will much more than counterbalance the evils likely to arise from it, I do say it is our duty as honest and patriotic men to adopt the resolutions presented to us by the Conference. (Cheers.)

HON. MR. SANBORN said—I have no desire to take up the time of the House, and shall only do so for a moment or two. I have been unable, from ill health, to be present during the speeches on the amendment which I had the honor to submit, and I shall merely avail myself of this opportunity to answer two or three of the arguments which have been advanced by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat. It appears to me that the difficulties under which my hon. friend labors can be very easily removed; and that, if he is really in harmony in sentiment with those who sustain the amendment now before the House, he ought not to hesitate to give it his support. On a former occasion I endeavored to show that the amendment did not impair the scheme at all; that it did not place us in antagonism with any of the other provinces; that it was entirely a matter of our own concern,—the election of members to the Legislative Council—and that it was of no consequence to the other provinces how those members were elected, if they had relatively the same number as we. My hon. friend accuses me of being inconsistent in taking ground in favor of the elective principle, while proposing still to retain the nominated members in their seats, and also to add ten new members from the Maritime Provinces. To this, I would answer that it is an exceptional condition in which we are placed. We cannot obviate the difficulty. A similar difficulty presented itself to those who sought the change when the elective principle was introduced into this House, and they met it just in the same manner in which we propose to meet it here. The life members were retained while recognition and sanction were

given to the elective principle, and the House remains now a visible memento of the carrying out of the very position which I take on the present occasion. (Hear, hear.) The ground taken then, and to which the Hon. Premier (Hon. Sir ÉTIENNE P. TACHÉ) gave the sanction of his name and reputation, was a recognition of the principle embodied in the amendment now before this honorable House. (Hear, hear.) If we gained anything by introducing the elective principle, we propose to keep that advantage, by retaining it just in the same form, and bearing the same relation to the proposed Legislative Council as it is retained in and bears relation to this House.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—But, under the present union, there is no federative necessity for relative equality of numbers in the Legislative Council, as there will be under the proposed union.

HON. MR. SANBORN—I admit no necessities of the kind. These necessities are entirely artificial. In that respect, I think hon. gentlemen are entirely in error in the position they take. And, though I concede to my hon. friend from Erie Division (Hon. Mr. CHRISTIE) every credit for great candor and soundness of judgment, still I must say that, when he enters into the province of law, he is travelling a little, as we say in the profession, out of the record—and that any one who is familiar with the doctrine of trusts could not fail to see the falseness of his reasoning in that particular. As regards a trust, of course, the person who has a mandate given to him, must act according to his discretion under the circumstances. But then he must do so within the trust that is given him, and not beyond the trust.

HON. MR. CHRISTIE—Of course.

HON. MR. SANBORN—My hon. friend cites the act empowering the Legislature of Canada to change the constitution of the Legislative Council, and on this act he bases his whole argument. If I convince him that that act does not cover his argument, will he then concede the point? That act, to which my hon. friend refers, was passed for a specific purpose, to enable Parliament to reconstruct this House. It had answered its purpose when the constitution of this House was changed, but it cannot properly be invoked as giving authority with reference to bringing in other provinces to form a new Confederacy.

HON. MR. CHRISTIE—But my hon. friend will observe, that we are not legislat-

ing now—that we are merely passing an Address.

HON. MR. SANBORN—We must feel that, according to the rules of law, we are asked here to go beyond the duties which our electors sent us into this House to discharge. I contend that neither any act on our own Statute Book, nor any Imperial Act, authorizes us to assume that they elected us to come here to demolish the whole fabric of our Constitution, and to seek to form another and entirely different political system, embracing a number of other provinces, so that our identity is entirely swamped and lost. I must say that, if my hon. friend feels bound at all by the trust committed to him by those who sent him here as a representative of the people, I conceive he is necessarily bound to this, that he must sustain the elective principle with regard to the constitution of the proposed Legislative Council. It is impossible, I think, to arrive at any other conclusion. (Hear, hear.) My hon. friend made use of one expression, with apparently some degree of reluctance—the term “buncombe.” I think that was suggestive, and very suggestive. For, if those who are favoring this principle favor it for what my hon. friend characterizes as “buncombe,” then they are seeking popularity with the people—they are seeking what the people want—(hear, hear)—and that argument certainly does not avail my hon. friend in his present position; for he maintains that the people fully understand this thing, and want it. If this be the case—if the whole Province of Canada is bent upon having this scheme—then those who are trying to resist it are standing alone, and are either acting patriotically, or are beside themselves. They cannot certainly be acting from any desire to obtain popularity, because, according to my hon. friend, they are just doing what the people do not want them to do. (Hear, hear.) I know that the position of my hon. friend is somewhat embarrassing. He resides in a section of the province where he feels there is a difficulty that needs to be removed in some way or other; and he is now endeavoring to show that the best means of removing that difficulty is to embrace a great many other difficulties of a huge character, and of which we cannot fully comprehend the consequences. When an hon. gentleman is prepared to take that ground, I think it would be better for him to take it in silence, than to attempt to sustain it by reason. As regards Lower Canada,

we are not situated in the same way. There is the French party, and there is the English party in Lower Canada, who are situated very differently from the people of Upper Canada; and the people of Upper Canada have a disposition not to recognize their peculiar circumstances, or to have any concern for them at all. If my hon. friend will pardon me, I would say that his whole philosophy is in favor of Upper Canada. In speaking of the public opinion of this province, it was always Upper Canada—he had no idea of Lower Canada as having any existence or any rights.

HON. MR. CHRISTIE—My hon. friend is quite mistaken. I quoted as lengthily from the manifesto of the Lower Canada Opposition, as from that of the Upper Canada Opposition.

HON. MR. SANBORN—I am now speaking of the English of Lower Canada; and, as regards the people giving a distinct assent to this proposition, my hon. friend will admit that the English of Lower Canada have not given such an assent.

HON. MR. CHRISTIE—I stated that I could speak with more confidence as to the public opinion of the section of country to which I belonged, than with regard to Lower Canada.

HON. MR. SANBORN—The resolutions to which Hon. Mr. DORION was a party, and which were read by my hon. friend, I conceive to embody, not what Mr. DORION's party, or any one political party rather than another desired. I take it for granted that British subjects of French Canadian origin generally have their feelings in that direction—that is, they desire large power for the local government—in fact they would desire the local governments to be the real governments, and that the Federation should be very much nominal, for very minor purposes, and with very weak powers in the Central Government; while, on the other hand, the English population of Lower Canada would take the opposite view, and desire larger powers in the Central Government, and smaller powers in the Local Government. This, I think, was the view to which the resolutions read by my hon. friend had reference. Now, as regards the Reform party of Upper Canada, let us see what they had reference to—whether it was anything like the Constitution which is now proposed. I hold in my hand a pamphlet—the Address of the Reform Constitutional Association to

the people of Upper Canada in 1859—and I find here what they conceive to be the true remedy thus stated:—

“The true remedy!” What then is the remedy best adapted to deliver the province from the disastrous position it now occupies? We answer—dissolve the existing legislative union. Divide Canada into two or more provinces with local executives and legislatures having entire control over every public interest except those, and those only, that are necessarily common to all parts of the province. Let no public debt be incurred by the legislatures, until the sanction has been obtained by direct vote. Establish some central authority over all, with power to administer such matters, and such only as are necessarily common to the whole province. Let the functions of this central authority be clearly laid; let its powers be strictly confined to discharging specified duties. Prohibit it from incurring any new debt, or levying more taxation than is required to meet the interest of existing obligations, discharge its own specified duties, and gradually pay off the national debt. Secure these rights by a written constitution, ratified by the people, and incapable of alteration except by their formal sanction.

This was the programme laid down by the Upper Canada Reform Convention of 1859.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Who is the author of that address?

HON. MR. SANBORN—Various parties had a hand in it. I find the name of Hon. Mr. McDougall, the present Provincial Secretary, attached to it. And I suppose my hon. friend from Erie Division (Hon. Mr. CHRISTIE) was one of them.

HON. MR. CURRIE—They proposed that the Constitution should be submitted to the people?

HON. MR. SANBORN—Yes; it was to be ratified by a direct vote of the people. And the beauty of the thing was, that the Central Parliament was to be bound not to increase the debt of the provinces, but gradually to pay it off. (Hear, hear.) I apprehend the Reform party of Upper Canada at that time was wiser than the same party in these days.

HON. MR. CHRISTIE—That is a question.

HON. MR. SANBORN—If my honorable friend would take that platform, or something like it, I should be happy to give it my best consideration at once; and I should be very glad if they would only give us a small part of it, of which I think they must see the justice—namely, written guarantees, so as to assure us that our rights of property shall not be overturned by the Local Parliament;

to prevent, for example, a Squatter's bill—(laughter)—being passed at the very first opportunity in the Local Parliament, demolishing all the rights of property. I see my hon. friend opposite (Hon. Mr. CRAWFORD) look melancholy, because he foresees that, when the new Constitution is adopted, twelve months will not pass before that becomes law in Lower Canada, and all protection for proprietors, so far as that is concerned, brought to an end. But this is only one instance, significant of what will take place. It is perfectly well known, and none can realize it better than those who have a much greater horror of the progress of popular sentiments than I have, that the tendency in the popular mind is to break down monopolies of every kind, and to go to extremes in dealing with vested rights, even those which are established and founded on substantial principles of justice. Now, these rights, at the very least, ought certainly to be confided to the highest legislative authority. I go further and maintain that guarantees for those rights ought to be placed in the written Constitution, that they ought to be beyond the power of interference by the legislative authority, and that they should be guarded by the judicial decisions of the highest courts in the country. In that case there would be a protection for property, but in this Constitution there is no such protection for property either in Upper or Lower Canada. And here is the point to which I ask the attention of my honorable friends of all parties—a point which I think all of them have been too little concerned about, and which applies just as well to Upper as to Lower Canada. For I say that, if some security is not given to the people in one of those ways for maintaining vested rights and interests of this character, the most disastrous results will arise in every Local Parliament; because, when these parliaments are constructed, they will necessarily consist of a different class of men from those who now compose the legislatures of the various provinces. There will be such inducements to men of the highest order to get elected to the Central Parliament, that the consequence will necessarily and naturally be the result to which I point. (Hear, hear.) I should like to refer to one argument which was used by my hon. friend from Saugeen (Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON)—who is not now in his place—that the appointment of members of the Legislative Council in

the proposed Federal Parliament is not in fact an abandonment of the elective principle, because the appointments are to be by the Ministry of the day, who must have the confidence of the people. That is certainly a most extraordinary argument. If it held good at all, it should apply equally to both Houses, and the Legislative Assembly should be appointed by the Ministry, because the Ministry have been selected by those who have been elected by the people. This is the clear, logical deduction from my hon. friend's argument, if it is good for anything—because, if appointment by the Ministry is not an abandonment of the elective principle, you would still have an elective Legislative Assembly, although its members were appointed by the Government (Hear, hear.) But this was also well answered on a former occasion by my hon. friend behind me (Hon. Mr. AIKINS.) It is not simply the first appointment that we oppose. It is the appointments afterwards, as the first members die out or resign, and their successors are appointed on the nomination of the future local governments. Instead of this producing a favorable result, it appears to me it will have just the opposite effect. The reason is plain. If, in the very first instance, the prerogative is exercised, not by the Sovereign or the Sovereign's representative, unbiassed, but is exercised by a party government, you have a House constituted at its very first meeting of a party character. In the other branch that particular Government has a majority. But it is possible, that that party may not long retain power. In the nature of things it is not probable that they will. No party does. But the Upper House remains permanent, and you provide by your very first operation for that dead-lock—that conflict between the Upper and the Lower House, which has been spoken of. (Hear, hear.)

On motion of Hon. Mr. MOORE, the debate was adjourned till to-morrow.

—o—
THURSDAY, February 16, 1865.

HON. MR. MOORE said—Honorable gentlemen, it is with a great degree of diffidence that I rise to address this House, after the very able speeches that have been made on both sides of this question, but I shall endeavor, honorable gentlemen, as briefly as

possible—for I do not feel able to address you at any length—to speak in that moderate tone in which I conceive the question before us ought to be dealt with. In the discussion of so important a question as the change of the Constitution of the country, the laying aside of the old Constitution and the adoption of a new and very different one, we all ought to endeavor to find common ground of agreement. It is important that no party, or at least no sectional interest among political parties, should betray itself in the discussion of so important a subject. I shall now endeavor to take a brief view of the scheme, as it is presented, and endeavor to give an exposition of the views which I entertain with regard to this matter. (Hear, hear.) It appears to me, in the first place, that the origin of this scheme was not what it ought to have been. It did not emanate from the people, but from the fact that certain political difficulties existed in Canada, in consequence of the political parties being so equally divided that it was found impracticable to get on with the government of this province. The scheme emanated from the Government of this country in consequence of those political difficulties, and had not its origin with any movement among the masses of the people. It is very well known that at the last general election, in 1863, this was not among the questions that were brought before the country. It was not one of those questions that the people were called upon to decide in returning members to represent them in the Legislature. It is very true that the scheme of a Federal union of all the provinces has been spoken of for a quarter of a century by eminent men of all shades of politics. We may refer to the convention that was held at Kingston, at which the British American League was formed. That convention was convened by the Conservative party of Upper Canada. Subsequently, the great meeting—if I may use that expression—that was convened in the city of Toronto, referred to the same question. But I go back and appeal to the fact that at the last general election, it was not one of those questions that were referred to the arbitrament of the people to decide by their votes as to the desirability of union. I think every honorable gentleman will agree with me that this was the fact. Now, honorable gentlemen, I desire to speak in a temperate tone and manner in regard to this scheme. I believe the gentlemen that now constitute the Government of Canada, as well as the gentlemen who constitute the dif-

ferent governments of the Lower Provinces, are all able men, and I believe they are all honest and practical men, and it was by and through the instrumentality of honorable gentlemen constituting the Government of Canada in connection with the governments of the Maritime Provinces that this scheme, if it had not its origin, at least was by them put before the people of this country in the shape in which it now presents itself in these resolutions. I therefore observe that this is a measure emanating from the minds of the foremost men in Canada, and probably the foremost men on the continent of America. Still, it is not a measure that has emanated from the people, and I would ask you all, honorable gentlemen, in reference to the change of a country's Constitution, if history does not bear me out in asserting that all such changes are preceded by a rising of the people in favor of the change. The people, feeling oppressed by the existing state of things, rise in their majesty and put an end to its continuance, and demand a new Constitution. But in regard to a change effected in the manner in which this is proposed, by the united wisdom of the several governments, without any convulsion, I hold that under those circumstances the people of the whole country to be affected by the change ought to have an opportunity of considering the great change. It is not sufficient in my mind that a few of the leading spirits of the land should be able to control and bring about so great a change without the initiatory steps being taken on the part of the people. Now, honorable gentlemen, I would refer to the representation in the first conference—the conference in which the initiatory steps were taken—at Charlottetown. All honorable gentlemen are aware that the governments of the several Maritime Provinces had decreed by resolutions passed during former sessions of their several parliaments, that they were to send delegates to meet at Charlottetown, for the purpose of uniting their several governments under one government; in other words, to consolidate their governments into what would be termed a legislative union. We could all understand from the position of those several local governments that it was a matter of very great importance that they should unite their governments under one to obviate the necessity of having different rates of duty; and in fact their interests were so blended that we can understand that union was of very great importance to them. The Government of Canada met the delegates at Charlottetown, and

by the representations that were made to the representatives of the Lower Provinces, they abandoned their project of meeting together for the purpose of consolidating their governments, and took up the larger question of a Federal union of all the provinces. I believe, honorable gentlemen, that if the inducements held out to the delegates convened at Charlottetown to abandon their first scheme were fully known, it would be found that chief among them was the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. It strikes me very forcibly from all that I heard in the Lower Provinces during a recent tour, that if there was one thing more than another to which the people gave prominence, it was the Intercolonial Railway. Now, with reference to this subject, the plan previously adopted was, that Canada was to furnish five-twelfths of the money, and the Maritime Provinces seven-twelfths. It appears by the resolutions laid on the table of this House, that if the Confederation scheme is carried out, the Intercolonial Railway is to be built. I admit it is a matter of necessity that it should be built in that case. There is no doubt about it. We cannot have union without it. But the fact does exist, that instead of Canada contributing five-twelfths of the cost of construction, it will be called upon to contribute about ten-twelfths. (Hear, hear.) I merely mention the fact to show that it appears to me that some strong inducement must have been held out to the delegates from the Lower Provinces to enter into this great scheme, when we find, as it is very well known, that the Intercolonial Railway has been one of those objects that has been first and foremost in the minds of the people of almost all the Lower Provinces. It would open up for them a vast section of new country, and the benefits to be derived would certainly be paramount to them above anything Canada could derive from its construction. It is therefore evident to my mind that this inducement has been held out in order to induce those provinces to come into the proposed union. Again, with regard to representation in the Conference—I refer now to the Conference at Quebec—there were twenty-one honorable gentlemen constituting the delegation from the Lower Provinces. Am I correct?

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—I believe that is correct.

HON. MR. MOORE—There were twelve delegates from the Province of Canada. We were told by my honorable friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands that they did not vote

by numbers but by provinces. Well, in voting by provinces, I think there was nothing to be gained, so far as the advocacy of certain measures in the interests of the Province of Canada was concerned in this Convention. For if they voted by provinces, the little Island of Prince Edward, and Newfoundland, would equal the votes of the Province of Canada. Now, honorable gentlemen, when we consider the position of Canada, our resources, and the amount that this province will bring into the common treasury, it does appear to me that Canada was not equitably represented in the Convention. I would not for one moment attribute to the delegates from Canada neglect of their duty in any particular, but when there became a necessity that certain arrangements were to be made with the Lower Provinces, then I can understand that if they were more favorable to the Lower Provinces than to Canada, the vote would preponderate in favor of the former. There is another point, honorable gentlemen, to which I would like to draw your attention, namely, the increase of the expense of government under the new arrangement. It does appear to me, that if the scheme is adopted, it will necessarily increase the burdens of the people, and, I believe that we will be obliged to resort to direct taxation to sustain the local governments. It appears to me impossible to have so many local governments, and, also, a General Government, without greatly adding to the expense. There is yet another point on which I feel more deeply than on any of the preceding. It places Lower Canada in a false position. The Anglo-Saxon race of Lower Canada is nearly one-fourth of the population, and in the Local Government they will be completely under the control of the people of French origin; not that I believe but that the latter would endeavor to give all their just due, but still it does appear to me that it places the people of Anglo-Saxon origin in a false position. Then the French population in the Federal Government is placed in a false position, for there they will be in a very small minority—in the same position, relatively, as the Anglo-Saxon race in the Local Government. The honorable gentleman who addressed the House so very ably and eloquently last evening—the honorable member for Erie—said he preferred taking the scheme as it was rather than risk any alteration. It has also been said by honorable gentlemen of the Government, that they could not permit any alteration, or suggestion of amendment, to be made in the resolutions now before the House.

But it does appear to me, honorable gentlemen, that inasmuch as there are five different legislatures to take those resolutions into consideration, if any one branch of either of those legislatures should be able to suggest any improvements, and the resolutions should be changed before their adoption by that branch, such a step would not defeat the whole scheme. It would be only offering so many suggestions on the part of the representatives of the people. Of course any alterations suggested in this manner, would go before the Imperial Parliament as a basis upon which to construct an Act of Union. It would afford the Imperial Parliament an opportunity of knowing the people's sentiments, and would not in any way really interfere with the proposed union being carried out. Therefore I think that any amendment that may be made in this branch of the Legislature, or in the other branch, or in either of the branches of the legislatures of the Maritime Provinces, would only go before the Imperial Parliament as so many suggestions that might very properly be considered by the Imperial authorities in dealing with so very important a subject. Now, admitting, as I do admit, that the gentlemen who constituted the delegation from Canada in the Convention, were the first men of our land—I believe men of patriotism, and who desired to do only that which was for the best interests of the country—still they are not infallible. They may have made mistakes, and may have omitted some things that, even if they were again to go into conference after six months had elapsed, might be placed in the resolutions that would very much improve them. My honorable friend from Peel has stated that although he approved of most of the resolutions, he desired to see amendments made, but inasmuch as he saw their introduction by this House would be fatal to the whole measure, he would take the whole as it stood. I disagree with that honorable gentleman, and with the position taken by the honorable gentlemen representing the Government in this House. I think it is a mistake, and it is insulting to both the House and the country to suppose that, because a certain number of men met together and deliberated for fifteen or eighteen days, there should be no improvement made upon the result of their deliberations. Now, honorable gentlemen, I am one of those who, if I can be convinced that a Federal union is going to promote the stability or welfare of Canada, will go with it most heartily, but I

do think it becomes necessary not to make out altogether an *ex parte* case, because I think the resolutions that were passed by the delegates, though sent out to the country, ought to be accompanied by the other side of the question, which has not been fairly heard. There is still another matter to which I wish to refer, and in doing so I might remark that I am aware that this is looking at the darkest side of the picture. I think that the engrafting of this system of government upon the British Constitution has a tendency to at least introduce the republican system. It is republican so far as it goes, and that is another reason why I do not approve of it. If we commence to adopt the republican system, we shall perhaps get the idea of continuing the system until we go too far. It is also said that we are to have a new nationality. I do not understand that term, honorable gentlemen. If we were going to have an independent sovereignty in this country, then I could understand it. I believe honorable gentlemen will agree with me, that after this scheme is fully carried into operation, we shall still be colonies.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—Of course.

HON. MR. MOORE—Now, that being the case, I think our Local Government will be placed in a lower position than in the Government we have now. Every measure resolved upon in the Local Government will be subject to the veto of the Federal Government—that is, any measure or bill passing the Local Legislature may be disallowed within one year by the Federal Government.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—That is the case at present as between Canada and the Imperial Government.

HON. MR. MOORE—I beg to differ slightly with the honorable gentleman. Any measure passed by this province may be disallowed within two years thereafter by the Imperial Government. But the local governments, under Confederation, are to be subjected to having their measures vetoed within one year by the Federal Government, and then the Imperial Government has the privilege of vetoing anything the Federal Government may do, within two years. The veto power thus placed in the hands of the Federal Government, if exercised frequently, would be almost certain to cause difficulty between the local and general governments. I observe that my honorable friend, Sir ETIENNE P. TACHÉ, does not approve that remark.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—You understand me correctly.

HON. MR. MOORE—It will be conceded that the question of the veto power was very ably discussed, at one time, in the United States Congress, and that discussion led to a qualification of the veto power in the Constitution of the United States, so that now any bill passed by both Houses may be vetoed by the President within ten days thereafter, by assigning reasons for doing so. Both Houses may then, however, again take up the measure, and if they pass it by a two-third vote, it becomes the law of the land, independent of the President's will. Now, I would have the veto power applied in a similar way in our new Constitution. Exercising it in an arbitrary manner, as the Federal power is privileged to do, it must, from the very nature of things, create dissatisfaction and difficulty between the two governments. Again, honorable gentlemen, it is said that by this union we are to strengthen our defensive capacity. I really cannot see the force of this argument, unless it were possible that in uniting with the Lower Provinces their population was to be brought nearer to us. If nature were to make the necessary effort and move their territory up alongside of us, and thus make a compact mass of people, I would at once agree that it would strengthen us in a military point of view. But the fact is, the union will give an extension of territory far greater in proportion to the numbers of the population than now exists in Canada. From that circumstance, I argue that it will weaken instead of strengthen us. (Hear, hear.) Unfortunately, if a war should take place between the United States and Great Britain, the Lower Provinces have a thousand miles of sea coast open to attack, and I apprehend they would be very jealous about having their militiamen sent to Canada for our defence from border incursions. And it would be very natural for them to desire that all their own force should be kept at home for their protection; and the same with regard to Canada. If a considerable portion of the militia of Canada were ordered to proceed to the Lower Provinces, it would most certainly weaken and cause great dissatisfaction in Canada. But, setting that aside, does it increase our numbers and our means of defence? Have we not the same territory exposed? We shall have no additional men by the union for the defence of Canada. Perhaps, after the union takes place, emigration will flow into the country, but I do not know that there would be any very great inducement, after a union, above the inducements that now exist. It appears to me that that question and fact

would remain in very much the same state as at present. Honorable gentlemen, in conclusion, I would say that I have thus endeavored to point out some of the objections to the scheme as presented that have occurred to me. We have all a common interest in this matter. (Hear, hear.) I think that no political or party feeling should have any bearing upon its consideration, and if, after a free and full discussion of its merits and demerits, and the people and the members of Parliament come to fully understand the question, it is found that it is going to be an advantage to the country, I will certainly give it my cheerful support. But I do wish to have some things respecting it made more clear to my comprehension than they are at present, and it is for these reasons that I have taken up the time of the House in making these few remarks. (Cheers.)

HON. MR. McMASTER said—The resolutions before the House have been so ably discussed in nearly all their different bearings, that it appears to me that but little can be advanced on either side in addition to what has been already said. I shall therefore only occupy the time of the House for a very few moments in explaining my reasons for the vote I intend to give on the amendment of the honorable member for Wellington. When the Confederation of the provinces was first proposed, I, although favorable to the principle of the scheme, entertained grave doubts as to whether, if carried, it would be of any real benefit to that section of the country in which I am more immediately interested. Much, however, depended upon the details, and after giving them a good deal of consideration, I have been unable to come to the conclusion that the scheme, as a whole, will be a remedy for all the evils complained of by the people of Upper Canada. (Hear, hear.) The appropriations to be made annually to the local legislatures out of the general revenue I regard as being most objectionable. (Hear, hear.) This, I believe will go far to neutralize some of the advantages which would have resulted from the scheme had the governments of the different provinces been obliged to provide for all expenditure of a strictly local character. The building of the Intercolonial Railway must also be regarded as a very questionable part of the project; indeed to my mind it is the most objectionable of the whole. (Hear, hear.) We are told by honorable gentlemen that the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty renders this road an indispensable necessity in order to

secure an independent outlet to the sea-board; but, if this view of the case be correct, why do not our merchants and millers forward their produce during the winter months to New York, Boston or Portland, by our or any of the other different railway lines which have long been open to these points? The reason is obvious. The freight by railway is so expensive that they find it to be for their advantage to pay interest, storage and insurance on their wheat and flour until the opening of the navigation. And if they do not now avail themselves of the shipping ports referred to, neither of which are more than six hundred miles from Toronto, will they send their produce double that distance over the Intercolonial road to Halifax? Most assuredly not. (Hear, hear.) If the Reciprocity Treaty even should be abrogated, the great bulk of our produce in the west will then, as now, continue to be stored at the different places of shipment along our canals and lakes until the opening of navigation, so that whatever may be said in favor of the Intercolonial road in a military point of view, or however it may be urged as a necessity in order to furnish easy and convenient intercourse between the provinces in the event of their being united, I hold that as a commercial speculation it will prove an entire failure, which must necessarily add greatly to our already large unproductive investments. (Hear.) And how the honorable gentleman from Toronto (Hon. Mr. Ross) could say as he did the other day, that Upper Canada alone had better build the Intercolonial Railway than be without it, is what I cannot comprehend.

HON. MR. ROSS—I say so again.

HON. MR. McMASTER—Well, if the honorable gentleman would resign his seat and present himself to any constituency west of Kingston, giving the views he has enunciated about this railroad a prominent place in his address to the electors, I fear this House would be deprived of his valuable services. (Laughter.) The change proposed in the constitution of the Legislative Council, by which the nominative is to be substituted for the elective system, I cannot but regard as a retrograde movement; and were the resolutions providing change, and authorizing the building of the Intercolonial Railway, and the annual subsidy to the different local legislatures, submitted separately, and under ordinary circumstances, I should, if standing alone in the House, feel it to be my duty to record my vote against them; but when viewed as part

of a general scheme, embracing other provisions, which may have an important bearing upon the future interests, the peace and prosperity of the province, I feel bound to consider the resolutions in that spirit of compromise which is absolutely necessary in framing any measure or constitution that will be at all likely to remedy our sectional difficulties. (Hear, hear.) I need hardly remind honorable gentlemen that nothing could be more unsatisfactory than the state of our public affairs for a long time past. The Legislature has been called together year after year, and the usual sessional expenditure incurred—which is always very large—but the sectional majorities arrayed against each other in the other Chamber, rendered useful legislation almost, if not altogether, impossible. Whatever government was in power lived, as it were, by the day, and being engaged in a constant struggle for existence, the very natural desire to obtain increased strength frequently led to the distribution of patronage and the expenditure of public money in a way that could not be justified. All admit we cannot go along as we have been doing, and that some change is necessary; and in the absence of anything better being submitted, I feel inclined to give the scheme proposed a trial, believing that there are reasonable grounds to hope that the Constitution which is to be based on the resolutions before the House will, at least to some extent, remedy those sectional difficulties which have operated so much to the prejudice of the country. (Hear, hear.) It will secure to the people of Upper Canada the entire control of their local affairs, which I regard as being of the utmost importance. It will put an end to the system of duplicating in one section of the province large amounts of money granted to the other for colonization roads and other local objects, on which vast sums have been squandered. It will secure to the people of Upper Canada representation by population in that branch of the Federal Legislature which controls the purse-strings. It will also give to them all the unsold Crown lands in the western section of the province. And I trust the promises made with reference to the widening and deepening of our canals, and the opening up of the North-West Territory will be carried out in good faith. (Hear, hear.) Indeed no Government can afford to treat with entire neglect works of so much importance to Upper Canada, and at the same time incur the large expenditure required for the Intercolonial Railroad. (Hear, hear.) When I look at these advantages, and think of the critical

position in which the province is now placed, and the serious consequences that might possibly follow, should the Confederation scheme be rejected, I shrink from the responsibility of becoming a party to any amendment which may have the effect of defeating the measure. (Hear, hear.) Holding these views, and looking upon the resolutions of the Quebec Conference in the light of a treaty entered into by five provinces, which must be either approved as a whole or rejected, I feel that in giving them my support, I am, all things considered, acting in the interest of the province generally, and doing what is best for my constituents. (Cheers.)

HON. MR. SIMPSON said—I think it was said by a wise man that there is nothing new under the sun. But had SOLOMON the scheme now before the House presented to him, he would probably have changed his opinion. Possibly nothing new can be said on the subject of representation by population, or even on the scheme now before the House; but representing, as I do, one of the largest and wealthiest constituencies in Upper Canada, I think it necessary for me to give my reasons for the position I have felt it my duty to take in reference thereto. It has been stated that the elections which have lately taken place have gone in favor of the Government; but, even if such were the case, how could it possibly be otherwise, seeing that men of all shades of politics have united in forming a happy family. We have seen those who have been for almost a lifetime antagonistic to each other opening their arms, as was so well and eloquently depicted the other evening by the honorable member from Montreal (Hon. Mr. FERRIER), and embracing each other; and we have been led to imagine that the millennium, so long predicted and anxiously looked for, has, so far as Canada is concerned at all events, at length arrived. (Laughter.) We are to have no more discord and no more strife, but are henceforth to live in harmony the one with the other. It has been asserted that in regard to myself I owe my return without opposition to the fact that I avowed myself in favor of the Confederation of the provinces on the basis submitted. This is not correct. I held no meetings—I made no speeches—and in no instance was I asked what were my views in regard to the scheme; and, if honorable gentlemen will permit me, I will read a portion of my short address to the electors. It is as follows:—

You will reasonably expect me to give my views on the important constitutional changes that are now contemplated. No one at all acquainted with the effects produced upon our legislation and on the general prosperity of the country, by the unhappy sectional difficulties existing between Upper and Lower Canada, but must have felt that some remedy should be found for those evils. Whether the very able gentlemen who have so strangely united to solve and remove these difficulties will be able to accomplish their praiseworthy task, time alone can tell. We need the details before being able to pronounce an opinion; but heartily (and I hope in common with every well-wisher of their country) I most earnestly pray that they may succeed.

It will be seen that here I simply state that the gentlemen who had so strangely come together would be entitled to the thanks of the country if they were able to agree upon a scheme which would solve the admitted difficulties between Upper and Lower Canada. But as I have read from my address, so I still maintain that, before we can be expected to express an intelligent opinion, we ought not simply to have half a scheme, but the details of the scheme in its entirety. If we refer to the election in North Ontario, where the Honorable Provincial Secretary had been the representative, and who returned for re-election after accepting office in the present Government, we find that he was defeated by a gentleman (Mr. M. C. CAMERON) who is known to be an opponent to the project. And if we take the more recent election which occurred in South Ontario, we find the contest between two gentlemen, both personal friends of my own, and both of whom were favorable to the principle, but who pledged themselves that before it became an accomplished fact, it should, so far as their vote would extend, be submitted for the approval of the people. And I would be greatly deceived if the gentleman who has now the honor to represent that riding in the other branch of the Legislature (Mr. GIBBS) shall be found supporting the scheme unless that course be first taken. We need the details before it is possible that we can pronounce upon the scheme and consider it on its merits.

HON. MR. ROSS—You have the details.

HON. MR. SIMPSON—The details are unfortunately the very things that are wanting—they are the marrow of the whole affair. (Hear, hear.) When the agitation for representation by population was first started in Upper Canada, I stated that I had no confidence in it as a cure for the evils

we complained of, and I then, and have ever since, felt that it would be better for the two provinces to separate than to create sectional jealousies and strife by the demand for an increased representation, and the religious cries associated with it. For my part, I have never, like some honorable gentlemen of this House, attended and presided over that kind of political organizations known as conventions, not believing these to be the proper means of redressing the grievances under which the country labored. The effect of those conventions was to add fuel to the agitation which was already sundering the country. That such should be the result I deeply regret, inasmuch as some of the dearest friends I have in the world are not only Lower Canadians, but adherents of a different faith. The fruit of this sectional hostility and discord we now see in the demand which has sprung up for Federation with all its concomitant burdens. I can lay no blame to my conscience for having assisted to bring about so unnatural a state of things, and whatever may be the consequences of the new condition of political existence towards which we are apparently drifting, my skirts, I rejoice to say, are clear, for I have had no hand or part in it. We are told that if this scheme is carried out, Upper Canada will be entitled to the great advantage of having in the House of Commons of the Federal Government 17 additional members. But what real advantage is this to be to the country? Do we desire 17 additional members for the purpose of crushing Lower Canada—is that what is meant? I answer, no. But even supposing we have 17 additional members—supposing representation by population is conceded in the new order of things—what will be the gain to Upper Canada? Will these 17 new members cure the evils of which we complain? Will they be able to reduce the excessive expenditures under which we are now laboring, and which have been one of the causes of the agitation for constitutional changes? I do not believe a word of it. Supposing Upper Canada has a larger representation by that number than Lower Canada, you must remember that Lower Canada, with the eastern provinces, is entitled to 112 members; so that Upper Canada would still be in a large minority of the whole House. My honorable friend the member for Niagara (Hon. Mr. CURRIE) has brought before the House a number of valu-

able statistics bearing on this question, and I must say I deeply regret that the members of the Government sitting in this Chamber have not attempted to refute them. If these figures were wrong, they were easily susceptible of being so proved, especially by so able a gentleman as the Honorable Commissioner of Crown Lands. But he has not attempted the task, inasmuch as he knows it would be a hopeless one. I hold in my hands a statement furnished by the Auditor General to the Minister of Finance, from which it appears that our debt amounts to \$75,578,000, and deducting sinking fund and bankers' balances, \$7,132,000, leaves a balance of \$68,446,000 as the actual debt of Canada, to be borne by the people of this province under any scheme that can be concocted. If we assume that the cost of the International Railway will be \$20,000,000—and from the experience afforded by the Grand Trunk there is too much reason to fear it will be double that amount—the proportion which Upper Canada would have to bear would be \$15,000,000, and this added to the already existing debt, would make our direct debt \$83,446,000. This increase in our debt will be one of the fruits of Confederation. But it may be said that the road will yield a revenue, though every member of the House who knows anything of railway statistics, and the character of the country to be traversed by the Intercolonial Railway, must know that this is impossible. My honorable friend from Toronto (Hon. Mr. ROSS) when he issued his flaming prospectus to the capitalists of England fondly hoped that the Grand Trunk would pay 11½ per cent. on the investment. But we know how these expectations have been disappointed by the actual result, and so far from there being grounds to hope that the Intercolonial Railway will occupy a better position, there is too much reason to fear that it will be still worse. Why, the cost of its maintenance could hardly be less than \$500,000 per annum beyond all its receipts. How then could such a work be considered to be of benefit to the country?

HON. MR. ROSS—In the same way as the canals—by cheapening the cost of transportation.

HON. MR. SIMPSON—This is impossible. It costs two cents per ton per mile to move freight by rail, and as the distance from Toronto to Halifax is 1168 miles, it would cost \$2.23 per barrel to move flour from Toronto

to that port; while a barrel of flour can now be sent *via* the St. Lawrence at 50 cents or under, and *via* New York at 53 cents. Taking another view of the scheme, in its financial aspect, we find that Canada now contributes, in all forms, to the support of the General Government, over \$10,000,000 per annum. No one will say that we shall be called upon to contribute less under Confederation. And if we add to this sum the interest, at five per cent., on the additional debt of \$15,000,000 created by the proposed railway and the expense of two local governments, assuming them to cost \$1,000,000 each, which is below the mark, with \$1,000,000 to be expended annually on the militia, as well as our share of maintaining and running the railway, we will find that the people of the two Canadas will be called upon to contribute \$14,200,000 annually, instead of the \$10,000,000, as at present. And I would ask honorable gentlemen if the country is in a position to bear this additional burden? (Hear, hear.) Really, looking at the question of expense, I am not sure whether I would not be in favor of returning to the primitive system of administering the affairs of the country—in preference to having this scheme—by a Governor in Council. (Laughter.) For there is no question that our annual expenditure will be, under Confederation, at least many millions more than at present, with the cost added thereto of maintaining and running the Intercolonial Railway—a work which can never pay.

HON. MR. FERRIER—It was predicted when it was proposed to build the Rivière du Loup section of the Grand Trunk that it would never pay, but the fact is that for the last two years it has not only paid expenses, but has given a profit.

HON. MR. SIMPSON—I should not contradict the honorable gentleman, because he knows more about Grand Trunk matters than I do, or most other people; but my late respected friend, Mr. FREEER, who was the lessee of that section during two or three years, told me that, while receiving a subsidy of \$18,000 per annum for running it, with the free use of four engines, and with a suitable equipment of rolling stock, it would have ruined him had he continued to work the line even on those apparently favorable terms.

HON. MR. FERRIER—It is perhaps useless for me to say anything more, as the honorable gentleman will not believe what I say,

—(Hon. Mr. SIMPSON—Hear, hear)—but all I can state is, that a premium was offered for the lease of the line, but the company determined to take possession of it.

HON. MR. SIMPSON—But the real question is, what was the cost of original construction, the interest on that amount, and the cost of maintenance? Take these charges into account, and it would require a pretty large rental to cover them, much larger, I think, than any responsible person would offer for a lease of the line. As to the Intercolonial Railway, we have no information from the government respecting the route to be followed or the length or cost of the road; but from figures I have been able to obtain, the following may be taken to be nearly correct:—

	Miles built.	To be built.
From Halifax to Truro	65	..
.. Truro to Shediac	90
.. Shediac to St. John	108	..
.. St. John to St. Andrews (under contract)	75
.. St. Andrews to Woodstock ..	50	..
.. Woodstock to Rivière du Loup	160
	223	325

The total length of road from Rivière du Loup is 548 miles; add from Rivière du Loup to Quebec, 120 miles; Quebec to Montreal, 170 miles; Montreal to Toronto, about 330 miles; so that we have a total of 1,168 miles over which it is gravely proposed to send flour and other heavy produce during the winter months. (Hear, hear.) As has been already stated, before a barrel of flour could reach Halifax from Toronto, it would be nearly eaten up in expenses. [An honorable member—There would be nothing left but the hoops. (Laughter).] It has been urged that under Confederation an active trade would spring up between Canada and the Maritime Provinces. A trade in what? What have we to send them excepting flour and the coarser grains? The former, as has been shown, cannot be sent, and the latter they do not require. The principal articles of export from the Lower Provinces are fish, timber and ships. We can take a moderate quantity of fish; but our forests supply us with an abundance of timber, and the ship yards of Quebec turn out some of the finest sailing ships in the world. The true markets for the principal staples of export for these provinces are New York and Boston. Small vessels from

thirty to fifty tons, laden with fish, run from the Maritime Provinces to these ports, where they dispose of their cargoes and purchase with the proceeds, corn meal, flour, pork, molasses and other necessities. But it has been left for our Canadian statesmen to propose new political alliances in order to divert trade and commerce from their natural channels. It is yet further said in favor of Confederation that it will increase our power of defence. In the ordinary acceptance of the term, union undoubtedly is strength; but there are cases in which union, instead of being a source of strength, is in reality an element of weakness. If we could attach the territory possessed by the moon to these provinces, and obtain the assistance for our joint defence of the man who is popularly supposed to inhabit that luminary, we might derive strength from the Confederation. (Laughter.) But although John Bull is accused of doing many foolish things, I am persuaded that the Mother Country is far too wise to entrust the lives of her valuable soldiers when sent to our defence—as in case of need I feel well assured they would be—in passing over a road so liable to attack and so easy of destruction by our neighbors on the other side, should we unfortunately ever become involved with them in war, which I sincerely pray may never occur. (Hear, hear.) In conclusion I have simply to say that I cannot possibly vote for the scheme before the House, and thereby deprive the wealthy and intelligent freemen, who have twice elected me unanimously, of a Constitution obtained by long years of struggle, without knowing what we have to offer them in its stead. (Cheers.)

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—Before the question is put, I have a few remarks to make on the general question, and particularly on the motion of amendment which is now before the House. I have copious notes which I will not refer to now, but which I will make use of at another stage of the debate. Questions have been put to me by several members, which I will answer in due season; and explanations have been asked, which I hope also to be able to give. But, at present, my object is merely to make a few remarks in reference to the amendment which has been brought forward by my honorable friend from Wellington (Hon. Mr. SANBORN). When the gentlemen who composed the Conference met, they had to lay down a broad basis, as it were,

for the foundation of their superstructure. Well, it so happened that the corner-stone was that which concerned the representation in both Houses. It was agreed on the one hand that in the House of Commons of the Confederate Government representation should be according to numbers, and that in the other branch of the Legislature it should be fixed that this representation should be equal for all the provinces—that is to say, Upper Canada, and Lower Canada, and the Maritime Provinces, grouped into one, should each be allowed to send the same number of representatives, so as to secure to each province its rights, its privileges, and its liberties. We acted upon this principle, because we felt that if the House of Commons' representation was based upon population, equality should be secured in the other branch of the Legislature. My honorable friend from Wellington has gone over almost every detail of the scheme of Federation, and he thought also he would try his hand a little at constitution-making, by improving that part which has particular reference to the Legislative Council. Well, honorable gentlemen, I think the saying is pretty correct that it is easy to find fault, but it is not so easy to do better. (Hear, hear.) The honorable gentleman no doubt thought in his own mind that he was going to improve the scheme of the Conference, but I think he has made it so bad that I believe I can shew in the course of the few observations I have to offer, even if we had the power to make amendments, no member of this House either from Upper or Lower Canada would consent to them for a moment. I have just said the agreement was that there should be equality in the representation in the Legislative Council. But the honorable gentleman has moved that the elective members as they now stand should form the Legislative Council in the Federal Government, and that also the life members should continue for the remainder of their days; and, as a set-off against the life members, he proposes to allow the other provinces a certain number of new members who should have the right to sit in the Legislative Council of the Federal Government. But what does he do? Does he preserve the proportion as laid down at the Convention? Not a bit of it. The proportion agreed upon at the Convention was one-third to the Maritime Provinces; the Lower Provinces grouped together had a right to send one-third of the representatives. The honorable gentleman, however, I suppose out of the fulness of his good dis-

position—I am sure it was not pressed upon him by the delegates from the Maritime Provinces—comes forward and says, “I will give you ten members as a set-off against the twenty-one members who are now members for life in the Canadian Legislative Council.” If I am not wrong in my arithmetic, ten are not a third of twenty-one. If the honorable gentleman had given seven members to the Lower Provinces as a set-off against the life members of this House he would have acted with strict justice, but he is generous enough to give them three more—ten, or nearly one half.

HON. MR. SANBORN—Ten are nearer one-third than the seven you propose.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—I think the honorable gentleman is wrong in his calculation. I say we have 21 members sitting here for life, and if the other provinces are entitled to one-third of that number, it is clear to my mind that they would have a right to no more than seven. (Cries of “no, no,” and “yes, yes.”)

HON. MR. CURRIE—They are entitled to a third of the whole. Do you refer to the elective members?

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—The elective members are a fact accomplished. On the elective principle it is proposed to give a third of the members of the Legislative Council of the Federal Government to the Maritime Provinces. But there are twenty-one life members of this House, and you want to give the Maritime Provinces an equivalent for them.

HON. MR. CURRIE—But not one-half.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—You should only give them seven.

HON. MR. SANBORN—No, ten.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—We will have to get a schoolmaster. (Laughter.) If seven is not a third of twenty-one, I do not know what a third is. (Laughter.) I am not very fluent in speaking the English language, and when I am met right and left, behind and before, with interruptions like this, I assure you I feel it a hard trial, and if honorable gentlemen have remarks to make, I trust they will wait until I have delivered mine. (Hear, hear.) Well, honorable gentlemen, admitting that the third of twenty-one are not seven—(laughter)—I say admitting, for the sake of argument, that ten are the third of twenty-one—(laughter)—I have another objection, and a very serious objection, which I do not think will advance very much the case of the honorable gentleman who has

moved this amendment. Many of us have been appointed for life in this House, and some of us were so appointed many years back. Here, for instance, is my honorable friend on the left (Hon. Mr. HAMILTON) who has been a member of the House some twenty-four years—who was among the first appointed by Lord SYDENHAM; and I see on the other side, honorable gentlemen also far advanced in years—men who, in the ordinary course of life, cannot expect to be very long with us. Will the honorable gentleman propose to give to the provinces below the right to appoint old gentlemen? Not a bit of it. They would send here young men—men who are in the prime of life—and when we shall have gone to our last home, these young men from below will be found sitting in your places and in my place. Where, then, would be the equilibrium? The equilibrium would be lost, and lost for ever. (Hear, hear.) And the honorable gentleman thinks that his amendment would be a great improvement to the scheme of the Conference. Well, for my part, honorable gentlemen, I believe it is a great failure in the way of improving the scheme of the Confederation—a very great failure indeed. The honorable gentleman has had the opportunity of speaking several times in this House, and very often he has made allusion to me since the opening of Parliament. He has endeavored to place me in contradiction to myself. He has stated that, in 1856, I was a member of the Government conducting the affairs of the House, and that I was the party who brought in the measure to extend the elective principle to this honorable House, and he says that I am here again, nine years later, endeavoring to destroy that which I had a hand in erecting so long ago as I have stated. But, honorable gentlemen, I think that when I shall have explained the circumstances which then forced the Government to bring forward the measure to render this House elective, you will agree with me that it was not on account of any fancy or predilection on their part that the elective system was proposed, but that it was necessitated by the circumstances in which the country found itself placed. It is from no levity in the minds of the members of the Government, or in my own mind; nor is there any inconsistency in what I then did and in what I am now doing. But we will have something more on that point in the course of a few moments. The honorable gentleman, the other day, said we ought to speak freely on this subject, the measure

being one of very great importance. He did speak freely himself, and gave expression to the fear that the Protestant English element of Lower Canada would be in danger if this measure should pass. He said as much as this, that in the Legislature of Lower Canada acts might be passed which would deprive religious educational institutions there of their rights, and even of their property. Another honorable gentleman, who spoke yesterday, also gave expression to the fear that vested rights and privileges might be wrested from the hands of the English-speaking population of Lower Canada—that there was nothing secure to them under the new Constitution. Well, the honorable gentlemen who could see, in the future, such dreadful consequences flowing from this union, and who make such sinister predictions, must make them upon some *data*. But I would ask honorable gentlemen if since 1791, when the Constitution was given to Lower Canada, there is, in all the records of the Legislature of Lower Canada, a single act to be found in which it can be shown that the Lower Canadians—the Papists of Lower Canada—ever attempted to commit a single injustice towards their fellow subjects of English origin professing the Protestant religion? I say, honorable gentlemen, that the act is not to be found. But acts of generosity, acts of liberality, acts of tolerance are to be found everywhere. (Hear, hear.) When you predict things of the future you ought to have at least an inch of ground to stand upon. You ought to be able to say that at such and such a time you did such and such unlawful acts. But I defy the honorable gentleman to point to one such act. (Hear, hear.) As it was well asked by my honorable friend, Sir NARCISSE F. BELLEAU, who was it that emancipated the Jews in 1808, much earlier than they were emancipated in England? Why, a Lower Canada House of Assembly. Who gave Protestant dissenters the right to keep records of marriages and burials? Well, it was a French Canadian—a Papist—House of Assembly. And that House had a great deal of difficulty, and why? Because they were opposed in the Legislature of Lower Canada by the Protestant English minority.

HON. MR. SANBORN—Not by an elective majority.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—Perhaps it is well that we have now responsible government, because responsible government is a cure for many evils. Well, the bill to give Protestant dissenters in Lower Canada certain rights was

opposed again and again in the Legislative Council of Lower Canada, and opposed by English Protestants. But this was no less a proof of the liberality of the French Canadians. (Hear, hear.) The honorable gentleman behind me is not at all satisfied with the electoral divisions as they stand in Lower Canada. He says there is no security whatever afforded by them to the Protestant community. But I wish that honorable gentleman had taken the trouble to look a little into the facts upon which he had based his conclusions in regard to these very electoral divisions. Honorable gentlemen, I feel warm on this subject. And why? Because the limits of the counties in Lower Canada were devised by one of the most intelligent, upright and liberal men it has ever been my fortune to meet with. If a model of human perfection can be found in Canada, it must be in the person of the honorable Judge MORIN. (Hear, hear.) Before laying his project before the Executive Council, that gentleman did me the honor to consult me in the matter, and on two occasions I attended by appointment at his office to advise with him on the details of his scheme. The divisions of the other branch of the Legislature were worked out so as to give our Protestant English fellow subjects everything which could be considered fair in every sense of the word. I say also that the same spirit was manifested in regard to the working out of the divisions of the Legislative Council. I assisted to work them out in conjunction with the Hon. Mr. CAUCHON, and I do assert here most solemnly that our whole trouble and study was to try and devise some means so as to give the English portion of the community of Lower Canada something like fair play. And when I am conscious of having done these things, I feel it comes hard on me to hear honorable gentlemen say that there is no security for them in the future, but that the French—the Papists—may do anything they choose in the lower branch of the Legislature. But, honorable gentlemen, if the lower branch of the Legislature were insensate enough and wicked enough to commit some flagrant act of injustice against the English Protestant portion of the community, they would be checked by the General Government. But the honorable gentleman argues that that would raise an issue between the local and the general governments. We must not, however, forget that the General Government is composed of representatives from all portions of the country—that they would not be likely to

commit an unjust act—and that if they did so they would be met by such a storm of opposition as would sweep them out of their places in a very short time. But, honorable gentlemen, to come back to the electoral divisions.—I wish to look at them a little more closely, to show the results already produced. I will be obliged to make a comparison, but believe me, I do not wish to make invidious comparisons. When, however, honorable gentlemen complain that they have no guarantee for the preservation of their rights and liberties, I act on the suggestion of the honorable gentleman and speak my mind freely. Now, how does the population of both Canadas stand in reference to religious creeds? We have in Upper Canada 1,396,090 souls, according to the last census, and of that number there are 258,141 Roman Catholics. I should like to know how many Roman Catholic representatives there are in this House? I don't know one. I say that there are 258,000 Roman Catholics in Upper Canada who are not represented by one of their own faith on the floor of this House—except, indeed, there are those of the Roman Catholic faith of whom I am not aware. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. CRAWFORD was understood to say in a jocular way that he was a Catholic. (Laughter.)

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ said—No; you are an Orangeman—we have shaken hands together already, and I hope we may shake hands again, but when the honorable gentleman says he is a Catholic, I fancy he must be joking. (Laughter.) I wish, honorable gentlemen, for you to pay a little attention to what I am saying, because it is facts that always tell. A tree is known by its fruits, and it is the fruit I wish to place before this House and before the country. The total population in Lower Canada at the last census was 1,110,000, and of these 942,724 were Roman Catholics, leaving of all other religious persuasions, know-nothings, if any there are, heathens and other unbelievers, 167,940. That is to say, honorable gentlemen, that the Protestants in Lower Canada are less in number than the Catholics in Upper Canada, by 91,201. Here, then, we have Protestants in Lower Canada to the number of 167,000, and the question arises how are they represented in this House? Well, they are represented by three members; besides, there are two other honorable gentlemen from Lower Canada who have English names, but I really do not know whether they are Protestants or Catholics. I

do however know, as I before stated, that there are three honorable gentlemen, Protestants, representing in this Council the 167,000 Protestants of Lower Canada. The honorable gentleman by my side, who has moved these amendments, is one of them; an honorable gentleman who sits opposite to me is another, and an honorable gentleman who sits behind me, is the third; and there are two other honorable gentlemen with English names whom I do not know whether to classify as Protestants or Catholics. I therefore say that in comparing the representation of the two sections of the province, the hon. gentleman has no cause to complain. I have ever labored to secure to my fellow subjects of English origin, of the Protestant faith, in Lower Canada, their rights and their liberties; and that my labors have not been in vain is proved by the fruits I have adduced. But that is not all.

HON. MR. MOORE—There are five Protestants in this House from Lower Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER—But they are not all elective.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—I speak of the elective members, because the argument has reference to the electoral divisions. Now let us look at the other branch of the Legislature; and I assert that the principle has worked equally well there. There are 258,000 Roman Catholics in Upper Canada represented in the other branch of the Legislature by only two Roman Catholics, and one of these, I am told, like my honorable friend opposite who has avowed himself a Roman Catholic, never goes to mass. (Laughter.) He is, however, a good Catholic, because he has an accomplished and charming wife and most beautiful daughters, the whole of whom are zealous Christians and good Catholics, who go to church and confess regularly; so that I am bound to take the head of the family as a good Catholic also. (Laughter.) Then, how does the case stand for the Protestants in Lower Canada? In Upper Canada we have just seen that 258,000 Catholics are represented by just two members of their own faith in the lower branch of the Legislature. How are the 160,000 Protestants in Lower Canada represented? Well, honorable gentlemen, they are represented by no less than 14 members. (Hear, hear.) That is to say more by fifty per cent. than they would be entitled to according to strict rule of three. (Hear, hear.) I would ask are all these things mere matters of accident? Is it chance or Dame Fortune that brings about

all these things? I believe not. (Hear, hear.) Causes invariably produce effects; and they are the effects mainly—I do not say entirely—of the pains we have taken to give our fellow-subjects of English origin the whole of their rights and fair play in every respect. The rest is due to French Canadian liberality. After stating these facts, I really do not think the honorable gentleman who represents the division of Wellington has much cause to complain. We judge of the tree by its fruit, and the fruit I have endeavored to place before you. If I have made any mistakes in my facts, I am ready to be corrected. But besides these 14 gentlemen representing the Protestant element in Lower Canada in the other branch of Legislature, I find three other English names, but whether they are Catholics or Protestants I cannot say, and therefore, not being certain of their creed, I have classed them as doubtful; but added to the 14, they would make the number 17. I think all this is pretty good proof of the liberality and the spirit of justice of the Lower Canadians; and if they have acted so for three quarters of a century, how is it to be supposed, now that they are about to form the majority again in the Lower Canada Legislature, they will all at once change their mode of acting, and become ready to tyrannize over and commit acts of injustice on their fellow-subjects of English origin in Lower Canada? I do not believe it. I do not believe there is such a thing as vandalism in their minds, and I believe they are as ready as ever to render equal and impartial justice to their fellow-men and fellow-subjects. (Hear, hear.) I must now pass to another portion of my remarks. Honorable gentlemen say I was inconsistent in that at one time I erected a monument, and since then I have been trying to pull it down. Well, honorable gentlemen, to understand how we stood in 1856 it is necessary we should take the history of the Legislative Council a little further back—from the time of its formation immediately after the union. We had not responsible government at the time of the union, but then it was that the whole system was put in practice. The first batch of councillors were appointed in 1841, and were 25 in number; but two of them never attended. Out of these 25 there were 18 conservatives and five reformers. In 1842 seven new councillors were added, five conservatives and two reformers. In 1843 the Government changed, and the change made a little difference in the political bearing of the appointments, so that in 1843, there were appointed

one conservative and five reformers. In 1844-45 there were two appointments—two reformers. In 1846 there was one conservative. In 1847 there were four conservatives. Therefore, in 1848, when the Liberal Government came into power—the LAFONTAINE-BALDWIN Administration—the fact was that their partisans in the Legislative Council were fifteen less than the opposite party. (Hear, hear.) What were the Reform Government to do? They were forced to appoint a large batch this time. They appointed no less than twelve gentlemen. But still it left a majority to the conservative party of three. And if the conservatives had been true to themselves—and I wish to God they had been, and I will tell you, by and by, why—they could have prevented a good deal of trouble and a good deal of agitation in the country. Supposing that what is called the Rebellion Losses Bill had not been passed in 1849, would the country have suffered a great deal from it? But if the conservatives had been true to themselves they would have stopped the bill. It would have been discussed in all the public prints. The Montrealers would not have been entirely reconciled to the measure, but they would have waived their opinions as dutiful subjects of the Queen, and we should not have witnessed the scandal we had in Montreal—the burning of the Parliamentary buildings and the Representative of the Queen pelted with stones and almost murdered, followed by the annexation movement. But I say if the conservatives had resisted and just postponed the bill for another year, all this trouble might have been avoided. Now, honorable gentlemen, what was the spirit which actuated the appointments to the Council from 1841 to 1848? It was a spirit of partisanship, and where there is partisanship there can be no justice. (Hear, hear.) Where there is partisanship there can be no stability—you can depend upon nothing. (Hear, hear.) It is only when justice is rendered to all parties that you can reckon upon stable and permanent governmental institutions. (Hear, hear.) To shew the difference between the spirit which actuated these nominations, from 1841 to 1847, and the spirit which exists now, it is only necessary to refer to the resolutions of the Conference. The fourteenth resolution says:

The first selection of the members of the Legislative Council shall be made, except as regards Prince Edward Island, from the Legislative Councils of the various provinces, so far as a sufficient number be found qualified and willing

to serve; such members shall be appointed by the Crown at the recommendation of the General Executive Government, upon the nomination of the several local governments, and in such nomination due regard shall be had to the claims of the members of the Legislative Council of the Opposition in each province, so that all political parties may, as nearly as possible, be fairly represented.

This shews you the spirit in which these resolutions were framed. Certainly the gentlemen who composed the Conference were, like ourselves, liable to err, but there is no doubt in my mind that they acted conscientiously from beginning to end. Well, honorable gentlemen, after the burning of the Parliament House in Montreal, the greatest possible excitement was created all over the province. Those who were most displeased at the passing of the Rebellion Losses Bill, condemned in the most violent terms the swamping, as they called it, of the Legislative Council, though after all it was nothing to be condemned, seeing that it simply, to some extent, re-established the equilibrium. But it was called, in the *furor* of the moment, the disgraceful swamping of the Legislative Council, and there was great agitation all over the country. Well, by means of the press constantly hammering away upon what had been done by the Government, and representing those who had been appointed as mere machines and tools of the Executive, although they were really among the most respectable and intelligent in Canada—but party passion does not reason—the people were led to believe that the Legislative Council had been disgraced by the appointment of these twelve additional members. But during the time that the conservatives were, on the one hand, thus battering down the Legislative Council, what had we on the other hand? We had the old Reform party in Lower Canada beginning to recall their old hatred to the Legislative Council. Although there was no reason to complain after the introduction of responsible government, yet people followed not their reason but their prejudice. So that the Legislative Council received a cross-fire from both sides. It was being battered down by public opinion on either hand, and what could it do? Nothing, but come down lower and lower in public estimation. Although the consciences of the members reproached them nothing—although they could walk the streets with their heads erect, yet the Legislative Council had been so much reduced in public opinion, that those gentlemen were really, I will not say ashamed, but reluctant to attend in their places. But,

besides, they came not to receive remuneration or salary. From the time they were appointed in 1841, they sacrificed their time and their money, and gave their services gratuitously to the public; and they were met, as I have already stated, by this universal deluge of abuse which was levelled against them. (Hear, hear.) There was therefore no great encouragement for them to attend in their places in the Legislative Council. But what have we seen since? Session after session, day after day, week after week, we saw the Speaker come into the Council with great pomp, as the Speaker always does come into the Council—(hear, hear, and a laugh)—preceded by the mace; and after the Speaker had made his usual dutiful bow to the Throne, he would take his seat and remain quietly in the chair for the space of one hour. At the end of the hour, he would consult his watch, and saying there was no quorum present—although surely the quorum was a very small one, being ten members only—he would declare the House adjourned until the following day.

It being six o'clock, the SPEAKER left the Chair.

After the dinner recess,

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ continued his remarks. He said—Honorable gentlemen, when the clock struck six, I was stating that, in one session after another, the SPEAKER of this honorable House had day after day to declare that there was no quorum, and the Government of the day had to employ all sorts of means to induce honorable gentlemen to attend in their places. The *prestige* of the Legislative Council had gone, and the members, notwithstanding the offer to pay their expenses, &c., remained at home, and the business of the country suffered very much. Towards the end of the session, we could muster a few gentlemen. But they did not take much interest in the business of the country—in fact, they were disgusted with it, and they got through legislation at railroad speed. Under those circumstances, what had the Government to do? They were obliged to resort to some means to restore, if possible, the *status* and *prestige* of this House. There was one unanimous cry on the subject from one end of Lower Canada to the other—both conservatives and reformers being as one in pointing to the elective principle as a cure for the state of things in which this province was placed; and the Government, in consequence, consulted with the English authorities with a view of obtaining leave to extend to this House

the elective principle. This was not, as I have stated already, because of any predilection on our part for the elective principle. It was not because we thought that the elective principle was much better than the system of appointment by the Crown—at all events before the introduction of responsible government. Before that, the gentlemen who nominated members of this House were responsible to no one. The appointments then were all made on one side. Even after the union, but before responsible government was established, or before it was put in a thoroughly practical working state, the appointments had been made in a partial manner. (Hear, hear.) And it is not surprising that we experienced the difficulties we did until that period. After the establishment of responsible government the position was very different—the resolutions of the 3rd September, 1841, having declared that no Government could be carried on except by heads of departments having the confidence of the representatives of the people in the lower branch of the Legislature. If, from that moment, bad appointments happened to be made to the Legislative Council, then the Government for the time being was responsible to the people for those appointments. And, when the people wanted an elective Council at that time, they did not base the demand upon constitutional principles, but were led by their passions, which had been excited by their recollections of the past. They did not reason the thing out; and, in fact, the great majority of the people here, as everywhere else, are not able to reason out constitutional points—they are led by those who are at the head of the different parties. In saying this, I have no wish to be unjust to my countrymen. For even in countries like the United States, which boast much of their education, the immense mass of the people are led by prominent men. They do not reflect, they do not think for themselves—and so it was with our people. The Government for the time being were thus, by the force of circumstances, obliged to bring forward the measure for altering the constitution of the Legislative Council. The measure was passed by a pretty large majority; and I think that until now the elective principle has worked remarkably well indeed, and that the electors have sent to this House gentlemen who would do honor to any deliberative body in the world—I care not where, whether in England, or on the continent of Europe, or in America. But difficulties have arisen since the passing of the Act of 1856, and the Government of the country came almost to a

dead-lock. Some remedy had to be found, and gentlemen of opposite parties wisely came together with the view of devising a plan which would not only cure our domestic difficulties, but give greater power and force to the British North American colonies. To bring this about we determined that we would endeavor to obtain a Federal union of all the British American Provinces. Delegates from below, and the gentlemen composing the Administration of Canada met together. Some of us might have preferred still to retain the elective principle, but then we had to meet those gentlemen from below, and we had to give and take. We could not carry everything our own way. (Hear, hear.) The gentlemen from the Lower Provinces were opposed to the elective principle, and went strongly for the system of appointments by the Crown. At the same time some among ourselves were not very much enamoured with the present system—(hear, hear)—and those who were anxious to retain the elective principle, were obliged to yield. Thus, honorable gentlemen, what is now proposed comes before you, not as the act of the Government of Canada—(hear, hear)—but as the mixed work of the delegates from all the provinces, in the form, as it were, of a treaty. I do not think, after the explanations I have given that I can be accused of a great deal of inconsistency, or of that levity which would make a man build up something to-day which he would be anxious to demolish to-morrow. No, honorable gentleman—but circumstances forced the Government in 1856 to bring on their measure for rendering this House elective; and the circumstances of the country in 1864 required that we should have recourse to some other means to put an end to the dead-lock in which the Province was placed. (Hear, hear.) I am sorry that I do not see the honorable gentleman from Grandville (Hon. Mr. LETELLIER) in his place. The Hon. Sir NARCISSE F. BELLEAU the other night made some remarks as to the difficulty of finding candidates for the Legislative Council. Now, for my own part, I should be exceedingly sorry to say anything that would wound the feelings of any one. And where could I look—before me, or behind me, or at my side—to find any one against whom I could bring the least reproach? No—I repeat it again—that those whom the elective principle has sent here are gentlemen who would compare well with the members of any legislative body that could be mentioned. But then there are difficulties inherent to the

working of the principle itself. I would especially mention the difficulty which arises from the constituencies being so large. I know not whether this has been felt in Upper Canada, but I know that it has been felt in Lower Canada. Many of you, honorable gentlemen, have spent laborious days and laborious nights in canvassing these immense divisions, where sometimes the internal communications are exceedingly difficult. You know the wear and tear thus imposed on the human body, and that some gentlemen after canvassing these immense divisions, have found their graves in consequence of the exhaustion brought on by these efforts. (Hear, hear.) But, honorable gentlemen, it is not merely this tear and wear of the human constitution which you have had to encounter. This country, I need not say, is not very wealthy. In point of wealth it does not resemble the Mother Country. There are gentlemen there with £200,000 or £300,000 a year, who think nothing of spending several thousand pounds, provided that by that expenditure they can put themselves in a conspicuous position before the country. But here our fortunes are limited. That is the case in Lower Canada. I hope it is not so in Upper Canada.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—It is worse there. (Laughter.)

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—Your fortunes in Upper Canada may be much greater than ours. (Cries of "no, no.") But I can tell you how it is generally among ourselves—speaking not so much for the district of Montreal as for the portion of the country in which I live myself, the district of Quebec. Where I reside, some forty or fifty miles below Quebec, the fortunes are not very large, and the farmer who by his industry has been able to accumulate some £8,000 or £10,000 is a very wealthy man. My honorable friend beside me (Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL) suggests that it is the Ottawa gentlemen who are able to afford a contest. (Laughter.) If so, I tell honorable gentlemen that we cannot afford it below. It is but few whose fortunes reach £6,000 or £8,000—perhaps half a dozen in a large parish. It is true that some of our merchants in Lower Canada, by their industry and aptitude in trade, have accumulated very handsome fortunes—but these are the exceptions. Well, a man who, after fifteen or twenty years of hard labor, has accumulated £6,000 or £8,000 for his family, or for his old age—knowing how a candidate is bled—(laughter)—is not very willing to go and

spend half of it in an election. You cannot persuade such a man to come forward—but you may engage other parties who have not got much money to lose to do so. These men will be ready to promise a great deal, though they may not be able to fulfil their promises, and are thus more likely to be elected than those who have fortunes. My honorable friend from Grandville, I think, misapprehended the honorable Knight on his left (Hon. Sir N. F. BELLEAU,) when he understood him to speak slightly of the talent of honorable members of this House. We have no aristocracy here in the sense of a family aristocracy, but we have an equally influential aristocracy, that of intellect. (Hear, hear.) And a man of intellect and education, though not a rich man, I consider is in every way worthy of respect, and would be a most desirable addition to this House. But, suppose we have a man of respectability, of education, and of intellect, and one who is highly esteemed by his neighbors—suppose he has a little fortune besides, he is not the worse man for that. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—He is so much the better. (Hear, hear.)

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—But, as I was remarking, what I am afraid of is, that men who are well qualified for the position, after having gone through one or two elections, in which they have lost one-half, or two-thirds, or the whole of their fortune, are not likely to stand another contest, and we lose the happiness of meeting them here again. And I fear that the longer the elective system is continued, the greater would be the difficulty in that respect. Let us take a lesson from history, and from what goes on around us. I recollect that, in 1855, when on board the *Canada*, going to Europe, I made the acquaintance of some most respectable American families, and particularly of a most interesting American woman. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) *Honi soit qui mal y pense.* (Continued laughter.) I met with a very interesting American woman, and, as she was conversing with me and mentioning some very preposterous laws that had been passed in her state, I said—"Madame, have you not some people of good common sense and respectability to oppose such absurd laws?" She replied, "Sir, I am an American woman, and—I am ashamed to say it—the respectable people, the people of standing in our state, have no voice in the government of their country." (Hear, hear.) Many of you, honorable gentlemen, are familiar with the

state of things in the United States, which has resulted from carrying the elective principle too far; and the fact that that principle, carried too far has worked much mischief, ought to place us on our guard. Some years ago, in Canada, there was quite a rage for the elective principle, and an agitation was got up with the view of rendering the judiciary elective. Well, a statesman of the United States, with whom I am well acquainted, and who now occupies a high position in that country, once remarked to me: "You have quite enough of the democratic element in your Constitution already, and, above all, do not make your judiciary elective, for that would be one of the greatest curses you could inflict on your country." (Hear, hear.) The elective principle, kept within proper bounds, is very good indeed, and hitherto, no doubt, has worked well in this House. But I doubt whether, in the course of time, this House would not lose its present high *status* if the elective principle was continued in it for ever. As regards this, however, I merely state my own opinion, and other honorable gentlemen may hold contrary opinions, as they are perfectly entitled to do. (Hear, hear.) Having thus, honorable gentlemen, explained the reasons which induced the Government, in 1856, to propose that the elective principle should be extended to this House, with the concomitant circumstances which assisted in bringing that about—and having also explained the reasons which have induced the Government now to look for another state of political existence, as we may call it, by Confederation with the Maritime Provinces, I think I am clear from any imputation of inconsistency or levity of purpose. Before sitting down I have a personal explanation to make. When I speak, honorable gentlemen, I speak with sincerity, but, like any other man, I may commit a mistake. The moment, however, that I find I have committed a mistake, I am ready to admit it, as any honest man should do. (Hear, hear.) I find that I took a wrong view of the proportions of appointed members that were to be allotted to each province, in case the amendment of my honorable friend from the Wellington Division should pass. I have since been convinced that I was wrong, and that it was really carrying out the principle of distribution adopted in the scheme, to allot to the Lower Provinces other ten members. I am glad to admit that my honorable friend was right in correcting me. But I still maintain that he was wrong—very wrong—in bartering old men

for young ones, because, no doubt, the old men would soon disappear from their seats, while the young men from below would long retain their places, and we would thus destroy the equilibrium upon which the whole fabric of the proposed Constitution is based. I say the honorable gentleman was wrong in that, and that, if his proposal were adopted, it would certainly be no improvement on the scheme as it has come from the Conference. (Cheers.)

HON. MR. SKEAD said—Honorable gentlemen, I claim the indulgence of the House for a few moments while I state from my point of view, as one of the representatives from Central Canada, the way in which I regard the measure now under consideration. I am an advocate of the union of the British North American Provinces. (Hear, hear.) When I came here a few weeks ago, my mind was scarcely made up as to the course I should pursue. At the same time I was desirous of taking that course which should be approved by the majority of my constituents. In November last I received the document which was sent to members of both Houses throughout the province; but as it was marked "Private," I felt bound by every consideration of propriety not to make it public. Having at that time been re-elected by my constituents, I had no occasion to use it in connection with securing my return to this House. But, speaking of my re-election a few months ago, I may remark that a number of my constituents felt disposed at that time to pledge me to oppose this union of the British North American colonies. For my own part I felt it would be wrong for me to do so, not knowing what was the programme that was about to be laid; I refused, therefore, to give a pledge. Probably I felt more independent on account of there being no opposition. (Laughter.) But be that as it may, I have the same desire to act in accordance with the deliberate views of my constituents as if I had canvassed every vote in the division. I pledged myself on the hustings on the day of my election, that as soon as the scheme was published I would give it my earnest attention, and form a judgment upon it to the best of my ability. After the document was formally laid on the table of the House, I waited till it was put in type, and having ordered two thousand copies of it, I sent them, some fifteen days ago, to my constituents, with a circular calling upon them to state any objections they might have to the scheme if they considered it objectionable, and to indicate what

course they wished me to pursue with reference to it. I am up to this evening without any answers to that circular, with one or two exceptions which I need not take up the time of the House by further alluding to. I now take it for granted, having given such an ample opportunity to my constituents to express their opinions, that I am at full liberty to pursue that course which I think myself to be for the interests of the country. (Hear, hear.) My feeling in the first instance was that the matter was being pressed too rapidly in this House—that we might have waited for a little—that we should have allowed the other House to go on and adopt the resolutions first, if they did adopt them, before we were called on to pronounce a final decision upon them. But I have somewhat changed my mind from hearing the able speeches of honorable gentlemen both for and against the amendment now under the consideration of the House; and I have come to the conclusion to give an independent vote, according to the best judgment I can form, since my constituents, after being invited to express their opinions, up to this hour have not responded to the request. I speak here as a representative of Central Canada, and particularly of the Ottawa country. The people there are engaged mainly in one trade, the lumber trade; and, with reference to that trade, the promulgation of this scheme has caused us some feelings of apprehension, not to say gloom. Till within the last few hours, as late as yesterday, I was still in the dark as to the bearings of the scheme in that respect. But I have now had assurances from the Government—and particularly from one or two members of it—that the scheme is not going to inflict that injury upon the lumbering interest which we imagined. In fact the clause relating to that subject has been so explained to me, that I am now perfectly satisfied. (Hear, hear.) My feeling formerly was that our trade was treated in a manner which it did not deserve. Here we have a trade employing many thousands of people—employing a large amount of shipping to carry away the produce of our forests, which exceeds the amount of the exported agricultural produce of the country by a value of some two millions of dollars. We naturally felt that such a trade had some right to be considered. (Hear, hear.) However, accepting the assurances of honorable gentlemen, in whom I have the utmost confidence, who compose the present Government, I am now quite prepared, as one of the representatives of the Ottawa section of country, to leave that

matter in their hands. A great deal has been said in this debate on the general question of the Confederation of these provinces, and as to that I shall say but little. As I have already stated, I am an advocate of union. I would even say that the scheme of the delegates to the Quebec Conference does not go far enough. I contend that, instead of merely taking in the provinces to the east of us, the scheme should have embraced British Columbia and the whole of the territory to the west. An honorable friend near me says that will come in good time. But I am afraid that some Downing-street or other influence may prevent it. (Cries of “no, no!”) I should like to see the Pacific as the western boundary of this young Confederation, in the same way as the Atlantic is its eastern limit, so that we should have one country stretching from ocean to ocean. (Hear, hear.) A great deal has been said in this debate on the subject of railways. Honorable gentlemen have spoken of the cost of building our railways, of the damage the Grand Trunk has done, and of the profits certain gentlemen have made out of it. For the life of me, I cannot see the force of their arguments. True, the Grand Trunk has cost a great deal of money, but how should we feel if we had to go back to the state of things which existed when we had no railroad? What should we do if the Grand Trunk were now taken from us? I believe we could not do without it. It has become a necessity. Every man within the range of its influence, has had his land enhanced in value—and the debt of \$15,000,000 or \$16,000,000, while of course in itself a great deal of money, is nothing when we reflect on the ability of the provinces to bear it. If spared to continue here during my term of eight years, I shall still advocate the Intercolonial Railway as a line necessary to connect us with the seaboard. It will cost us some little money no doubt, but it will yield us compensating advantages. There are large forests to the east of us, which have still to yield up their wealth, and no one can tell how much may come out of that country, when its resources are developed. The subsidy we are now paying the ocean steamships will go a good way to pay the interest on our share of the cost of the railway. Besides we are now spending a great deal of money to bring population into these provinces—an object that will be promoted to a large extent by the building of that road. To build it will take some four or five years, and we cannot tell how much that section of the country will be settled in that time. It will no doubt

prove of great advantage to us. We shall then be ready, I hope, to commence the railroad to British Columbia, and the improvement of the Ottawa river to the upper lakes—(hear, hear)—and the navvies and others who have been employed on these works will find employment on the road leading to the Pacific, and will ultimately become settlers in the great Red River country. (Hear, hear.) Such are my sentiments in connection with the subject now before the House. My experience may not have been as great as that of some honorable members, but I have been in the habit of observing what was going on around me, and I have come to the conclusion that the union of these provinces is desirable and necessary. (Hear, hear.) It has been said that the gentlemen forming the present Ministry have held such opposite opinions that no good can be expected to result from their coalition. I have not such a poor opinion of human nature as to feel disposed to question in any way the sincerity and patriotism of those honorable gentlemen. They have seen the necessity of some change being brought about, if the good of the country was to be promoted. Whatever may have been the antagonism of their views formerly, they now occupy the same wigwam, and, it is said, the same blanket covers them—(laughter)—and, so long as the country receives the benefit, I am satisfied to support them, no matter what their politics may have been during the last twenty years. (Hear, hear.) No doubt the country has been suffering—a cure had to be found, and I think we are now on the highway to get it. (Hear, hear.) Honorable gentlemen composing the Government will permit me to repeat that our lumber trade deserves their earnest and best attention on account of the employment it gives to so large a number of persons, the way in which it swells the exports of the country, the market it affords for the produce of the agricultural portion of the community, and the manner in which it forwards the settlement of our wild lands. To the Ottawa district it is, of course, of special importance, but it has an interest for the whole province, inasmuch as it makes for us a back country. A country that is all frontier must always be a little country. (Hear, hear.) If a check is in any way put upon the lumber trade, as the consequence of its being placed under the separate control of each local government, it would be a result much to be regretted. But it is to be hoped that the Government will give this matter

their most earnest consideration, and that they will do what in their opinion is best for the interests of all concerned. It has been said by some in our section that Central Canada is to be made the footstool of Upper Canada, and that it is also to be made the footstool of Lower Canada. For my own part I am quite unable to see how we can be made the footstool of both. (Hear, hear.) That was the idea expressed in a letter sent me the other day, begging me to give the scheme all the opposition in my power. It may be true that the western part of the province is a little covetous, and a little ambitious of controlling everything; still, I have that faith in the good feeling of the western people, and in our ability to protect ourselves, that I do not believe our lumbering interest is to be destroyed all at once, even though the Local Government of Upper Canada should have its seat in Toronto. Whoever may compose the Local Government, I think they must see the importance of the lumber trade, and will do what they can to foster and encourage that which is essential to the good of the whole country. I do not believe they will adopt the policy of killing the goose that lays the golden egg. (Hear, hear.) I see there is a disposition to have the vote taken, and I will not detain the House longer. (Cries of "go on.") I have only this to say in conclusion, that when these scattered provinces are united together, as is now proposed, and when the bond of that union has been sealed with the great Imperial seal of Great Britain—with the blessing and favor of an all-ruling Providence—I, for one, have no fear of the result. (Cheers.)

HON. MR. SANBORN said—I desire, before the vote is taken, to offer a single explanation. The Honorable Premier (Hon. Sir E. P. TACHÉ) attributed to me certain remarks on which he based the early portion of his speech. He said I complained of the arrangement of the electoral divisions in Lower Canada. I made no such complaint. I made no allusion to that. What I had reference to was the appointment of Legislative Councilors for divisions, and their having property qualifications in those divisions. I am sure the Honorable Premier did not desire to attribute to me anything I did not say.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—If my honorable friend says he did not use the argument, of course my remarks upon it go for nothing.

HON. MR. SANBORN—Another point, too, I may notice. The Honorable Premier based his argument on my having drawn a

distinction between Papists and Protestants. Now, I never used the terms "Papist," or "Catholic," or "Protestant." (Hear, hear.) The distinction I drew, and the remarks I made, were with regard to the English and the French of Lower Canada. And honorable gentlemen will remember that I distinctly admitted what the Premier had claimed for his countrymen—namely, their well-known liberality. I have always admitted that, and have never had any disposition to deny it. But my argument was that, in establishing a Constitution, our rights and interests should be protected by distinct provisions in that Constitution—that these would form the only satisfactory assurance we could get—that we could not rest upon the liberality of any class of men, but must have the assurance of distinct guarantees. That was the line of argument I pursued. (Hear, hear.) I do not think the Premier should have been so hard upon me for not stipulating that the ten men who should be chosen in the Maritime Provinces should be old men, so that they might not have the advantage of putting in young men as an offset to our old ones. When I see, in the case of the Premier himself, at his advanced years, the youthful fire burn up so brightly, and that age does not at all detract from the vigor he manifests, I think he must excuse me for not having made an invidious distinction between old men and young ones. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

HON. MR. WILSON begged to state that he was opposed to the amendment, but was precluded from recording his vote, in consequence of having paired off with Hon. Mr. MOORE.

The House then divided on Hon. Mr. SANBORN'S amendment, which was negatived by 42 to 18.

CONTEXTS—The Honorable Messieurs Aikins, Archambault, Armstrong, Bureau, Chaffers, Cormier, Currie, Flint, Leonard, Leslie, Letellier de St. Just, Malhiot, Olivier, Perry, Proulx, Reesor, Sanborn, and Simpson.—18.

NON-CONTEXTS—The Honorable Messieurs Alexander, Allan, Armand, Sir N. F. Belleau, Bennett, Blake, Fergusson Blair, Boulton, Bossé, Bull, Burnham, Campbell, Christie, Crawford, DeBeaujeu, Dickson, A. J. Duchesnay, E. H. J. Duchesnay, Dumouhel, Ferrier, Foster, Gingras, Guevremont, Hamilton (Inkerman), Hamilton (Kingston), Lacoste, McCrea, McDonald, McMaster, Macpherson, Matheson, Mills, Panet, Price, Prud'homme, Read, Ross, Ryan, Shaw, Skead, Sir E. P. Taché, and Vidal.—42.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

THURSDAY, *February 16, 1865.*

HON. MR. DORION, in resuming the adjourned debate on Confederation, said—I should have desired to make my remarks to the House in French, but considering the large number of honorable members who are not familiar with that language, I think it my duty to speak at the present time in English. In rising on this occasion to address the House on the important question submitted to us, I must say I do so with an unusual degree of embarrassment, not only on account of the importance of the subject of our deliberations, but also because I have to differ from many of those with whom I have been in the habit of acting ever since I first entered into political life. Yet, MR. SPEAKER, when I consider the questions raised by the resolutions submitted by the Government, I find that whether they be purely political ones, such as the proposal to restrict the influence and control of the people over the Legislature of the country by substituting a Chamber nominated by the Crown for an Elective Legislative Council, or whether they are purely commercial in their character, such as that regarding the Intercolonial Railway, or the larger question of Confederation itself, I still hold the same views that I held, in common with others who have now changed their opinions, when the subjects were first mooted. (Hear, hear.) And as I have not heard, since the first opening of this debate, any reason for substituting a nominated for an elective Upper Chamber that was not fully argued out in 1856, when, by an overwhelming majority of this House, it was decided that the elective principle should prevail—as I have not heard any reason why we should pledge our credit and resources to the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, even previous to any estimate of its cost being made, that was not urged in 1862 when the question was before the country—nor any reason for intercolonial union that was not raised in 1858, when the present Hon. Finance Minister pressed the question on the attention of the Imperial authorities—I do not see on what ground these several subjects which were then so unpopular, and those views which were then almost universally repudiated, should now be more favorably considered by the people of this country—I fail to perceive why those once unpalatable measures, now

coupled with additions to the burdens of the people, should have grown into the public favor. I cannot understand why I or any members of this House should change our views merely because certain other members have, when we do not conscientiously think such change would be for the benefit of the country. I say, sir, that I am quite entitled to maintain the same views now that I have always entertained. (Hear.) This scheme, sir, is submitted to us on two grounds; first, the necessity for meeting the constitutional difficulties which have arisen between Upper and Lower Canada, owing to the growing demands on the part of Upper Canada for representation by population; and, secondly, the necessity for providing more efficient means for the defence of the country than now exist. These are the only two grounds we have heard stated for the propositions now submitted to us; and, sir, I shall apply myself to explain my views on these two subjects, and also upon the scheme generally. When on the first question, I trust I shall be permitted to go a little into the history of the agitation of representation by population, for I owe it to myself, to my constituents and the country. My name has been used in various ways. It has sometimes been said that I was entirely favorable to representation by population—at other times that I was entirely favorable to the Confederation of the provinces, and I will now endeavor, once more, to state as clearly as possible what my real views have been and still are. (Hear.) The first time representation by population was mooted in this House, on behalf of Upper Canada, was, I believe, in the Session of 1852, when the Conservative party took it up, and the Hon. Sir ALLAN MACNAB moved resolutions in favor of the principle. We then found the conservatives arrayed in support of this constitutional change. It had been mooted before on behalf of Lower Canada, but the Upper Canadians had all opposed it. I think two votes were taken in 1852, and on one of these occasions the Hon. Attorney General West (Hon. J. A. MACDONALD) voted for it; it came up incidentally. In 1854 the MACNAB-MORIN coalition took place, and we heard no more of representation by population from that quarter—that is, as mooted by the Conservative party, who from that moment uniformly opposed it on every occasion. It was, however, taken up by the present Hon. President of the Council, the member for South Oxford, and with the energy and

vigor he brings to bear on every question he takes in hand, he caused such an agitation in its behalf as almost threatened a revolution. As the agitation in the country increased, so did the vote for it in this House increase, and on several occasions I expressed my views upon the subject. I never shirked the question—I never hesitated to say that something ought to be done to meet the just claims of Upper Canada, and that representation based on population was in the abstract a just and correct principle. I held, at the same time, there were reasons why Lower Canada could not grant it; I entreated Lower Canadian representatives to show themselves disposed to meet the views of Upper Canada by making, at any rate, a counter proposition; and in 1856, when Parliament was sitting in Toronto, I, for the first time, suggested that one means of getting over the difficulty would be to substitute for the present Legislative union a Confederation of the two Canadas, by means of which all local questions could be consigned to the deliberations of local legislatures, with a central government having control of commercial and other questions of common or general interest. I stated that, considering the different religious faith, the different language, the different laws that prevailed in the two sections of the country, this was the best way to meet the difficulty; to leave to a general government questions of trade, currency, banking, public works of a general character, &c., and to commit to the decision of local legislatures all matters of a local bearing. At the same time I stated that, if these views should not prevail, I would certainly go for representation by population, and such checks and guarantees as would secure the interests of each section of the country, and preserve to Lower Canada its cherished institutions. (Hear, hear.) This speech, sir, has been twisted in all sorts of ways. I have heard it quoted to prove that I was in favor of representation by population, pure and simple; that I was in favor of a Confederation of the provinces and for several other purposes, just as it suited the occasion or the purpose of those who quoted it. (Hear and laughter.) The first time the matter was put to a practical test was in 1858. On the resignation of the MACDONALD-CARTIER Administration, the BROWN-DORION Government was formed, and one of the agreements made between its members was that the constitutional question should be taken up and settled, either by a

Confederation of the two provinces or by representation according to population, with such checks and guarantees as would secure the religious faith, the laws, the language, and the peculiar institutions of each section of the country from encroachments on the part of the other. The subject came up again in the latter part of 1850, when the Toronto Convention took place. I should, however, first say that, when the BROWN-DORION Administration was formed, the Hon. the President of the Council urged very strongly that representation by population should be taken up as the method by which to settle the constitutional question; while, on the contrary, I saw the difficulty of so taking it up, even with such checks and guarantees as were spoken of, and made the counter-proposition that a Confederation of the two provinces should be formed. Of course as our Administration was so short-lived, the subject was not discussed in all its bearings; but if we could have come to an agreement on one or the other mode, that one would have been submitted as the solution for the evils complained of—it being however distinctly understood that I would not attempt to carry any such measure through without obtaining for it a majority from Lower Canada. I would never have tried to make any change in the Constitution without ascertaining that the people in my own section of the province were in favor of such a change. (Hear.) To return to the Toronto Convention. I was invited to attend it, but though I was unable to do so, certain communications took place, and a meeting of the liberal members of the House from Lower Canada was held, and a document issued, signed by the present Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. MCGEE), Hon. Mr. DESSAULLES, Hon. Mr. DRUMMOND, and myself. The document was given to the public for the purpose of setting forth the views which we held as to the settlement of the difficulty. Pretended extracts have been given from that document, as from my speech, to attempt to prove all sorts of things as being my views, but I can show most clearly that the proposition made in it was just that which had been made in 1858, viz, the Confederation of the two provinces, with some joint authority for both. Both at that time, and at the time of the formation of the BROWN-DORION Administration, various suggestions were made as to the carrying out of the plan of confederating the

two Canadas. Some thought that two entirely distinct legislatures should be formed; one local for Lower Canada, another local for Upper Canada, with a general legislature acting for both. Others suggested the idea that the same legislature might fulfil all purposes; that the same body might meet and deliberate on questions of common interest, and that the members for each section might then separate and discuss all matters of a sectional character. Others, again, said the same result might be obtained by having but one legislature, and insisting that no laws affecting either section of the province should be carried, unless with the support of a majority from the section affected by them. These three plans were suggested—the first to have two entirely distinct legislative bodies, one for general purposes, others for local ones; the second, to have one legislature, of which the parts should have the right to act separately for local objects, after general business had been disposed of; the third, to have but one body, but to resolve that no legislative act of a local nature should pass without the consent of a majority of the representatives from that locality. (Hear, hear.) The document to which I have just referred, issued in October, 1859, contained this language on the subject:—

Your Committee are impressed with the conviction that whether we consider the present needs or the probable future condition of the country, the true, the statesman-like solution is to be sought in the substitution of a purely federative for the present legislative union; the former, it is believed, would enable us to escape all the evils, and to retain all the advantages, appertaining to the existing union.

* * * * *

The proposition to federalize the Canadian union is not new. On the contrary, it has been frequently mooted in Parliament and the press during the last few years. It was no doubt suggested by the example of the neighbouring States where the admirable adaptation of the federal system to the government of an extensive territory, inhabited by people of diverse origins, creeds, laws and customs, has been amply demonstrated; but shape and consistency were first imparted to it in 1856, when it was formally submitted to Parliament by the Lower Canada Opposition, as offering, in their judgment, the true corrective of the abuses generated under the present system.

The document further went on to say:—

The powers delegated to the General or Federal Government ought to be those only which

are essential for the ends of the Confederation and consequently we ought to reserve for the subdivisions as ample powers as possible. Customs, finance, laws regulating the currency, patent rights, Crown lands and those public works which are of common interest for all parts of the province, ought to be the principal, if not the only subject submitted to the control of the Federal Government; while all that belongs to matters of a purely local character, such as education, the administration of justice, the militia, the laws relating to property, police, &c., ought to be referred to the local governments, whose powers ought generally to extend to all subjects which would not be given to the General Government. The system thus proposed would in no way diminish the importance of the colony nor impair its credit—

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—From what document is my hon. friend reading?

HON. MR. DORION—I am translating from the document published by the Lower Canada liberals in 1859. It continues:—

The proposed system would in no way diminish the importance of the colony, or impair the credit, while it presents the advantage of being susceptible, without any disturbance of the federal economy, of such territorial extension as circumstances may hereafter render desirable.

Well, Sir, I have not a word of all this to take back. I still hold to the same views, the same opinions. I still think that a Federal union of Canada might hereafter extend so as to embrace other territories either west or east; that such a system is well adapted to admit of territorial expansion without any disturbance of the federal economy, but I cannot understand how this plain sentence should be considered by the Hon. President of the Council, or by other hon. members who have spoken in the other House, as any indication that I have ever been in favor of Confederation with the other British Provinces. There is nothing I have ever said or written that can be construed to mean that I was ever in favor of such a proposition. On the contrary, whenever the question came up I set my face against it. I asserted that such a confederation could only bring trouble and embarrassment, that there was no social, no commercial connection between the provinces proposed to be united—nothing to justify their union at the present juncture. Of course I do not say that I shall be opposed to their Confederation for all time to come. Population may extend over the wilderness that now lies between the Maritime Provinces and ourselves, and commer-

cial intercourse may increase sufficiently to render Confederation desirable. My speeches have been paraded of late in all the ministerial papers—misconstrued, mis-translated, falsified in every way—for the purpose of making the public believe that in former times I held different views from those I now do. A French paper has said that I called with all my heart for the Confederation of the provinces—(*que j'appellais de tous mes vœux la confederation des provinces*). But I say here, as I said in 1856, and as I said in 1861 also, that I am opposed to this Confederation now. In the *Mirror of Parliament* which contains a report, though a very bad one, of my speech in 1861, I find that I said on that occasion:—

The time may come when it will be necessary to have a Confederation of all the provinces; . . . but the present time is not for such a scheme.

This is the speech which has been held to signify that I was anxious for Confederation, that I should like nothing better. Why? I distinctly said that though the time might come when it would become necessary, it was not desirable under existing circumstances. (Hear, hear.) In 1862 I was not in Parliament; the CARTIER-MACDONALD Administration was dismissed, and my hon. friend, the member for Cornwall (Hon. John S. MACDONALD), was called upon to form a new one. He applied to Mr. SICOTTE to form the Lower Canada section while he himself undertook the formation of the Upper Canada portion. The question of representation by population then necessarily came up for settlement—this time at the hands of the Liberal party who had voted for it year after year—and when I came down to Quebec, summoned by telegraph, I found the arrangements made, the policy of the new government was settled, representation by population was excluded. (Hear, hear.) The Liberal party from Upper Canada, sir, to my surprise, had decided that it was not to be taken up—that they were going into office just as the Conservative party had done before on a similar occasion in 1854; they decided that they would sustain an Administration which made it a closed question, and whose members all pledged themselves to vote against it. (Hear, hear.)

MR. RANKIN—No, no.

HON. MR. DORION—If not, I was misinformed. I certainly understood that the Administration was formed on the under-

standing that every member of it should vote against the question of representation by population whenever it came up, and that the Upper Canada party would support the Administration so formed. At any rate the Upper Canada Liberal party supported, for eleven months, a government pledged to exclude representation by population from the category of open questions, and agreed to lay that question aside.

MR. McKENZIE (Lambton)—No, no.

HON. MR. DORION—I hear an honorable gentleman say it was not so, that he did not agree to lay aside representation by population then, but if he did not then has he not done so since? He declared at a public meeting the other day that representation by population was no cure for the evils afflicting Upper Canada. The members from Upper Canada who had joined the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Government had certainly abandoned representation by population, by entering into an Administration which bound every one of them to vote against it. The Hon. Provincial Secretary had stated publicly in Ottawa, in January, 1864, that it had been abandoned by the Liberal party at the Toronto Convention in 1859; and although he had at the time been soundly abused for this by the *Globe* and by those of his party who look to the *Globe* as their political gospel, he had now the satisfaction of seeing the hon. member for Lambton, and some others who formerly held very strong views on this question, acknowledge, as they had done at a public meeting held at Toronto about three weeks ago, that they also considered representation by population as applied to Canada no remedy for the Upper Province, and that it was not a measure the liberals ought to insist upon, and that it had been abandoned. (Hear, hear and laughter.) Yes, the question was in effect abandoned when in November, 1859, six hundred delegates from all parts of Upper Canada attended the Reform Convention at Toronto, and agreed to advocate a Confederation of the two Canadas, by giving to each province a local legislature, with some joint authority, to carry on the general business common to both. The hon. member on my left was present on the occasion—

HON. MR. HOLTON—Yes I was.

HON. MR. DORION—And the hon. member has told me that he never saw a more respectable, a more educated, or more intelligent assemblage brought together in such

numbers to discuss public questions. But that scheme did not attract much attention out of the Convention. It took no hold on the popular mind. Shortly before that, in 1858, the present Hon. Finance Minister, who then sat on the cross-benches, made a speech of two or three hours' duration, in which, with all that force and ability for which he is distinguished, he expounded and advocated the Confederation of the whole of the British North American Provinces. He was then assisted in its advocacy by the present Hon. Minister of Agriculture; and, subsequently, on becoming a member of the CARTIER-MACDONALD Administration, he went to England and drew the attention of the Imperial authorities to the scheme of Confederation of all those provinces. The Hon. Finance Minister received an answer not very encouraging; and that which he received from this country was still less encouraging. There was not even an answer to his speech, able though it certainly was—

HON. MR. HOLTON—He never ventured to propose any resolution to Parliament.

HON. MR. DORION—Though the Administration was formed with the understanding of effecting the Confederation of all the provinces, and it was the main plank of their platform, they never dared to submit the question to Parliament at all. (Hear.) Subsequently, in 1861, the hon. member for South Oxford brought forward a motion based on the resolution at the Toronto Convention. I spoke and voted for it. It was in perfect accord with a notice I had given in 1856, and which was read here by the Hon. President of the Council a few nights ago, and with my often-repeated declarations that I was willing to adopt some measure calculated to remove existing difficulties, without doing injustice to either section; but while I was willing to do justice to Upper Canada, I always declared that I would not do so by sacrificing the interests of Lower Canada, or placing her in the position of having to beg for justice at the hands of the sister province. (Hear, hear.) I always stated that the difference existing in the religious faith of the people of the two sections, in their language, in their laws, in their prejudices even—for there are prejudices which were respectable and ought to be respected—would prevent any member from Lower Canada, representing a French constituency, from voting for representation by population, pure and simple, and thereby placing the people of

Lower Canada in the position of having to trust for the protection of their rights to the people of Upper Canada, who would thereby have the majority in the Legislature. (Hear.) There is at this moment a movement on the part of the British Protestants in Lower Canada to have some protection and guarantee for their educational establishments in this province put into the scheme of Confederation, should it be adopted; and far from finding fault with them, I respect them the more for their energy in seeking protection for their separate interests. I know that majorities are naturally aggressive and how the possession of power engenders despotism, and I can understand how a majority, animated this moment by the best feelings, might in six or nine months be willing to abuse its power and trample on the rights of the minority, while acting in good faith, and on what it considered to be its right. We know also the ill feelings that might be engendered by such a course. I think it but just that the Protestant minority should be protected in its rights in everything that was dear to it as a distinct nationality, and should not lie at the discretion of the majority in this respect, and for this reason I am ready to extend to my Protestant fellow-citizens in Lower Canada of British origin, the fullest justice in all things, and I wish to see their interests as a minority guaranteed and protected in every scheme which may be adopted. With these views on the question of representation, I pronounced in favor of a Confederation of the two Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, as the best means of protecting the varied interests of the two sections. But the Confederation I advocated was a real confederation, giving the largest powers to the local governments, and merely a delegated authority to the General Government—in that respect differing *in toto* from the one now proposed which gives all the powers to the Central Government, and reserves for the local governments the smallest possible amount of freedom of action. There is nothing besides in what I have ever written or said that can be interpreted as favoring a Confederation of all the provinces. This I always opposed. There is no breach of confidence in my saying that in the conversations I had with the Hon. President of the Council, previous to his accepting office, since he has referred to

them himself in a speech which he made when reflected at South Oxford, I positively declined to support any proposition for the Confederation of all the provinces. Very true, sir, I did not refuse to vote for it in committee. I did not vote at all—I was not present when the vote was taken, but I did not conceal my opposition to it. In that speech the Hon. President of the Council also said:—

Before the negotiations were gone through with, I warned the Hon. Messrs. HOLTON and DORION to take action, but they refused me. (Hear, hear.) I felt all the pain of a refusal, but they left me no resource. When the question was asked me by the Government, I said I wanted six members—four from Upper and two from Lower Canada. When asked how many supporters I could bring from Lower Canada, I replied that since Hon. Mr. DORION did not act, I could bring no supporters.

So, sir, I have the best evidence possible to repudiate the accusation that I was in favor of Confederation of all the provinces in the fact that, before there was any question at all as to who should go into the Government, I stated—and that in the hearing of several honorable members now present—that I would have nothing to do with it because I did not conceive it would be for the interest of the country to have such a Confederation, at all events at the present time. (Hear.) Now, sir, I think I have shown that I neither favored representation by population pure and simple, nor a Confederation of the provinces; and when honorable gentlemen state that the necessity of settling the question of representation is the origin of this Federation scheme, they labor under a grave misapprehension. There is nothing further from the fact. (Hear, hear.) The representation question was almost altogether abandoned—was played out; there was no agitation about it, and certainly less than there had been for the last ten years. The honorable member for South Oxford, after adopting the views of the Toronto Convention, still persisted in advocating representation by population, but so changed was the feeling that he could hardly get a debate on the motion he made last session for a committee to consider the constitutional difficulties. There was then another cause for this Confederation scheme of which representation by population was made the pretext. It is not so well known, but far more powerful. In the year 1861, Mr. WATKIN was sent from England by the Grand Trunk

Railway Company. He came with the distinct view of making a large claim on the country for aid, but in the then temper of the people, he soon found that he could not expect to obtain that. Thinking that if he only could put some new scheme afloat which would give a decent pretext to a well disposed Government, he would quietly get the assistance required, he immediately started for the Lower Provinces, and came back after inducing people there to resuscitate the question of the Intercolonial Railway. Parties were readily found to advocate it, if Canada would only pay the piper. (Hear, and a laugh.) A meeting of delegates took place, resolutions were adopted, and an application was made to the Imperial Government for a large contribution to its costs, in the shape of an indemnity for carrying the troops over the road. Mr. WATKIN and Hon. Mr. VANKOUGHNET, who was then a member of the Government, went to England about this scheme, but the Imperial authorities were unwilling to grant the required assistance, and rejected their propositions. Mr. WATKIN, although baffled in his expectations, had not given up his project. He returned again to Canada, and by dint of perseverance, induced my honorable friend on my right (Hon. J. S. MACDONALD) and other honorable members of his Cabinet to enter into his views. As to the advantages of the Intercolonial Railway, I have not the slightest idea that my hon. friend had any suspicion whatsoever of the motives which animated these Grand Trunk officials, and that their object was to have another haul at the public purse for the Grand Trunk—(laughter)—but this was the origin of the revival of the scheme for constructing the Intercolonial Railway.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—We found the project then left to us as a legacy by the CARTER-MACDONALD Administration.

HON. MR. DORION—So it was. The MACDONALD-SICOTTE Government found the matter so far advanced that an arrangement had been made for a meeting of delegates of the several provinces to consider again this railway scheme, the other project having failed. At this meeting of delegates, which took place in September, 1862, a new scheme for building the Intercolonial was adopted, by which Canada was to pay five-twelfths and the Lower Provinces seven-twelfths. So unpopular was this arrangement that when its terms were made known, if a vote of the

people had been taken upon it, not ten out of every hundred, from Sandwich to Gaspé, would have declared in its favor, although Canada was only to pay five-twelfths of its cost. (Hear, hear.) This project having failed, some other scheme had to be concocted for bringing aid and relief to the unfortunate Grand Trunk—and the Confederation of all the British North American Provinces naturally suggested itself to the Grand Trunk officials as the surest means of bringing with it the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) Such was the origin of this Confederation scheme. The Grand Trunk people are at the bottom of it; and I find that at the last meeting of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, Mr. WATKIN did in advance congratulate the shareholders and bondholders on the bright prospects opening before them, by the enhanced value which will be given to their shares and bonds, by the adoption of the Confederation scheme and the construction of the Intercolonial as part of the scheme. (Hear, hear.) I repeat, sir, that representation by population had very little to do with bringing about this measure. The TACHÉ-MACDONALD Government were defeated because the House condemned them for taking without authority \$100,000 out of the public chest for the Grand Trunk Railway, at a time when there had not been a party vote on representation by population for one or two sessions. Those who had been the loudest in their advocacy of it, had let it drop. I was tracked through Lower Canada as being willing to sell Lower Canada, grant representation by population, and destroy Lower Canadian institutions. I thank God, sir, I never insulted Upper Canada, like some of those who reviled me. I never compared the people of Upper Canada to so many codfish. I showed on the contrary that I was always willing to meet the just claims of Upper Canada. (Hear, hear.) Well, without any demand whatever for the agitation of this question, the moment the Government was defeated and there was a necessity for resigning or going before the people, these gentlemen opposite prepared to embrace their greatest opponents and said to themselves, "We will make everything smooth, we will forget past difficulties, provided we can but keep our seats."

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—(Ironically)—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. DORION—I hear a voice, sir, which is well known in this House, the voice of the Attorney General West, saying “hear, hear.” But what was the course of that hon. gentleman last year, when the hon. member for South Oxford had a committee appointed to whom was referred the despatch written by his three colleagues, the Minister of Finance, the Attorney General East and the Hon. Mr. Ross, who is now no longer a minister. He voted against the appointment of the committee, and, after it was named, as a member of it, he voted against the principle of Confederation. (Hear, hear.)

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. DORION—The last vote taken in that committee was about the middle of June, the very day of the crisis, and the hon. gentleman voted against the principle of Confederation of all the provinces, in accordance with the opinions he again and again expressed in this House, as being opposed to all Confederation whatever. (Hear.) When I state that these gentlemen only found out that Confederation was a panacea for all evils, a remedy for all ills, when their seats as ministers were in danger, I come to this conclusion quite legitimately, from facts which are well known to this House. (Hear, hear.) But, sir, it would probably be of very little moment whether I was formerly in favor of Confederation or against it, or whether the Hon. Attorney General West was in favor of Confederation or opposed to it, if the scheme proposed to us were an equitable one, or one calculated to meet the wishes of the people of this country; but, as I said a minute ago, the scheme was not called for by any considerable proportion of the population. It is not laid before the House as one which was demanded by any number of the people; it is not brought down in response to any call from the people; it is a device of men who are in difficulties, for the purpose of getting out of them. (Hear, hear.) The members of the TACHÉ-MACDONALD Government could not appeal to the country after their defeat upon the question, whether they were justified in taking \$100,000 out of the public chest, in addition to the millions they had previously taken, without the consent of Parliament; so, having either to give up their seats or evade that particular issue, they abandoned all their previous opinions, and joined the hon. member for South Oxford in carrying out this Confederation scheme.

(Hear.) I come now to another point, viz., is the scheme presented to us the same one that was promised to us by the Administration when it was formed? This, sir, might be but of slight importance if the manner in which this proposed Constitution was framed had not a most unfortunate bearing on the scheme itself; but it is a grave matter, since the scheme is so objectionable, especially as we are gravely told that it cannot be amended in the least, but that it is brought down as a compact made between the Government of this country and delegates from the governments of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, and Prince Edward Island—as a treaty which cannot be altered or amended in any particular. (Hear.) The plain meaning of this is, sir, that the Lower Provinces have made out a Constitution for us and we are to adopt it. This fact will appear the more clearly when it is considered, as was pointed out much to my surprise, by the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. T. C. WALLBRIDGE), that in the Conference the vote was taken by provinces, putting Upper and Lower Canada, with nearly 2,500,000 people, on no higher level than Prince Edward Island, with its 80,000—on the same level with New Brunswick, with its 250,000—on the same level as Nova Scotia, with its 330,000.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—That is entirely a mistake.

HON. MR. DORION—It was admitted by the Honorable the President of the Council the other evening.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—No, no!

HON. MR. DORION—It was the champion of representation by population who made the statement. He it was that went to Prince Edward Island and asked it to frame a Constitution for this country. (Hear and laughter.) In order to shew, Mr. SPEAKER, that I am not mistaken in what I state, that this scheme is not the one which it was announced in the formation of this Administration was to be brought down—in order to prove, indeed, that it was then determined not to bring down such a measure,—I will cite a declaration made by members of the Government as to the negotiations which took place at its formation. I will read from the *Quebec Morning Chronicle* of June 23rd:—

The Hon. Atty. Gen. MACDONALD, in explaining the negotiations, read the following memorandum:

Memorandum—Confidential.

The Government are prepared to state that immediately after the prorogation, they will address themselves, in the most earnest manner to the negotiation for a Confederation of all the British North American Provinces.

That failing a successful issue to such negotiations, they are prepared to pledge themselves to legislation during the next Session of Parliament for the purpose of remedying the existing difficulties by introducing the Federal principle for Canada alone, coupled with such provisions as will permit the Maritime Provinces and the North-Western Territory to be hereafter incorporated into the Canadian system.

That for the purpose of carrying on the negotiations and settling the details of the promised legislation, a Royal Commission shall be issued, composed of three members of the Government and three members of the Opposition, of whom Mr. BROWN shall be one, and the Government pledge themselves to give all the influence of the Administration to secure to the said Commission the means of advancing the great object in view.

This was the first memorandum communicated to the member for South Oxford, but that hon. member did not accept of it. This memorandum proposed the scheme which is now brought to the House, and I repeat, that scheme was not accepted by the honorable member for South Oxford, but an understanding was come to, which is to be found in the next memorandum, which was communicated to the House in these terms:—

The Government are prepared to pledge themselves to bring in a measure next session for the purpose of removing existing difficulties, by introducing the Federal principle into Canada, coupled with such provisions as will permit the Maritime Provinces and the North-West Territory to be incorporated into the same system of government.

And the Government will seek, by sending representatives to the Lower Provinces and to England, to secure the assent of those interests which are beyond the control of our own legislation to such a measure as will enable all British North America to be united under a General Legislature based upon the Federal system.

There is a vast difference, Mr. SPEAKER, between these two propositions. The first was that the Government would pledge themselves to seek a Confederation of the British American Provinces, and if they failed in that to Federate the two Canadas, and this was rejected; the second, which was accepted by the President of the Council, pledged the Government to bring in a measure for the Confederation of the two Canadas, with provision for

the admission of the other provinces when they thought proper to enter.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—When they were ready.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—Everything is accomplished.

HON. MR. DORION—But, sir, I may be asked, granting all this, granting that the scheme brought down is not the scheme promised to us, what difference our bringing in the provinces at once can make? This I will endeavor to explain. When they went into the Conference, honorable gentlemen opposite submitted to have the votes taken by provinces. Well, they have now brought us in, as was natural under the circumstances, the most conservative measure ever laid before a Parliament. The members of the Upper House are no longer to be elected, but nominated, and nominated by whom? By a Tory or Conservative Government for Canada, by a Conservative Government in Nova Scotia, by a Conservative Government in Prince Edward Island, by a Conservative Government in Newfoundland, the only Liberal Government concerned in the nomination being that which is controlled by the Liberal party in New Brunswick, whose fate depends on the result of the elections that are now going on in that province. Such a scheme would never have been adopted if submitted to the liberal people of Upper Canada. When the Government went into that Conference they were bound by the majority, especially since they voted by provinces, and the 1,400,000 of Upper Canada with the 1,100,000 of Lower Canada—together 2,500,000 people—were over-ridden by 900,000 people of the Maritime Provinces. Were we not expressly told that it was the Lower Provinces who would not hear of our having an elective Legislative Council? If, instead of going into Conference with the people of the Lower Provinces, our Government had done what they pledged themselves to do, that is, to prepare a Constitution themselves, they would never have dared to bring in such a proposition as this which is now imposed upon us by the Lower Colonies—to have a Legislative Council, with a fixed number of members, nominated by four Tory governments. Why, taking the average time each councillor will be in the Council to be fifteen to twenty years, it will take a century before its complexion can be changed. For all time to come, so far as this generation and the next are concerned, you will find the Legislative Council controlled by the influence of the present Government. And is it

to be believed that, as promised in the document we are considering, such a Government as we have "will take care of the Opposition, or consider their right to be represented in the Council?" (Hear, and laughter.) Sir, I thank the delegates for their kind solicitude for the Opposition, but I do not believe they will do anything of the kind. Have we not heard the Honorable Attorney General West, a few nights ago, state, turning to his followers, "If I were to advise the nomination, I should advise the selection of the best men I could find—and of course of my own party?" (Hear.) So it will be, sir; and, if this precious scheme is carried, we shall have a Legislative Council divided in the following proportion:—For Upper Canada, we should probably have liberals in the proportion of three to nine; for I suppose the honorable member for South Oxford has made sacrifices enough to deserve at least that consideration, and, as his friends compose one-fourth of the Executive Council, I dare say we should get one-fourth of the Upper Canada Legislative Councillors liberal too.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Just 25 per cent.

HON. MR. DORION—Just 25 per cent. of liberals for Upper Canada. Then, in addition, we should get from Nova Scotia ten conservatives, from Prince Edward Island four more, and four from Newfoundland. Thus we shall have eighteen conservatives from the Lower Provinces, which, added to thirty-six from Canada, would make fifty-four conservatives against twenty-two liberals, taking the ten New Brunswick councillors to be all liberals. Now, supposing three per cent. as the average number of deaths per annum—the average proportion of change—it would take nearly thirty years to bring about a change in the character of a majority of the Council, even supposing all the additions made to it to be from the liberal ranks. But, sir, that will hardly be the case. In some of the Lower Provinces there will be Conservative governments now and then, and there may occasionally be conservative governments in Canada. (Hear, and laughter.) So this generation will certainly pass away before the views of the Liberal party will ever find expression in the decisions of the Upper House.

MR. MACKENZIE (Lambton)—That makes no difference, as between the two measures.

HON. MR. DORION—The honorable member for Lambton says that makes no dif-

ference. It makes just the difference that we are to be bound by the scheme or by a Constitution enabling the Council to stop all measures of reform, such as would be desired by the Liberal party; if the honorable member for Lambton thinks that makes no difference, I beg to differ from him, and I believe the Liberal party generally will. The Government say they had to introduce certain provisions, not to please themselves, but to please the provinces below, and they have pledged themselves to those provinces that this House will carry out the scheme without amendment. Does not the honorable member see the difference now? If the two Canadas were alone interested, the majority would have its own way—would look into the Constitution closely—would scan its every doubtful provision, and such a proposal as this about the Legislative Council would have no chance of being carried, for it is not very long since the House, by an overwhelming majority, voted for the substitution of an elected for a nominated Upper Chamber. In fact, the nominated Chamber had fallen so low in public estimation—I do not say it was from the fault of the men who were there, but the fact is, nevertheless, as I state it—that it commanded no influence. There was even a difficulty in getting a quorum of it together. So a change became absolutely necessary, and up to the present moment the new system has worked well; the elected members are equal in every respect to the nominated ones, and it is just when we see an interest beginning to be felt in the proceedings of the Upper House that its Constitution is to be changed, to return back again to the one so recently condemned. Back again, did I say? No, sir, a Constitution is to be substituted, much worse than the old one, and such as is nowhere else to be found. Why, even the British House of Lords, conservative as it is, is altogether beyond the influence of the popular sentiment of the country. Their number may be increased on the recommendation of the responsible advisers of the Crown, if required to secure united action or to prevent a conflict between the two Houses. From the position its members occupy, it is a sort of compromise between the popular element and the influence or control of the Crown. But the new House for the Confederation is to be a perfectly independent body—these gentlemen are to be named for life—and there is to be no power to increase their number. How long will the system work without producing a collision between the

two branches of the Legislature? Suppose the Lower House turns out to be chiefly Liberal, how long will it submit to the Upper House, named by Conservative administrations which have taken advantage of their temporary numerical strength to bring about such a change as is now proposed? Remember, sir, that, after all, the power, the influence of the popular branch of the Legislature is paramount. We have seen constitutions like that of England adopted in many countries, and where there existed a nobility, such as in France in 1830, the second chamber was selected from this nobility. In Belgium, where the Constitution is almost a *fac-simile* of that of England, but where there are no aristocracy, they adopted the elective principle for the Upper House, and no where in the world is there a fixed number for it, unless it is also elective. It must be fresh in the memory of a great many members of this House how long the House of Lords resisted the popular demand for reform, and great difficulties were threatened. At last in 1832 the agitation had become so great that the Government determined to nominate a sufficient number of peers to secure the passage of the Reform Bill. The members of the House had to choose between allowing the measure to become law, or see their influence destroyed by the addition of an indefinite number of members. They preferred the first alternative, and thereby quieted an excitement, which if not checked in time, might have created a revolution in England. The influence of the Crown was then exerted in accordance with the views of the people; but here we are to have no such power existing to check the action of our Upper Chamber, and no change can be made in its composition except as death might slowly remove its members. I venture to prophesy, sir, that before a very short time has elapsed a dead-lock may arise, and such an excitement be created as has never yet been seen in this country. (Hear, hear.) Now, if this Constitution had been framed by the members of our Government, we could change some of its provisions—this provision would most certainly be altered—there is not a man in the Liberal ranks who dare vote for such a proposition as this, that could go before his constituents and say, "I have taken away the influence and control of the people over the Upper Chamber, and I have created an entirely independent body, to be chosen by the present governments of the several provinces." But no, the Constitution is in the nature of a compact, a treaty, and

cannot be changed. (Hear.) But, sir, the composition of the Legislative Council becomes of more importance when we consider that the governors of the local legislatures are to be appointed by the General Government, as well as the Legislative Council; their appointment is to be for five years, and they are not to be removed without cause. I will venture upon another prediction and say we shall find there will be no such thing as responsible government attached to the local legislatures.

MR. DUNKIN—There cannot be.

HON. MR. DORION—There will be two, three, or four ministers chosen by the lieutenant-governors and who will conduct the administration of the country, as was formerly done in the times of Sir FRANCIS BOND HEAD, Sir JOHN COLBORN, or Sir JAMES CRAIG. You will have governments, the chief executives of which will be appointed and hold office at the will of the Governor. If that is not to be the case, why do not honorable gentlemen lay their scheme before us? (Hear.) Is this House, sir, going to vote a Constitution with the Upper House as proposed, without knowing what sort of local legislatures we are to have to govern us? Suppose, after we have adopted the main scheme, the Government come down with a plan for settling the local legislatures upon which great differences of opinion will arise, may it not happen then that the majority from Lower Canada will unite with a minority from Upper Canada and impose upon that section a local Constitution distasteful to a large majority of the people of Upper Canada. The whole scheme, sir, is absurd from beginning to end. It is but natural that gentlemen with the views of honorable gentlemen opposite want to keep as much power as possible in the hands of the Government—that is the doctrine of the Conservative party everywhere—that is the line which distinguishes the Tories from the Whigs—the Tories always side with the Crown, and the Liberals always want to give more power and influence to the people. The instincts of honorable gentlemen opposite, whether you take the Hon. Attorney General East or the Hon. Attorney General West, lead them to this—they think the hands of the Crown should be strengthened and the influence of the people, if possible, diminished—and this Constitution is a specimen of their handiwork, with a Governor-General appointed by the Crown; with local governors also, appointed by the Crown; with legislative councils, in the General Legislature, and in all the provinces, nominated by the

Crown; we shall have the most illiberal Constitution ever heard of in any country where constitutional government prevails. (Hear.) The Speaker of the Legislative Council is also to be appointed by the Crown, this is another step backwards, and a little piece of patronage for the Government. We have heard in a speech lately delivered in Prince Edward Island or New Brunswick, I forget which, of the allurements offered to the delegates while here in the shape of prospective appointments as judges of the Court of Appeal, Speaker of the Legislative Council, and local governors—(hear, hear)—as one of the reasons assigned for the great unanimity which prevailed in the Conference.

HON. MR. HOLTON—They will divide all these nice things amongst them. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. DORION—I do not accuse honorable gentlemen of holding out these inducements, I only mention the fact from a speech I have read on the subject.

HON. MR. HOLTON—It was a speech of one of the delegates. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. DORION—I now come to another point. It is said that this Confederation is necessary for the purpose of providing a better mode of defence for this country. There may be people who think that by adding two and two together you make five. I am not of that opinion. I cannot see how by adding the 700,000 or 800,000 people, the inhabitants of the Lower Provinces, to the 2,500,000 inhabitants of Canada, you can multiply them so as to make a much larger force to defend the country than you have at present. Of course the connection with the British Empire is the link of communication by which the whole force of the Empire can be brought together for defence. (Hear, hear.) But the position of this country under the proposed scheme is very evident. You add to the frontier four or five hundred more miles than you now have, and an extent of country immeasurably greater in proportion than the additional population you have gained; and if there is an advantage at all for the defence of the country, it will be on the part of the Lower Provinces and not for us. And as we find that we are about to enter into a very large expenditure for this purpose of defence—this having been formally announced in a speech delivered by the President of the Council at Toronto—and as Canada is to contribute to that expenditure to the extent of ten-twelfths of the whole, the other provinces paying only

two-twelfths, it follows that Canada will pay ten-twelfths also of the cost of defence, which, to defend the largely extended country we will have to defend, will be much larger than if we remained alone. I find in the speech delivered by the President of the Council on that occasion, this statement:—

I cannot conclude without referring to some other things which have received the grave attention of the Conference. And the first point to which I desire to call attention is the fact that the delegates have unanimously resolved that the united provinces shall be placed at the earliest moment in a thorough state of defence. The attacks which have been made upon us have created the impression that these provinces are in a weak and feeble state; if, then, we would do away with this false impression and place ourselves on a firm and secure footing in the eyes of the world, our course must be to put our country in such a position of defence that we may fearlessly look our enemies in the face. It is a pleasure to me to state, and I am sure it must be a pleasure to all present to be informed, that the Conference at Quebec did not separate before entering into a pledge to put the military and naval defences of the united provinces in a most complete and satisfactory condition.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Where is that resolution? (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. DORION—It appears then that our course is to put "the military and naval defences" into "a most complete and satisfactory condition." Now I find that, according to these resolutions, the General Government is to have control of "the military and naval defences," but, of course, the cost of them is not stated. This I contend, then, that if the military and naval defences of all the provinces are to be provided for by the General Government, and if you have to increase the militia for this purpose, the Lower Provinces will pay only their proportion of two-twelfths, and Canada, while obtaining no greater defensive force than at present, will have to pay five times as much as we are now paying. (Hear, hear.) Why, sir, take the line dividing New Brunswick from Maine and you find it separates on the one side 250,000, thinly scattered over a vast territory, from 750,000 on the other, compact and powerful. These 250,000 Canada will have to defend, and it will have to pledge its resources for the purpose of providing means of defence along that extended line. (Hear, hear.) And, if rumor be true, the Intercolonial Railway, this so-called great defensive work, is not to pass along Major ROBINSON'S line. The statement has been made—I have seen it in newspapers usually well informed—that a new route has

been found that will satisfy everybody or nobody at all; and while I am on this point I must say that it is most singular that we are called upon to vote these resolutions, and to pledge ourselves to pay ten-twelfths of the cost of that railway, without knowing whether there will be ten miles or one hundred miles of it in Lower Canada, or whether it will cost \$10,000,000 or \$20,000,000.

HON. MR. HOLT—It will be nearer \$40,000,000. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. DORION—In 1862, when the question of the construction of this road was before the country, what was the cry raised by honorable gentlemen opposite? Why, that the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Government had pledged itself to build a railway at whatever cost it might come to; and those who were loudest in these denunciations, were the very gentlemen who have now undertaken to build the road without knowing or even enquiring what the cost of it will be. (Hear, hear.) This, if I remember right, was the purport of a speech made by the Hon. Attorney General West at Ottaville. (Hear, hear.) I was satisfied, sir, at that time, to press my objections to the scheme and retire from the Government; but my colleagues were denounced without stint for having undertaken to build the railway and pay seven-twelfths of its cost, and now the House is asked by the very men who denounced them to pay ten-twelfths of it, without even knowing whether the work is practicable or not. (Hear, hear.) We have heard for some time past that the engineer, Mr. FLEMING, is prepared to make his report. Why is it not forthcoming?—why has it been kept back? The representatives of the people in this House will show an utter disregard of their duty if they do not insist upon having that report, and full explanations respecting the undertaking, as well as the scheme for the constitution of the local governments, before they vote upon the resolutions before the House. (Hear, hear.) It is folly to suppose that this Intercolonial Railway will in the least degree be conducive to the defence of the country. We have expended a large sum of money—and none voted it more cordially and heartily than myself—for the purpose of opening a military highway from Gaspé to Rimouski; and that road, in case of hostilities with our neighbors, would be found of far greater service for the transport of troops, cannon and all kinds of munitions of war, than any railway following the same or a more southern

route possibly can be. That road cannot be effectually destroyed; but a railway lying in some places not more than fifteen or twenty miles from the frontier, will be of no use whatever, because of the readiness with which it may be attacked and seized. An enemy could destroy miles of it before it would be possible to resist him, and in time of difficulty it would be a mere trap for the troops passing along it, unless we had almost an army to keep it open. Upon this question of defence, we have heard so much during the past two or three years that I think it is time now we should have some plain explanations about it. We heard the other day from the honorable member for West Montreal—and I am always glad to quote him, he is usually so correct—(laughter)—that in less than a year the American army, the army of the Northern States, was increased from 9,000 to 800,000 men ready for service, and that in less than four years they were able to put to sea a fleet which, in point of numbers—I do not say in armament or value—was equal to the entire naval force of England. Well, the honorable gentleman might have gone further and shown that within a period of four years the Northern States have called into the field 2,300,000 men—as many armed men as we have men, women and children in the two Canadas—and that we hear every day of more being raised and equipped. It is stated that, in view of these facts, it is incumbent upon us to place ourselves in a state of defence. Sir, I say it here candidly and honestly, that we are bound to do everything we can to protect the country—(hear, hear, hear)—but we are not bound to ruin ourselves in anticipation of a supposed invasion which we could not repel, even with the assistance of England. The battles of Canada cannot be fought on the frontier, but on the high seas and at the great cities on the Atlantic coast; and it will be nothing but folly for us to cripple ourselves by spending fifteen or twenty millions a year to raise an army of 50,000 men for the purpose of resisting an invasion of the country. The best thing that Canada can do is to keep quiet, and to give no cause for war. (Hear, hear.) Let the public opinion of this country compel the press to cease the attacks it is every day making upon the Government and people of the United States; and then if war does come between England and the States—even if from no fault of ours—we will cast our lot with England and help her to fight the battle; but in the meantime it is no use what-

ever to raise or keep up anything like a standing army.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—Will my honorable friend let me ask him how we can assist England in a war on the high seas unless we have a naval force?

HON. MR. DORION—The honorable member for Peterborough stated the other day, and correctly I believe, that the place for our militia was behind the fortifications of our fortified places, where they would count for something to be of some use. No doubt of this. Why, sir, it is absurd to speak of defending this country with such a force as we could maintain when we have the recent example before our eyes of a country in Europe possessing as large a defensive force, literally wiped off the map by an invading army of some 75,000 or 80,000 men. The kingdom of Denmark consists now of only two small islands—less by far, in extent, than one of our large counties; and this dismemberment has been forced upon it, although it had a standing army of 30,000 men, and the feeling of the whole population was in favor of the war. (Hear, hear.) I do not use this argument for the purpose of showing that something ought not to be done respecting our militia. I am willing that we should make sacrifices, if necessary, for the purpose of organizing it thoroughly; but I am decidedly opposed to a standing army, and do not believe we could raise an army now that would be able to withstand the force that could be sent against it. (Hear, hear.) We have sent to the frontier 2,000 men, whose services for a year will cost us a million and a-half; and at the same rate of expenditure, 50,000 men would cost us over thirty millions of money. Now, if the whole defence of the country is to rest upon us, I ask again what would such a force amount to? (Hear, hear.) Now, sir, when I look into the provisions of this scheme, I find another most objectionable one. It is that which gives the General Government control over all the acts of the local legislatures. What difficulties may not arise under this system? Now, knowing that the General Government will be party in its character, may it not for party purposes reject laws passed by the local legislatures and demanded by a majority of the people of that locality. This power conferred upon the General Government has been compared to the veto power that exists in England in respect to our legislation; but we know that the statesmen of England are not actuated by the local feelings and

prejudices, and do not partake of the local jealousies, that prevail in the colonies. The local governments have therefore confidence in them, and respect for their decisions; and generally, when a law adopted by a colonial legislature is sent to them, if it does not clash with the policy of the Empire at large, it is not disallowed, and more especially of late has it been the policy of the Imperial Government to do whatever the colonies desire in this respect, when their wishes are constitutionally expressed. The axiom on which they seem to act is that the less they hear of the colonies the better. (Hear, hear.) But how different will be the result in this case, when the General Government exercises the veto power over the acts of local legislatures. Do you not see that it is quite possible for a majority in a local government to be opposed to the General Government; and in such a case the minority would call upon the General Government to disallow the laws enacted by the majority? The men who shall compose the General Government will be dependent for their support upon their political friends in the local legislatures, and it may so happen that, in order to secure this support, or in order to serve their own purposes or that of their supporters, they will veto laws which the majority of a local legislature find necessary and good. (Hear, hear.) We know how high party feeling runs sometimes upon local matters even of trivial importance, and we may find parties so hotly opposed to each other in the local legislatures, that the whole power of the minority may be brought to bear upon their friends who have a majority in the General Legislature, for the purpose of preventing the passage of some law objectionable to them but desired by the majority of their own section. What will be the result of such a state of things but bitterness of feeling, strong political acrimony and dangerous agitation? (Hear, hear.) Then sir, I find that in addition to all the other sums that are to be paid by the general to the local governments, there are provisions in favor of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, which must strike the House as being of a rather extraordinary nature. In the document which was sent by the Provincial Secretary to the members of this House marked "Private," there appears to have been a mistake. It was therein stated that the General Government would have no right to impose an export duty on timber, logs, masts, spars, deals and sawn lumber; but that the local governments would have the power

to impose export duties on these articles. This provision, it seems, was too favorable to Lower Canada; for it would have allowed Lower Canada to impose an export duty upon Upper Canadian timber.

HON. MR. HOLTON—As New Brunswick does upon American.

HON. MR. DORION—And by this means raise a sufficient revenue, at the expense of Upper Canada, to meet its local expenditure. This mistake seems to have been corrected, for, in this respect, the resolutions before the House have been changed, but hardly amended.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Changed in a sense hostile to Lower Canada. (Hear.)

HON. MR. DORION—The clause of the resolutions to which I refer now reads, that the General Parliament shall have power to make laws "respecting the imposition or regulation of duties of customs on imports and exports—except on exports of timber, logs, masts, spars, deals and sawn lumber from New Brunswick, and of coal and other minerals from Nova Scotia." That is, the General Government may impose a tax for its own benefit upon all timber and minerals exported from Upper or Lower Canada, but not from New Brunswick or Nova Scotia. (Hear, hear.) Then, among the powers granted to local legislatures, we find the power to pass by-laws imposing direct taxation. (Hear, hear.) That is the first power they have, and I have no doubt that, before many months have passed after they are constituted, they will find it necessary to resort to it. But, in addition to this, I find that New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, which, no doubt, are the favored children of the Confederation, have powers not granted to the other provinces. New Brunswick, the resolution declares, shall have the power to impose an export duty on timber, logs, masts, spars, deals and sawn lumber, and Nova Scotia on coal and other minerals, for local purposes; so that while our timber and minerals exported from Upper and Lower Canada will be taxed by the General Government for general purposes, the timber and minerals of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia will be exempt, the revenue derived from them going to the benefit of the local governments, to be expended on local objects. (Hear, hear.) This is one of the results of the Conference in which, of course, New Brunswick counted as much as Upper and Lower Canada, and Nova Scotia and the other Lower Provinces had the balance of influence. (Hear, hear.) Now, among the other powers granted to the

General Government is its control over agriculture and immigration, as well as the fisheries. An honorable member from Upper Canada (Mr. MACKENZIE of Lambton), enquired very anxiously, yesterday, if it was possible that any act respecting agriculture could be affected by the General Government? Well, sir, it is as plain as can be that agriculture and immigration are to be under the control of both the local and the general legislatures. And the forty-fifth resolution says:—"In regard to all subjects over which jurisdiction belongs to the general and local legislatures, the laws of the General Parliament shall control and supersede those made by the Local Legislature, and the latter shall be void so far as they are repugnant to or inconsistent with the former." What will be the operation of this provision? The Local Legislature will pass a law which will then go to the General Government; the latter will put its veto upon it, and if that does not answer, it will pass a law contrary to it, and you have at once a conflict. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—Then they will fight. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) No sectional difficulties then!

HON. MR. DORION—Oh! none whatever. I may pass now perhaps to the consideration of a portion of the financial part of the scheme. I shall certainly not attempt to follow the Hon. Finance Minister in what I admit was the able statement, or rather able manipulation of figures, he made the other day. When that honorable gentleman was able to prove to the satisfaction of the BARINGS, the GLYNS, and the leading merchants of England that the investment they would make in the Grand Trunk Railway would yield them at least 11 per cent., it is not astonishing that he was able to show to this House that the finances of the Confederation will be in a most flourishing condition, and that we shall have a surplus every year of at least a million dollars. (Laughter.) From what I knew of former prophecies, I imagined he would make it eleven or twelve millions at any rate, but he is modest and puts it down at only a million. But how does he make out even this moderate surplus? He takes, in the first place, the revenue of Newfoundland for 1862. I had the curiosity to look for the reason, and what do you suppose it is? The revenue for 1862 was the highest he could find, except 1860. (Hear, hear.) Then he takes the revenue of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Canada, for 1863—the highest figures again. (Hear, hear.) Taking all this, he still finds a de-

iciency of \$827,512, which he provides for by adding a supposed increase for 1864 of \$100,000 for each of the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and of \$1,500,000 for Canada. (Hear, hear.) And this leaves a surplus of just \$872,488. (Hear, hear.) Well, even granting that on the 31st of December he had a surplus of a million, if at the end of the present financial year it is not diminished to half a million by his militia and other expenditure, I shall be very agreeably surprised. (Hear.) This, then, is the inducement he offers to the country to adopt this scheme. I have a million more than I want, he exclaims, and I will reduce the duties to 15 per cent. But the honorable gentleman forgets that he has the Intercolonial Railway to provide for, as well as that military and naval defensive force which we are going to raise. (Hear, hear.) He forgets all this, but the promise is there; and just as he held out to the expected shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway the 11 per cent. dividends upon their investments, he now tells the people of these several colonies that the customs duties will be reduced to 15 per cent. (Hear, hear.) I do not desire to go over the figures the honorable gentleman has laid before the House, for I have not the talent of grouping them together, so as to present an attractive, but deceptive, whole, that he possesses in such an eminent degree. I find in the resolutions now proposed a few propositions to which I would call the attention of the House. The first thing that the Confederation will have to provide for is the Intercolonial Railway, which will certainly cost twenty millions of dollars, the interest upon which, at 5 per cent., will amount to one million of dollars annually. (Hear, hear.) Then to Newfoundland we are bound to pay \$150,000 a year, for all time to come, to purchase the mineral lands of that colony; while, as regards the other provinces, all the public lands are given up to the local governments. But that is not all, for, in order to manage these "valuable lands" in Newfoundland, we shall have to establish a Crown Lands department under the General Government; and if honorable gentlemen desire to learn something of the probable expense of such an establishment, they need only refer to a return brought down last night, by which they will see that there are no less than sixty or seventy officers in the Crown Lands department, and that some eight or ten new appointments have been made since March last, when the present Government was formed.

(Hear, hear.) This return is a highly instructive one in other respects. It shows that within that period there is not a department of the Government that has not increased its force of employes, except that of the Attorney General East, who is satisfied with the three officers it contained before he returned to the Government. (Hear, hear.) I may state, however, that in the return there is an omission which ought to be supplied. The honorable gentleman has made a large number of appointments connected with the administration of justice in Lower Canada that are not mentioned. This return is, however, instructive as showing the additional number of appointments that have been made within the past year in all the departments—several of whom have been taken from their seats in this House and appointed to offices to make room for others here.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Oh! there are only four of them—that's all. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. DORION—Then New Brunswick is to get a special subsidy of \$63,000 a year for ten years. It is evident this sum is voted to that province to enable it to avoid the necessity of direct taxation.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Of course it could not impose direct taxation, for it has no municipal machinery. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. DORION—Now, I find from a speech delivered by Hon. Mr. TILLEY, the head of the New Brunswick Government, that this grant of \$63,000 a year, beyond the subsidy of 80 cents per head of the population for the purposes of local government, will give New Brunswick \$34,000 a-year over and above all its necessities. (Hear, hear.) Under these circumstances, there need be no direct taxation in that province. The whole speech of Hon. Mr. TILLEY, to which I refer, would be found very instructive if I could read it all, but I am afraid of wearying the House. (Cries of "go on.") Well, after reciting the various advantages that will be conferred on New Brunswick by Confederation, Hon. Mr. TILLEY says:—

Over and above all these advantages, we get for ten years a subsidy of \$63,000 per annum; our local expenditures, summed up, amount to \$320,630; and we get from the General Government, without increased taxation, \$90,000 in lieu of our export duty (it should be "import duty,") and casual territorial revenue, making \$201,637, and a special subsidy of \$63,000 a year for ten years, making in all \$354,637, being \$34,000 over and above our present necessities. These are the principal points looked to. (Hear, hear.) But, honorable gentlemen will remember Hon.

Mr. TILLEY declared—no Intercolonial Railway, no Confederation—and Canada gave him what he wanted. (Hear, hear.) It is not New Brunswick alone that is to get something handsome over and above its necessities. I have here a letter from the Charlottetown (P. E. I.) *Examiner*, wherein Mr. WHELAN, the editor, and one of the delegates at the Quebec Conference, sums up the advantages to be obtained by Prince Edward Island pretty much as Hon. Mr. TILLEY does for New Brunswick. He says:—

By this arrangement the debt of Prince Edward Island will be guaranteed to the amount of \$2,025,000—the interest of which, at five per cent. will be \$101,250. Add to this the proportion which the Confederation has given to each province for the support of their local administration, at the rate of 80 cents per head, giving for the population of Prince Edward Island, which is 81,000, the sum of \$64,800; we have then a total of \$166,050, which Prince Edward Island will receive annually. Deduct from this sum \$12,000 for interest at five per cent. on our debt of £75,000 or \$240,000, and the balance in our favor will be \$154,050, which sum exceeds by nearly forty-eight thousand dollars the actual cost of our local affairs, the Central Government undertaking to pay certain general expenses. (Hear, hear.)

The general expenses he alludes to are the salaries of the governor, judges, and so on, which the General Government will pay. Thus, sir, we have Mr. WHELAN, one of the delegates, and Hon. Mr. TILLEY, another, chuckling over the good bargains they have made at the expense of Canada, and endeavoring in this manner to carry the scheme of Confederation by showing that New Brunswick is to have \$34,000 over and above its necessities, and Prince Edward Island \$48,000. I would advise the Hon. Finance Minister, when he is in distress for want of money, to go down there and borrow this surplus which we will have to pay to these provinces; they will no doubt, be willing to lend on favorable terms. (Laughter.) I have entered into a short calculation to show what proportion Upper and Lower Canada will respectively have to bear of these additional burdens,—\$63,000 a year for ten years to New Brunswick, would make a capital at five per cent. of about \$350,000.

HON. MR. HOLTON—More near \$400,000.

HON. MR. DORION—My calculation is rather under than over the mark, but let us take \$350,000 as the capitalized value of this annuity for ten years. That gives an interest of \$17,500 per annum forever. Now, supposing the increased extent of territory to be

defended under the Confederation augments the militia expenditure to the extent of a million a year—this, I think, is a very reasonable estimate, and will not go very far towards carrying out the intentions of the Conference respecting military and naval defence, as explained by the President of the Council to his Toronto audience. Then add the interest of the sum required to build the Intercolonial Railway, five per cent. on \$20,000,000, and we have an annual payment of \$1,000,000 more, which is increased by \$150,000, the indemnity paid to Newfoundland for its valuable mineral lands. Then we have to pay the local governments, at the rate of 80 cents per head, \$3,056,849. The interest on the debt of Nova Scotia, \$8,000,000, will amount to \$400,000; on that of New Brunswick, \$7,000,000, to \$350,000; on that of Newfoundland, \$3,250,000, to \$162,000; and on the debt of Prince Edward Island, \$2,021,425, to \$101,071. Adding all these sums together, we find that the annual expenditure, in addition be it remembered to the burdens which we now bear, will be \$6,237,920—(hear, hear)—representing a capital of \$124,758,400. (Hear, hear.) The share of Canada in this annual expenditure will be \$1.89 per head, amounting to the sum of \$4,725,000. This is altogether irrespective of the debt of \$62,500,000 with which Canada enters the union. The share of Upper Canada, according to population, will be \$2,646,000; but Upper Canadians have long claimed that they paid upwards of two-thirds of the expenditure, and the *Globe* lately said that this was the proportion ten years ago, but that the disparity had greatly increased since. If Upper Canada really pays two-thirds of the expenditure, its share in the additional but necessary expenditure will be \$3,183,334 per annum. (Hear, hear.) This is taking for granted that the Lower Provinces should pay their share according to population. I have my doubts about that, and I believe that the city of Montreal pays a little more duty on imports than Prince Edward, and more, perhaps, than Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland put together, and that the population of the District of Montreal pay a good deal more per head than that of New Brunswick.

MR. H. F. MACKENZIE—Do you mean the local consumption?

HON. MR. DORION—I mean to say that the inhabitants of the city of Montreal pay a great deal more than the inhabitants of any similar portion of any of the provinces, and that the district of Montreal consumes as much as any other section of the same extent and

population. But I have taken these figures, as to the relative contribution of Upper and Lower Canada to the revenue, as given by the organ of the President of the Council. But, sir, we have been told, for ten years past, that Upper Canada wanted representation by population for nothing else but because Lower Canada was spending the money of the province lavishly—two-thirds of it coming from the pockets of the people of Upper Canada. We have been told that it was not to interfere with the institutions, language, or laws of Lower Canada, but merely to give Upper Canada proper control over the finances. That was the only thing to be gained by it.

MR. A. MACKENZIE—No, no!

HON. MR. DORION—Perhaps the honorable gentleman will recollect a letter written by the honorable member for Montreal West to "my dear friend MACARROW," of Kingston. It was on the eve of the general election in June 1861, and intended to induce the people of Upper Canada to join in putting out that bad Administration that had been the bane of the country—the CARTIER-MACDONALD Administration. The reasons which were given were as follows:—

First.—Because they collectively violated the Constitution, and outraged the moral sense of the country by the double-shuffle and double swearing of 1858. *Second.*—Because they violated the Constitution by allowing payments, and granting gratuities, and giving or procuring lucrative contracts for members of Parliament, or their supporters, as witness the payments, grants and contracts made or given to Mr. TURCOTTE, Mr. McLEOD, Mr. BENJAMIN, Mr. A. P. MACDONALD, and Mr. McMICKEN. *Third.*—Because they violated the Constitution by keeping for three sessions Messrs. ALLEYN, DUBORD and SIMARD in their seats for Quebec on a pretended majority of 15,000 votes. *Fourth.*—Because they violated the Constitution by justifying the sale of offices in Sheriff MERCER's case, and in retaining the Hon. Col. PRINCE in the Upper House as their active partisan, after his office had been created and his commission made out, as Judge of the District of Algoma. *Fifth.*—Because they violated the Constitution by keeping JOSEPH C. MORRISON in the Cabinet, as Minister of the Crown, after he had been three times rejected by the people. *Sixth.*—Because they violated the Constitution in abandoning to the discretion of Sir EDMUND HEAD personally, the sole representation of the people of Canada, during the memorable visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of WALES. *Seventh.*—Because they have continuously and systematically violated the Constitution in expending vast sums of money, amounting in the aggregate to several millions of dollars, without the authority of Parliament.

Sir, I advise the honorable gentleman to continue that correspondence and add the \$100,000 which the Grand Trunk Railway had got, and the bill of exchange affair.

MR. POWELL—The Confederation is worth all that. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. DORION—The letter proceeds to say:—

This indictment will be admitted to contain grave misdemeanors and breaches of trust, which ought to be punished by the people, now that they have the offenders up for judgment. Whatever differences of opinion may exist among the Opposition, whether members or leaders, as to the nature and extent of the constitutional reforms demanded in our present frame of Government, there is not a shadow of difference in this point, that some remedy must be found at once for the unprincipled expenditure of the public money which is daily demoralizing our public men, beggaring the country, and retarding its natural ratio of increase. We want, first of all, an honest government, a really responsible government—which, except in the clearest case of necessity, such as an invasion of the soil, will not on any pretext whatever lavish the people's money without the authority of the people's representatives.

Well, sir, this was the advice given to Upper Canada in 1861, by one of the leaders, the present Hon. Minister of Agriculture.

HON. MR. MCGEE—What has that to do with the union of the provinces?

HON. MR. DORION—It has much to do with it. It shows that representation by population was put forth as a remedy for the financial evils of our present system of government. Under this advice Upper Canada gave a large majority against the Government of the day, and the members elected turned round, and by abandoning, for a time at least, representation by population, they acknowledged that the financial question was paramount to it. I have shown, Mr. SPEAKER, I think, the proportion which Upper Canada would have to pay of the increased expenditure which must immediately ensue from the adoption of Confederation which is proposed to free Upper Canada from a larger expenditure by Lower Canada than what she contributes to the revenue. Now, let us see what that expenditure is. The whole expenditure of the province exclusive of interest on public debt, costs of legislation, militia, subsidy to ocean steamers and collection of revenue, which will have to be paid even with Confederation, if it takes place, does not amount to more than \$2,500,000, or one dollar per head of the whole population. Then supposing that

Upper Canada pays two-thirds of that sum, or \$1,666,666, and Lower Canada one-third, Upper Canada would only pay \$266,666 more than her share according to population. And it is, I say, to get rid of this expenditure of a couple of hundred thousand dollars that the Upper Canadian members of the Government propose that their section of the country should pay an additional yearly expenditure of \$3,181,000, yielding no return whatsoever—(hear, hear)—and to saddle on Lower Canada an additional expenditure of from \$1,500,000 to \$2,000,000 a year—the amount depending on the proportion which they respectively contribute to the revenue of the country. And, Mr. SPEAKER, this is only the immediate and necessary expenditure that will fall upon the people of Canada at the very outset. There is not a single sixpence in this estimate for any improvements to be made in the eastern or western portion of the Confederacy. (Hear, hear.) But, sir, respecting the defences of the country, I should have said at an earlier stage of my remarks that this scheme proposes a union not only with Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and Newfoundland, but also with British Columbia and Vancouver's Island. Although I have not been able to get the information from the Government—for they do not seem to be very ready to give information—yet I understand that there are despatches to hand, stating that resolutions have been adopted in the Legislature of British Columbia asking for admission into the Confederation at once. I must confess, Mr. SPEAKER, that it looks like a burlesque to speak as a means of defence of a scheme of Confederation to unite the whole country extending from Newfoundland to Vancouver's Island, thousands of miles intervening without any communication, except through the United States or around Cape Horn. (Oh!)

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—There is an Inter-oceanic Railway to be built.

HON. MR. DORION—Yes, I suppose that is another necessity of Confederation, to which we may soon look forward. Some western extension of this Grand Trunk scheme for the benefit of Messrs. WATKIN & Co., of the new Hudson's Bay Company. So far as Lower Canada is concerned, I need hardly stop to point out the objections to the scheme. It is evident, from what has transpired, that it is intended eventually to form a legislative union of all the provinces. The local governments, in addition to the General Government, will be found so burdensome, that a

majority of the people will appeal to the Imperial Government for the formation of a legislative union. (Hear, hear.) I may well ask if there is any member from Lower Canada, of French extraction, who is ready to vote for a legislative union. What do I find in connection with the agitation of this scheme? The honorable member for Sherbrooke stated at the dinner to the delegates given at Toronto, after endorsing everything that had been said by the Honorable President of the Council:—

We may hope that, at no far distant day, we may become willing to enter into a Legislative Union instead of a federal union, as now proposed. We would have all have desired a legislative union, and to see the power concentrated in the Central Government as it exists in England, spreading the ægis of its protection over all the institutions of the land, but we found it was impossible to do that at first. We found that there were difficulties in the way which could not be overcome.

Honorable members from Lower Canada are made aware that the delegates all desired a legislative union, but it could not be accomplished at once. This Confederation is the first necessary step towards it. The British Government is ready to grant a Federal union at once, and when that is accomplished the French element will be completely overwhelmed by the majority of British representatives. What then would prevent the Federal Government from passing a set of resolutions in a similar way to those we are called upon to pass, without submitting them to the people, calling upon the Imperial Government to set aside the Federal form of government and give a legislative union instead of it? (Hear, hear.) Perhaps the people of Upper Canada think a legislative union a most desirable thing. I can tell those gentlemen that the people of Lower Canada are attached to their institutions in a manner that defies any attempt to change them in that way. They will not change their religious institutions, their laws and their language, for any consideration whatever. A million of inhabitants may seem a small affair to the mind of a philosopher who sits down to write out a constitution. He may think it would be better that there should be but one religion, one language and one system of laws, and he goes to work to frame institutions that will bring all to that desirable state; but I can tell honorable gentlemen that the history of every country goes to show that not even by the power of the sword can such changes be

accomplished. (Hear, hear.) We have the history of the Greek race, having at one time a population of six millions, dwindling down to seven hundred thousand, and we find them even then, after several centuries of oppression, rising up and asserting their rights. (Hear, hear.) We have the same circumstance in the history of Belgium, which was united to Holland with a view to secure the assimilation of the two countries, but fifteen years of trial had hardly elapsed when the whole of the Belgium people and Government rose *en masse* to protest against that union, and to assert their separate nationality. (Hear, hear.) Sir, it is not only from the history of the past we may derive the lesson, but we have the circumstances of the present generation to guide us. I am astonished to see the honorable member for Montreal West helping a scheme designed to end in a legislative union, the object of which can only be to assimilate the whole people to the dominant population. In that honorable gentleman's own country the system has produced nothing but a dissatisfied and rebellious people. Is it desirable that in this country then we should pass a measure calculated to give dissatisfaction to a million of people? You may ascertain what the cost of keeping down a million of dissatisfied people is by the scenes that have been and are now transpiring on the other side of the line, where a fifth of the people of the United States has risen and has caused more misery and misfortune to be heaped upon that country than could have been wrought in centuries of peaceful compromising legislation. Sir, if a legislative union of the British American Provinces is attempted, there will be such an agitation in this portion of the province as was never witnessed before—you will see the whole people of Lower Canada clinging together to resist by all legal and constitutional means, such an attempt at wresting from them those institutions that they now enjoy. They would go as a body to the Legislature, voting as one man, and caring for nothing else but for the protection of their beloved institutions and law, and making government all but impossible. The ninety Irish members in the British House of Commons, composed as it is of nearly seven hundred members, by voting together have caused their influence to be felt, as in the grants to the Maynooth College and some other questions. It would be the same way with the people of Lower Canada, and a more deplorable state of things would be the inevitable result. The majority would be forced by the minority to

do things they would not, under the circumstances, think of doing. This is a state so undesirable that, although I am strongly opposed to the proposed Federal union, I am still more strongly opposed to a legislative union. Those who desire a legislative union may see from this what discordant elements they would have to deal with in undertaking the task, and what misery they would bring upon the country by such a step. (Hear, hear.) I know there is an apprehension among the British population in Lower Canada that, with even the small power that the Local Government will possess, their rights will not be respected. How, then, can it be expected that the French population can anticipate any more favorable result from the General Government, when it is to possess such enormous powers over the destinies of their section of the country? Experience shows that majorities are always aggressive, and it cannot well be otherwise in this instance. It therefore need not be wondered at that the people of Lower Canada, of British origin, are ready to make use of every means to prevent their being placed at the mercy of a preponderating population of a different origin. I agree with them in thinking that they ought to take nothing on trust in this matter of entering upon a new state of political existence, and neither ought we of French origin to do so, in relation to the General Government, however happy our relations to each other may be at present.

HON. MR. MCGEE—That is a glorious doctrine to instil into society. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. DORION—Well it is the doctrine generally acted upon, and correctly so. When my honorable friend makes a contract with a friend and neighbor to be filled even a few months in the future, does he not have it put in legal form, in black and white? Of course he does. And when we are making arrangements calculated to last for all time to come, is it not vastly more important that the same safe and equitable principle should be recognized? (Hear, hear.) The honorable gentleman recognized it himself in the most marked manner, by placing in the resolutions guarantees respecting the educational institutions of the two sections of Canada. The Roman Catholics of Upper Canada were anxious to have their rights protected against the hand of the Protestant majority, and, where the Protestants are in a minority, they are just as anxious to have their rights permanently protected. But, sir, the whole scheme, since it must be taken or rejected as

a whole, is one which I do not think any honorable member of this House can really endorse in an unreserved manner, if he were to speak his sentiments freely. I see nothing in it but another railway scheme for the benefit of a few—and I cannot better describe the whole project than by a quotation from the remarks of a gentleman, who expressed himself on the subject of Confederation and the Intercolonial Railway a very short time before he became a member of the present Administration, and a warm advocate of both these bubbles. After speaking of the visit of Mr. WATKIN to this country, he closes with the following:—

If our Government were to rush into the railway project, expend a large sum of money upon the road, and form a compact immediately with Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, both the alliance and the road would be carried out mainly for the benefit of the dominant power in this province at this moment; we need hardly say we mean Lower Canada. The important question to Upper Canada—her connection with the North-West Territory—would be altogether ignored, Quebec would be made the capital of the Federation, representation by population would form no part of the compact, and, instead of having one leech draining her of her resources, Upper Canada would have three. Before entering into new alliances, it should be the effort of Upper Canadians to regulate the affairs of their own province, to obtain representation by population, and to open the North-West Territory, so that when the Federation of all the British American provinces does come, it may be found with Upper Canada as the central figure of the group of states, with western adjuncts as well as eastern. Not even the most ardent supporter of the union of all the provinces can allege that there is any absolute necessity for haste in carrying out the project. Nobody is being hurt by the provinces remaining in their present condition; no one single material interest, either in Canada or the Lower Provinces, would be enhanced in value by the union.

This appeared in the *Globe* in 1863.

MR. A. MACKENZIE—What Administration did that refer to?

HON. MR. DORION—It did not refer to mine.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—Well, whose was it?

HON. MR. HOLTON—I think the Minister of Agriculture might inform my honorable friend.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—The Honorable Attorney General has them nearly all around him. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. DORION—On the 15th of Oc-

tober, Hon. Mr. BROWN's paper further stated:—

The line, in fact, will leave us just where we are now. In the summer, when navigation is opened, we can send produce down the river and gulf, and, to some extent, compete with the Americans. But in the winter, to suppose we can send flour and wheat over this long land route cheaper than the Americans can send it from the eastern ports, is an absurdity which no man acquainted with the trade will commit.

Again, on the 17th of October, in the same year, it said:—

The road is to run mainly through a country which does not belong to Canada, but which cannot, under any possible circumstances, bring any profit or return, directly or indirectly.

On the 20th it said:—

It will not be wise for the opponents of the measure to rely upon present appearances. The ministerial project must be resisted at every stage, in the press and in Parliament.

Again, on the 25th of the same month:—

With fair professions of retrenchment and economy on their lips, Ministers took office; but three short months afterwards we find them launching a new railroad scheme upon the market, admittedly more onerous at the moment of initiation than was the Grand Trunk at the same stage.

Sir, I agree with the statement, that to go into the construction of this road without knowing what it is to cost, or over what particular route it is to be built, is a thing not to be thought of by any prudent member of this House, and that such a proposal ought to be resisted at every stage. I think, too, that the whole scheme, apart from the construction of the railway, is worse than the railway scheme itself, and ought to be still more strongly opposed. It is a mere revival of a scheme that has been rejected by the people on every occasion on which it has been presented to them during the past seven years. Independent of various other considerations the mere question of its expense ought to cause it to be rejected by the representatives of the people. When the duties on imports were raised to twenty and twenty-five per cent., what was the cry we heard from the lower portion of the province? It was that the people were quite unable to pay such a serious tax, and the result was the establishment of a free port at Gaspé. We have not, for several years, collected a single cent of income from that large section of country, but have, from year to year, paid out large sums of money for the opening up of roads, for the administration of justice, and for keeping up

a steam summer communication with the extreme eastern section of the province. More money has been squandered in that section of the country than on any other, yet it has produced no revenue. And that was the character of the country through which the Intercolonial road was to run, both in Canada and in New Brunswick. For we are asked to add, at one stroke, to our debt of sixty-two and a half millions of dollars, an annual charge representing in capital the moderate sum of one hundred and twenty-four millions—for that is the financial nature of the proposition, and this for the purpose of adding 900,000 inhabitants to our population, most of whom are not in a better position, if they are in as good, as the people of the district of Gaspé. (Hear, hear.) Sir, in 1841, nearly twenty-five years ago, Lower Canada entered into the union of the provinces with a debt of £133,000. That was a debt created by the Special Council, for the Legislature of Lower Canada under the old Constitution owed not a penny when it ceased to exist. That debt was created between 1837 and 1840. Since the union there have been expended in Lower Canada, for the Beauharnois canal, the enlargement of the Lachine canal, the works on Lake St. Peter, and the Chambly canal, about four millions of dollars. Besides, we have three hundred and fifty miles of the Grand Trunk Railway—about a hundred less than Upper Canada. Taking one-half the cost to the province of that railway—two million pounds currency, or eight millions of dollars—we have four millions for canals and eight millions for railways. Twelve millions of dollars have, therefore, been expended for public works in Lower Canada, with perhaps another million for other small works—in all, thirteen millions of dollars.

MR. A. MACKENZIE—What about the Montreal harbor?

HON. MR. DORION—The Montreal harbor will pay for itself. The Government will not be called upon to pay a single sixpence of its indebtedness. The province only guarantees a small portion of its debentures, and will never have to pay a copper of it, any more than it will of the municipal indebtedness of the city of Montreal, the interest of which is regularly paid every year. Twelve or thirteen millions of dollars' worth of public works is all we are able to show for an increase of our debt from £133,000 at the time of the union, to \$27,500,000, which, on going out of the union to enter into the Confederation, is the Lower Canada proportion of the \$62,500,-

000 of public debt we are bringing into it. I do not take into consideration the Municipal Loan Fund indebtedness, nor the Seigniorial Tenure redemption, because if we have received any benefit from the outlay, we are going to be charged for those items separately over and above our share in the \$62,500,000. If I am not right in thus stating the case, I hope honorable gentlemen on the other side of the House will correct me. From the explanations given the other day by the Honorable Finance Minister, I infer that by putting the Seigniorial Tenure to the charge of Lower Canada, and by Upper Canada abandoning its indemnity for the Seigniorial Tenure expenditure, there is no necessity for taking those items into account as part of the liability of Canada in the Confederation; that the charge for the redemption of the Seigniorial Tenure, the township indemnity under the Seigniorial Act of 1859, the interest on that indemnity, the liability of the province to the Superior Education Fund, and the loss on the Lower Canada Municipal Loan Fund, amounting in all to about \$4,500,000, will have to be paid by Lower Canada alone, the interest on which, at five per cent, will be \$225,000, which sum will be retained out of the \$880,000 to be paid by the General Government to Lower Canada for local purposes, leaving something less than 60 cents per head for carrying on the Local Government. Upper Canada came into the union with a debt of £1,300,000. Immediately after the union £1,500,000 sterling was borrowed for public works, most of which amount was expended in Upper Canada. And yet Upper Canada goes out of the union by simply abandoning its claim for indemnity under the Seigniorial Tenure Act, having nothing to assume but its Municipal Loan Fund and its share in the Federal debt; while Lower Canada, on the contrary, goes out with a load of \$4,500,000 of local debt, besides the \$27,500,000 which falls to its share to be paid through the General Government. And this, too, after paying for twenty-five years a highly increased taxation, for all which it has nothing to show except public improvements to the amount of about \$13,000,000. Sir, if such a scheme as this, on being submitted to the people, would be approved by them, I am very much mistaken. I submit that no such project ought to be voted by the House, before we have the fullest information necessary to enable us to come to right conclusions. (Hear, hear.) It is for the security of the majority, as well as of the minority, I make

this demand. Honorable gentlemen who cry "hear! hear!" may find themselves very much disappointed, if, after this portion of the scheme is passed, the local constitutions proposed were quite unsatisfactory. I contend that the local constitutions are as much an essential part of the whole as the general Constitution, and that they both should have been laid at the same time before the House. (Hear, hear.) We ought, besides, to have a clear statement of what are the liabilities specially assigned to Upper and Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) It is well that Upper Canada should know if she has to pay the indebtedness of Port Hope, Cobourg, Brockville, Niagara, and other municipalities which have borrowed from the municipal loan fund, and what these liabilities are; and it is important for Lower Canada to be told what are the amounts they will be required to tax themselves for. We ought, besides, to obtain some kind of information upon the subject of the Intercolonial Railway, what is the proposed cost, and what route is to be followed; and before these facts are before the House, we ought not to take it upon ourselves to legislate on the subject. Still further, the people of the country do not understand the scheme. (Hear, hear.) Many members of this House, before hearing the explanations which have been offered, were, and others are still, in doubt as to the bearing of many of these resolutions. In the Upper House doubts were expressed as to who should recommend the appointment of the members composing the Legislative Council. It was thought in many quarters that the appointment of these members was to be made by the local governments after the scheme should come into operation. But this it seems is a mistake. There are many other matters with which we are unacquainted, particularly as regards the assets and liabilities. There is a provision that the nomination of the judges of the superior courts shall be vested in the General Government, but it would seem that the constitution of the courts is to be left to the local governments; and I put the question, What does this mean? Do you mean that the local governments are to establish as many courts as they please, declare of how many judges they will be composed, and that the General Government will have to pay for them? Is a local government to say, here is a court with three judges; we want five, and those five must be appointed and paid by the General Government? I have received no answer to this and to several other questions. I can

well understand what is meant by the regulation of the law of divorce; but what is meant by the regulation of the marriage question? Is the General Government to be at liberty to set aside all that we have been in the habit of doing in Lower Canada in this respect? Will the General Government have the power to determine the degree of relationship and the age beyond which parties may marry, as well as the consent which will be required to make a marriage valid? (Hear, hear.) Will all these questions be left to the General Government? If so, it will have the power to upset one of the most important portions of our civil code, and one affecting more than any other all classes of society. The adoption, for instance, of the English rule, whereby females at the age of twelve, and males at the age of fourteen, can contract a valid marriage without the consent of parents, tutors or guardians, would be looked to by the mass of the people of Lower Canada as a most objectionable innovation in our laws, as would also any provision to allow such marriages to take place before any common magistrate without any formality whatsoever. (Hear, hear.) Yet is there no danger that such measures might be carried, when you see the different feelings existing on these questions among the people of the different provinces? There is another question to which I must refer before closing. It is said that the division of the debt is a fair one. We have given, say the Government, \$25 of debt to each inhabitant—that is, in those provinces where it was less, they have increased it to that amount, charging it to the Confederation, and thereby they have made a present to the several provinces of the difference between their present indebtedness and the \$25 per head. (Laughter.) This \$25 per head, when compared to the debt of England, is a heavier burthen upon our own people than the Imperial debt upon the people of England, taking into consideration the greater wealth per individual in England and the fact that the greater part of that debt bears three per cent. interest. (Hear, hear.) There is another aspect in which this question of debt is to be considered. To equalize it, the Conference have increased it on the basis of the present population for the several provinces. This is fair enough at present, supposing that each province contribute the same proportion to the general revenue, and would continue to be so if their population progressed in the same ratio of increase; but, from the natural advantages of Upper and Lower

Canada, and their greater area of arable lands, there is no doubt they will increase in population and wealth in a much greater ratio than the Lower Provinces, and in ten years hence, this proportion, which this day appears a fair one, will have much increased for Upper and Lower Canada, while it will have diminished for the Lower Provinces. (Hear, hear.) I owe an apology to the House for having offered such lengthened remarks on this question, and I have to thank honorable members for having so kindly listened to them. (Cries of "go on.") I will simply content myself with saying that for these reasons which I have so imperfectly exposed, I strongly fear it would be a dark day for Canada when she adopted such a scheme as this. (Cheers.) It would be one marked in the history of this country as having had a most depressing and crushing influence on the energies of the people in both Upper and Lower Canada—(hear hear)—for I consider it one of the worst schemes that could be brought under the consideration of the House; and if it should be adopted without the sanction of the people, the country would never cease to regret it. (Hear, hear.) What is the necessity for all this haste? The longer this Constitution is expected to last, the greater the necessity for the fullest consideration and deliberation. I find, sir, that when, in 1839, Lord JOHN RUSSELL brought into the House of Commons his first measure for the union of the provinces, he announced his intention to lay his measure before the House, have it read a second time, and postpone it till next session, to give a year to the people of Canada to consider it and make such representations as they would think proper. (Hear, hear.) And it was only in the subsequent session, and after undergoing considerable modifications in the mean time, that the measure was passed. Nothing could be more reasonable than such delay. But here it seems the people are to be treated with less respect than they were when their Constitution was suspended, and this measure is to be pushed with indecent haste. There are three modes of obtaining the views of the people upon the question now under discussion. The most direct one would be, after debating it in this House, to submit it to the people for their verdict, yea or nay. The second is to dissolve the House and appeal to the people. The third is to discuss and pass the resolutions or address to a second reading, and afterwards leave it open to the public to judge of its merits, by meeting and discussing it, and sending in petitions,

and instructing their representatives how to vote upon it when they came to Parliament at the next session. Any one of these methods would elicit the views of the people. But to say that the opinions of the people have been ascertained on the question, I say it is no such thing. (Hear, hear.) We have heard one side of the question discussed, but we have heard none of the views on the other side; and yet the feeling, as exhibited in some parts of the country, has been unmistakably in favor of an appeal to the people. Some fifteen counties in Lower Canada have held meetings and declared for an appeal before the scheme is allowed to pass; and when honorable gentlemen on the other side have held second meetings, they have been condemned more conclusively than at first. (Hear, hear.) In the county of Rouville, the hon. member representing that county, not satisfied with the first expression of opinion, held a second meeting, but the decision was still more emphatic than at the first. (Hear, hear.) Then meetings have been held, all tending to the same conclusion, in St. Maurice, Maskinongé, Berthier, Joliette, Richelieu, Chambly, Verchères, Bagot, St. Hyacinthe, Iberville, St. John's, Napierville, Drummond and Arthabaska, Two Mountains, Vaudreuil, and also in the city of Montreal.

MR. BELLEROSE—What about Laval?

HON. MR. DORION—Yes, a meeting was called, and called without the requisite notice; the notice having been given at the church doors on a Friday for a meeting on the next day; but notwithstanding, when the meeting was held, the hon. gentleman did not dare press a resolution in favor of Confederation, but simply one of confidence in himself. (Hear, hear.) His friends collected together, and all they did was to express confidence in him. There was no resolution in favor of Confederation, nor of passing such a measure without submitting it to the people. (Hear, hear.) I have now to thank the House for the patience with which they have listened to my remarks. In the terms of the paragraph I have quoted from the *Globe*, I shall feel it my duty to resist the passage of the measure at every stage, with a view that the scheme should go to the people in some shape or other. (Hear, hear.) There is no hurry in regard to the scheme. We are now legislating for the future as well as for the present, and feeling that we ought to make a Constitution as perfect as possible, and as far as possible

in harmony with the views of the people, I maintain that we ought not to pass this measure now, but leave it to another year, in order to ascertain in the meantime what the views and sentiments of the people actually are. (The honorable gentleman was loudly cheered on resuming his seat.)

After some discussion as to the mode of continuing the debate, the House adjourned at ten minutes past twelve.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

FRIDAY, February 17, 1865.

HON. MR. CURRIE said—Hon. gentlemen, with the consent of my hon. friend opposite (Hon. Mr. DICKSON) who is entitled to the floor, in consequence of having moved the adjournment of the debate, I rise for the purpose of proposing the resolution which for some length of time has been before the House, on the notice-paper. It is one which, I think, should commend itself to the good sense and impartial judgment of the members of this Honorable House; and I shall be surprised if it shall meet any degree of opposition from the hon. gentlemen representing the Government in this branch of the Legislature. (Hear, hear.) The resolution is as follows:—

That upon a matter of such great importance as the purposed Confederation of this and certain other British colonies, this House is unwilling to assume the responsibility of assenting to a measure involving so many important considerations, without further manifestation of the public will than has yet been declared.

It is not aimed at either the destruction or the defeat of the resolutions before the House. It simply asks for delay until such time as the people of the country can more fully express their views on the matter than they have hitherto had an opportunity of doing. Hon. gentlemen, I stated, when I first addressed this Chamber in reference to the proposed address, that I was not opposed to the Confederation of the British Provinces in itself, but that I was opposed to many of the details embraced in the resolutions upon which this House is asked to found an Address to Her Majesty the Queen. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. ROSS) who followed me upon that occasion, stated among other things, that I had attempted to decry the Lower Provinces, and that I had attempted also to decry the credit of

Canada. I appeal to hon. members present, who were good enough to listen to me on that occasion, to point out a single word which I said, reflecting upon the credit of the people of the eastern provinces. Instead of having said anything to their discredit, I thought I had paid them a very high compliment. So far from reflecting upon the character of the public men of those provinces, I alluded to but one of them by name, the Hon. Mr. TILLEY, and I paid him the compliment, which he fully merits, of stating that he must be ranked among the leading and most prominent of British American statesmen. (Hear, hear.) As to my decrying the credit of Canada—if, to tell the truth—if, to speak the honest convictions of one's mind—if, to state to the world what the Public Accounts of our country tell us—if this be to decry the credit of our country—then I am guilty of the charge. But the hon. gentleman went on and told us, that my speech was so illogical that it was unworthy of notice.

HON. MR. ROSS—I did not say that.

HON. MR. CURRIE—The hon. gentleman said what amounted to that. And yet to my astonishment he found it necessary to reply to me in a speech four columns in length—a speech, however, in which he failed to controvert a single position which I had the honor to take on that occasion. Then I was charged with having attacked statements of fact made by our public men.

HON. MR. ROSS—Hear! hear!

HON. MR. CURRIE—The hon. gentleman from Toronto says "Hear, hear." But I ask, is it not the duty of hon. gentlemen, standing on the floor of this House, to correct misstatements which have been sent to the country? Was I doing anything more than my duty, when, in my humble way, I endeavored to correct what, if not misstatements, were at least evidently incorrect statements? We have had too much of that kind of thing in this country. And since my hon. friend from Toronto (Hon. Mr. Ross) has chosen to remind me of it, I must say that I think it is much to be regretted that certain statements have been made in this country, and sent from this country, which, instead of helping to build up our credit, have done much to injure it. (Hear, hear.) Perhaps I could not allude to anything more forcibly in point, than the flaming prospectus sent to the world under the auspices of my hon. friend from Toronto, in which he promised the confiding capitalists of England a

divided of 11½ per cent. on the stock they might subscribe to the Grand Trunk Railway.

HON. MR. ROSS—Was it not 11½? (Laughter.)

HON. MR. CURRIE—No; he was not so modest as to put it at 11½. (Laughter.) It was 11½ per cent. I was charged with attacking the statements of the Hon. Mr. TILLEY. I stated, when last addressing the House, that Hon. Mr. TILLEY informed a public meeting—I think in St. John, New Brunswick—that the tariff of Canada was in fact an 11 per cent. tariff, and my hon. friend from Toronto said that Hon. Mr. TILLEY was correct in making that statement.

HON. MR. ROSS—What I said was that the average duty on the whole imports of the country, including the free goods, was 11 per cent.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Then I must say that that is a very novel way of arriving at the tariff of a country—to take all the dutiable goods, to add to them all the free goods, and then to average the duty on the whole. It may be a very convenient, but it is not a correct or honest mode in my opinion.

HON. MR. ROSS—It is precisely what Hon. Mr. TILLEY did; and I did it in the same way.

HON. MR. CURRIE—My hon. friend told us that our present able and talented Finance Minister had stated the tariff of our country to be an 11 per cent tariff. I asked my hon. friend when the Finance Minister stated that?

HON. MR. ROSS—I said that, taking the statements Hon. Mr. GALT had furnished with reference to the tariff of customs duties, and the amount of imports of dutiable and free goods, and finding the average of the whole to be 11 per cent., Hon. Mr. TILLEY had made a statement based on Hon. Mr. GALT's own figures.

HON. MR. CURRIE—I find the report makes my hon. friend say, that "The Hon. Mr. TILLEY had quoted the figures of our own Minister of Finance." He was wrong in that statement, because Hon. Mr. TILLEY, on the occasion I referred to, had quoted the figures furnished by the Comptroller of New Brunswick.

HON. MR. ROSS—The Comptroller of New Brunswick could not furnish the figures of the trade of Canada.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Surely my hon. friend will remember, that, to give official force to the statement of Hon. Mr. TILLEY, he said that, after the Comptroller of the province had reviewed our tariff, he came to the con-

clusion that it was but an 11 per cent. tariff. I quote from the report:—

Hon. Mr. TILLEY quoted the figures of our own Minister of Finance, and the hon. member represented him as not speaking the truth, but as, in effect, attempting to deceive those whom he addressed. Hon. Mr. CURRIE—I beg to know when the Finance Minister of Canada stated that the average duties collected in Canada were 11 per cent.

He (Honorable Mr. Ross) desired to be no longer interrupted; I ceased to interrupt him, and he did not give me an answer to the question. But, if the honorable member from Toronto will turn to the celebrated speech of the Minister of Finance made only the other day at Sherbrooke, he will find that Hon. Mr. GALT puts the Canada tariff at 20 per cent.

HON. MR. ROSS—But he did not include the free goods; that is all.

HON. MR. CURRIE—No, he did not include the free goods. But I say that if he had taken the value of dutiable goods, as we find it given in the Trade Returns of 1863—the last complete returns for a year that we have—instead of arriving at the conclusion that we had a tariff of only 20 per cent., he would have found that the actual duty on the dutiable goods imported in 1863 was 22½ per cent. (Hear, hear.) Then my hon. friend from Toronto came to the assistance of Mr. LYNCH of Halifax. And, not stopping there, he undertook the defence of the present President of the Council (Hon. Mr. BROWN) and the Provincial Secretary (Hon. Mr. McDUGALL.) I confess I was a little amused, and somewhat surprised to find my hon. friend from Toronto becoming the apologist and champion of those hon. gentlemen, who, I believe, are perfectly competent on all occasions to take care of themselves—even without the assistance of my hon. friend. (Hear, hear.) He next alluded to the propriety and necessity—when the people of Canada were on the point of forming a partnership with the other provinces—of our knowing what the assets of those provinces were—what stock they were bringing into the common concern. I had shewed that we had a great many valuable public works—some of them of a profitable character. My hon. friend told us that the Lower Provinces too were engaging in profitable works. He told us that New Brunswick had spent eight millions of dollars on railways, and Nova Scotia six millions—and that from those railways those provinces

were getting a net revenue of \$140,000, or \$70,000 a year each, which would go into the revenue of the General Government. Well, hon. gentlemen, when such statements are made on the floor of this House, they of course go abroad, and those who make them ought to be well satisfied that they are based on reliable facts.

HON. MR. ROSS—So they were.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Well, I was very much struck by the hon. gentlemen's statement. I was surprised to find it stated, in the first place, that those provinces had already spent so much on railways; and, in the next place, that those railways in the eastern provinces were so much more profitable and paid so much better than the railways in Canada. Now, I find, on looking at the Public Accounts of those provinces—the very latest available—that the New Brunswick railways cost \$4,275,000, and that the Nova Scotia railways cost \$1,696,288—that the New Brunswick railways in 1862 paid \$21,711 net, and the Nova Scotia railways, \$40,739—making together, instead of \$140,000 for the two provinces, as stated by my hon. friend from Toronto, the small sum of \$62,450. And this too, hon. gentlemen will bear in mind, was from new railways, or railways comparatively new—and they will find, if they take the trouble to examine the accounts, that the cost of the repairs of those railroads, as of every other railroad after it has become somewhat worn, is increasing year by year.

HON. MR. ROSS—The House will recollect that I took the figures which were prompted to me while speaking.

HON. MR. CURRIE—That is the mistake which, I fear, has been committed during the whole of this discussion. (Hear, hear.) Our public men have been too reckless in making statements—statements in the east, as to the prosperity of Canada; and statements in the west, as to the wealth, property and resources of those eastern provinces. Now, hon. gentlemen, let us look at our public works, which my hon. friend in a measure tried to belittle and decry.

HON. MR. ROSS—I did not belittle them; I said that indirectly they were of great value to the country.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Yes; and directly too. I find, by the Public Accounts of the province, that in 1863 the net revenue of our public works—all of which are going to the Confederate Government—yielded to

this province a net revenue of \$303,187—and that our public works cost this province, taking the amount set down in the statements of affairs of the province, \$25,931,168. So much for the stock—so far as the public works at all events are concerned—that this province is prepared to put into the partnership with the other provinces. (Hear, hear.) I shall refer no further to the remarks made by my hon. friend from Toronto in answer to the few words I addressed to the House the other day, beyond expressing my regret that my hon. friend should not merely have been dissatisfied with the statements I made, but that he should have thought fit to take exception to the style and the manner in which my remarks were submitted to the Honorable House.

HON. MR. ROSS—I said, the temper and tone.

HON. MR. CURRIE—From the attention you were kind enough to give me, hon. gentlemen, on that occasion, and from the way in which my remarks were received both by my political opponents and my political friends, I had hoped that I had not exceeded the bounds of propriety—that, neither in my temper nor in my tone had I violated the rules of this House. If I did so I regret it, and I may be allowed to express the hope that when my native land has paid one-fourth as much for my political education as it has paid for that of my hon. friend from Toronto—if my manners still fail to be those of a CHESTERFIELD, or my eloquence that of a PITT—I shall at all events be able to treat my fellow members with courtesy and propriety. (Hear, hear.) But, leaving these little matters to take care of themselves, I shall now allude to the strong pressure which seems, from some source or other, to be urging the representatives of the people of Canada, and the people themselves, to adopt this important scheme without that time for deliberate consideration which a matter of that kind is entitled to. I am satisfied that that pressure does not come from the people themselves. I am satisfied it does not come either from this or from the other branch of the Legislature. I entertain the fear, which has been expressed before, that it has been a pressure from without, which has been urging us to take this step too rapidly, I fear, for our country's good. It may be that the statesmen of Great Britain,

and that a great portion of the people of Great Britain are very anxious for this measure, and that the press of that country generally approves of it. But, when they rightly understand it—when parties holding our provincial securities know that Confederation means more debt, more taxation, and a worse public credit—we will have another cry coming from across the Atlantic. And when British manufacturers know that Confederation means a higher tariff on British goods, we shall have different views from them also, crossing the Atlantic. (Hear, hear.) Hon. gentlemen, when I left my constituency, I had little idea that this measure was going to be pressed upon the country in the manner in which I see the Government of the day are attempting to press it. I think we should pause before adopting these resolutions. I think we want some more information before we adopt them. Before we vote away our local constitutions—before we vote away in fact our whole Constitution—we should know something of what we are going to get in place of what we are giving away. Did any hon. gentleman suppose, before he left his home, that we would not have the whole scheme of Confederation brought down to us, and be asked to pass a judgment on it, or to consider it at all events as a whole scheme? I think we ought to be cautious in taking half a measure until we know what is the whole of it. (Hear, hear.) Hon. gentlemen will remember the caution with which the Parliament of England proceeded, in 1839, when dealing with the rights of the people of Canada. At that time there was an urgent necessity for a new Constitution for the people of Canada, and a great necessity for it, particularly in the eastern province. When the Government of the day brought down their resolutions—in something like the same shape as those now before the House—resolutions embodying the principle of a Legislative Union—the leader of the opposition, Lord STANLEY, claimed that the whole measure should be brought down; and the Government of the day was actually compelled, by the force of public opinion in and out of Parliament, to withdraw the resolutions, and to bring down their entire measure. (Hear, hear.) And are we to be less careful of our own constitutional rights—are we to guard more loosely the interests of ourselves and those who are to come after us—than the people

legislating for us three or four thousand miles away? Besides, we are asked by those resolutions to pledge our province—to what? To build the Intercolonial Railway, without knowing, as I stated the other day, where it is to run, or what it is to cost. Why do we not have the report of the able engineer sent to survey and report upon that work? Why is it delayed? Why is it attempted to hurry this measure through the Legislature, while we are in the dark with reference to that great undertaking? It may be that it is kept back designedly, and for the purpose of furthering this very measure, not here, but in other parts of British America.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend is going too far. The report has not yet been made, and, that being the case, it is somewhat extraordinary to charge the Government with keeping it back.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Certainly; I think the case is bad enough, when the Government are charged merely with what they have done. And I have no desire to make an incorrect statement. But I will put it in this way: I think we have good reason to be surprised, that the Government should come down with their scheme, and submit it to the House, before they even themselves know what the work is to cost—(hear, hear)—and ask this House and the country to pledge themselves to the construction of a work of which they do not even know the cost themselves. (Hear, hear.) But, if the report has not been prepared, we have been told in the public prints that the survey is either finished, or very nearly finished. The report, therefore, can soon be furnished; and, why should there be so much hurry and anxiety to pass these resolutions before we get it? Then, again, why do the Government not bring down those School Bills which have been promised? Why are the people, or why is Parliament, to have no opportunity of passing judgment upon those measures—the School Bill for Upper Canada, and the School Bill for Lower Canada—before this Confederation scheme is adopted? I cannot see the propriety of keeping back these matters; and I do not think the members of the Government can show any reason whatever why they should not be settled at once. Then, hon. gentlemen, we should know something about the division of the public debt. If hon. gentlemen will take up the Public Accounts placed in their hands during the present session, they will find a statement of

the liabilities of this province, certifying the amount to be no less than \$77,203,282. Now it is well known that Canada is only allowed to take into the Confederation the debt of \$62,500,000. We have a right to ask how the other \$15,000,000 are to be paid? By whom are they to be assumed? What portion is Upper Canada to assume? What portion is Lower Canada to assume? (Hear, hear.) Then, hon. gentlemen, if we adopt these resolutions, and a bill based on them is brought into the Imperial Parliament and carried—look at the power which is given to the Confederate Parliament. They have the power to impose local taxation upon each of the separate provinces. I would like to know how that power is to be exercised; I would like to know whether it is to be a capitation tax, or an acreage tax upon the lands of the province, or whether it is to be a tax upon the general property of the province. I am sure there is no hon. gentleman present who would not like information on these points, before voting for this scheme. (Hear, hear.) Then, hon. gentlemen, there is another very important question—the question of the defence of these provinces—which within a few months has taken a shape which it never took before in the history of this country. I shall trespass on the attention of the House for a few moments, while I read an extract from a very able report on that question, which ranks, and in time to come too will rank, deservedly high as a State paper. It is a memorandum of the Executive Council, dated October, 1862, at the time the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Administration held office. And, whatever the errors of that Government might have been, however they may have been found fault with in other matters, I believe the people generally were of opinion that the stand which the Government took on that question, was one which entitled them to the respect and confidence of the community at large. The Government say in this memorandum:—

That they are not unwilling to try to the utmost to comply with the suggestions of the Imperial Government is evidenced by the manner in which the projected Intercolonial Railway has been entertained. Their conduct in this matter should relieve them from every imputation. At the same time, they insist that they are and must be allowed to be the best judges of the pressure which the provincial credit can sustain. They are prepared, subject to certain conditions, to encumber this credit with liabilities arising out of

the Intercolonial Railway, but they are not prepared to enter upon a lavish expenditure to build up a military system distasteful to the Canadian people, disproportionate to Canadian resources, and not called for by any circumstance of which they at present have cognizance.

That is, the arming and bringing into the field a force of 50,000 men.

His Grace, while promising liberal assistance, contends that any available supply of regular troops would be unequal to the defence of the province—and that the main dependence of such a country for defence must be upon its own people. Your Excellency's advisers would not be faithful to their own convictions or to the trust reposed in them, if they withheld an expression of their belief that without very large assistance any efforts or sacrifices of which the people of the province are capable, would not enable them successfully and for any lengthened period to repel invasion from the neighboring republic. They have relied for protection in some degree upon the fact, that under no conceivable circumstances will they provoke war with the United States, and if therefore Canada should become the theatre of war resulting from Imperial policy, while it would cheerfully put forth its strength in the defence of its soil, it would nevertheless be obliged to rely for its protection mainly upon Imperial resources; and in such an event it is their opinion that they would be justified in expecting to be assisted in the work of defence with the whole strength of the empire. It is not necessary at this stage of their history, to put forward assurances of the readiness of the Canadian people to assume whatever responsibilities belong to them as subjects of Her Majesty. Their devotion has been exhibited too often to be open to doubt or depreciation. They have made sacrifices that should relieve them from suspicion, and which Her Majesty's Government should remember as a pledge of their fidelity. No portion of the empire is exposed to sufferings and sacrifices equal to those which would inevitably fall upon this province in the event of war with the United States. No probable combination of regular troops and militia would preserve our soil from invading armies; and no fortune which the most sanguine dare hope for would prevent our most flourishing districts from being the battle field of the war. Our trade would be brought to a standstill, our industry would be paralyzed, our richest farming lands devastated, our towns and villages destroyed; homes, happy in peace, would be rendered miserable by war, and all as the result of events for the production of which Canada would be in no wise accountable.

And, honorable gentlemen, that is not only the language in times past of leading politicians in Canada. Hon. gentlemen may call to mind the writings and sayings to the same effect of men in the eastern provinces—men now holding high position under the Impe-

rial Government. One hon. gentlemen, to whom I have particular reference (Hon. JOSEPH HOWE) declared it was unreasonable to expect that we should defend ourselves against a foreign power, when we had no voice either in the declaring of war or the making of peace—that while we were quite ready, as in times past, to expose our persons and property to meet the invader at the threshold of our country, we were unwilling to take upon ourselves, as colonists, a duty which belonged to the parent state. But does this correspond with the views that are now adopted by the Ministry of the day? I hold in my hand an extract from a speech delivered by one of the most prominent members of the Government at a recent banquet in the city of Toronto. And what did that hon. gentleman say? Speaking of the Conference at Quebec, he stated that “the delegates unanimously resolved that the United Provinces of British North America shall be placed at the earliest moment in a thorough state of defence.” Hon. gentlemen, I was not aware that the Imperial Government had ever cast off the burden of the defence of this province. But we are told by an hon. gentleman, high in the Executive, that this Conference, self-appointed as it was, by a resolution that we do not see laid upon the table, promised to place the province in a thorough state of defence. Hon. gentlemen, what does that mean? It means an expenditure here of four or five millions of dollars annually, or else the statement exceeded the truth. Again the hon. gentleman stated:—“The Conference at Quebec did not separate before entering into a pledge to put the military and naval defences of the united provinces in the most complete and satisfactory position.” Before we discuss this scheme further—before we are called on to give a vote upon it—I say we ought to know something more with reference to this important matter. (Hear, hear.) Hon. gentlemen may perhaps argue that there is no necessity for this question going to the people—no necessity for further time being allowed to the people of Upper Canada or of Canada generally to consider this matter. Why, hon. gentlemen, has it not been stated by every hon. member who has taken the floor to address the House on this question, that it is the most important question ever submitted to this or any other British Colonial Legislature? And yet many of those hon. members are unwilling

that the people of this country should have any further time to consider this important matter—although, by the laws of our land, no municipality has a right to enact or pass a by-law creating a little petty debt, not to be paid off within a year, without submitting it first to the vote of the people. (Hear.) Hon. gentlemen assign as a reason why the matter should not be submitted to the people—that we have had a number of elections to this House since it was known that the scheme of Confederation was under the consideration of the Government, and that these elections went favorably to the scheme. I would ask, hon. gentlemen, how many elections have we had in Upper Canada since the scheme was printed and laid before the people? I would like to see the hon. gentleman stand up, who has been elected to come here to vote upon this scheme since it was submitted to the people. It is true we have had one election in Upper Canada since that time—my hon. friend near me (Hon. Mr. SIMPSON) alluded to it yesterday—the election in South Ontario, a constituency until recently represented by one of the hon. gentlemen who entered the Ministry which brings this scheme before us—our present esteemed Vice-Chancellor of Upper Canada, Hon. Mr. MOWAT. What did the candidates say at that election? Both of them, as stated by my honorable friend, in asking the suffrages of the people, had to promise that, if elected to Parliament, they would vote for a submission of this scheme to the people. (Hear, hear.) And that is the last election we have had in Upper Canada. It is true that many honorable gentlemen now present, in their addresses to their several constituencies, when seeking election last fall, said they were in favor of a union of the British North American Provinces. But, hon. gentlemen, there is not a man in this chamber, within the sound of my voice, who would not say the same. I am myself as much in favor of Confederation to-day as ever I was in my life; and I will challenge any one to say that at any time, on any public occasion, I ever said aught against the scheme of the Confederation of the British North American Provinces. (Hear, hear.) But, honorable gentlemen, when I look at this scheme, imperfect as I conceive it to be, it receives my opposition, not because it is a scheme for the Confederation of British North America, but because it is a scheme containing within itself the germs of its

destruction. The resolution before the House is not, as I said before, aimed at the destruction of the scheme; and I hope, before the debate closes, the Government will see the propriety and the advisability of granting the reasonable delay therein asked for. Suppose the Government concedes even the short delay of one month, it can do no possible harm to the measure. If the measure be good—if it be so desirable as the governments of the respective provinces tell us it is—the simple permitting it to stand over for a month will certainly not destroy it. If, on the other hand, it be bad—if it contain within itself the elements of decay—it is better to know it now than hereafter, when the resolutions will have been embodied in a Statute over which we have no control. To shew my own feeling in the matter, all I have to say is this: give a reasonable delay—allow the section of the country I have the honor to represent to speak on the subject, and if it be found to be the will of my constituents that the measure in its present shape be adopted, honorable gentlemen may be assured that I shall give them no further opposition; and that instead of doing everything in my power to impede the progress of these resolutions, I will do nothing to impede their progress through the House. "But," say hon. gentlemen, "delay means defeat." If it be a good measure—if it commend itself to the approval of the people, supported as it is by the most able and brilliant men in Parliament—the scheme is in no danger. And, hon. gentlemen, supposing a month's delay is granted, we will even then be further advanced with the measure than the people of the eastern provinces. The writs for the elections in New Brunswick are returnable, if I mistake not, on the 25th March.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—On the 9th March.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Then it will be at least the 21st or 22nd of March before the Legislature of that colony can be called together.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—I misunderstood the statement made by my hon. friend. What I meant to say was that the Legislature of New Brunswick is expected to assemble on the 8th or 9th of March.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Then they are going to hurry up matters there; I am sorry to hear, nearly as fast as in Canada, the people of which have not had the same opportunity,

at all events, of considering the question as the people of New Brunswick. The people of New Brunswick seem to be fully alive to the importance of this momentous question, and I hope that when their verdict is given it will be a well-considered verdict; but this we do know, that it will not be given until after a free and fair opportunity has been afforded them of discussing the question on its merits in all its bearings. My hon. friend from the Western Division (Hon. Mr. MCCREA) really surprised me the other day when he declared that an elective Legislative Council was neither asked for nor desired by the people. My recollection is that the Council under the nominative system was a standing grievance in Lower Canada as well as in Upper Canada.

HON. MR. MCCREA—That was before the union.

HON. MR. CURRIE—The demand arose that the Council should be elective.

HON. MR. MCCREA—Not after the union.

HON. MR. CURRIE—My hon. friend is, I can assure him, mistaken in stating that there were no petitions in favor of an elective Legislative Council at the time of the change. If my hon. friend will consult the Journals of Parliament, he will find there petitions for the change; he will find also that from the town of Cobourg a petition was received in favor of representation by population in this as well as in the other branch of the Legislature. But my hon. friend, in his ignorance of the facts of the case—although he certainly handled the subject with a good deal of ability, though not with the ability he usually puts forth when he has a good cause to plead—(a laugh)—made a statement which he could scarcely have considered before bringing it under the notice of the House. He said that a House appointed by the Crown would be more responsible to the people than the present House. That, hon. gentlemen, is certainly a new doctrine to me. If such would be the case, why, I ask, do you not apply the same system to the other branch of the Legislature? In such an event I feel assured that the Government of the day would have a much more comfortable and pleasant life of it than even the present Government, strong and talented as they undoubtedly are. (Laughter.) But, says my hon. friend, once more, the people of Canada are in favor of the scheme, in regard to which they have had ample time

for holding meetings and adopting petitions. But, I would ask what did most of the members even of this House know of the scheme when they first came to Quebec? Did we know as much about it then as we know now?

HON. MR. ROSS—Yes.

HON. MR. CURRIE—My hon. friend from Toronto says, "Yes."

AN HON. MEMBER—No.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Another hon. member replies, "no." I may say for myself that I have learned something even from the speech of my hon. friend from Toronto that I did not know before. The people of the country have been waiting, expecting this matter would be discussed in Parliament, and that the whole scheme would be presented so as to enable its being judged of as a whole. Unfortunately, however, it is only a part of the scheme which we have at this moment before the Council. I did not have the pleasure of hearing the whole of the remarks of my hon. friend from Montreal (Hon. Mr. FERRIER), but I was greatly interested in listening to the portion I did hear. I refer to what he said respecting the ministerial crisis in June last. I thought that the celebrated memorandum, which, by the bye, has since been in great part repudiated by the Government of the day, contained all the Ministerial explanations. But that scene, so forcibly described by the hon. gentleman, where the President of the Council met the Attorney General East—

HON. MR. FERRIER—I did not say I saw it. I only heard of it.

HON. MR. CURRIE—When the Hon. Mr. CARTIER embraced the Hon. Mr. BROWN. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. FERRIER—I simply said it was so reported on the streets.

HON. MR. CURRIE—And the Hon. Mr. BROWN promised eternal allegiance to the Hon. Mr. CARTIER. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. FERRIER—I was simply giving the *on-dit* of the day. I said I knew nothing whatever of it further than what I had heard on the streets.

HON. MR. CURRIE—I must have misunderstood my hon. friend. I thought he was a witness of the affecting scene. (Laughter.) But my hon. friend did tell the House something which was new to me, and which must have sounded as new to the country, when he said that the Grand Trunk Railway cost the people of Canada very little. The

hon. gentleman seemed to think that I was very much opposed to the Grand Trunk. But never in my life have I spoken a single word against the Grand Trunk as a railway. I believe there is no hon. gentleman who can possibly appreciate more highly the commercial advantages to this country of that work than I do. At the same time, I have taken occasion, and may do so again if the necessity requires it, to speak of some of the transactions connected with that undertaking. Let this work or any other public work come under the attention of this Chamber, and it will receive at my hands in the future, as in the past, that degree of consideration to which as a public work it is entitled. I hope the day is not far distant when the Grand Trunk will become what it ought to be, a strictly and entirely commercial work, and when the people of all classes and parties will look upon it with favor.

HON. MR. FERRIER—It is strictly a commercial work now.

HON. MR. CURRIE—My hon. friend stated that it had cost the country a mere trifle. But unluckily the Public Accounts do not tell the same story, and they do not exactly confirm the views of my hon. friend in relation to this work. If he looks at the assets of the province—the valuables of the province—he will find there is a charge against the Grand Trunk of \$15,142,000 for debentures. And besides there is this little \$100,000 which has been used in redeeming the city of Montreal bonds. There is something more besides about subsidiary lines.

HON. MR. FERRIER—I spoke of the first capital investment.

HON. MR. CURRIE—My hon. friend from the Erie Division (Hon. Mr. CHRISTIE) admitted in opening his case that this scheme was very much marred by its details. Admitting this—which is just the whole argument—that the details so greatly mar the scheme, it is much to be feared that the measure will not work so peacefully, usefully, or harmoniously as its originators expected, and I believe sincerely hoped it would do; because I do these hon. gentlemen the credit of believing that in devising a scheme which should be for the future as well as the present welfare of the country, they were animated by a desire to do the very best they could under the circumstances. Their great error, in my opinion, lay in

their yielding too much on the part of Canada to gratify the eastern provinces, so as to enable them to bring about this scheme at the present moment. If the scheme is so marred in its details as to destroy the whole measure, why not reject it? Then my hon. friend alluded to the state of the country, just before the present Government was formed, in terms which I hardly think he was justified in using. He claimed that the country was in a state of anarchy and confusion. Now, hon. gentlemen, I must say that for my part I saw none of that anarchy, and I must say very little of that confusion. I assert that there may be witnessed in other lands what was witnessed in this. We saw weak governments striving month after month to keep themselves in power, and we saw these governments daily and hourly attacked by a strong and wary opposition. But, hon. gentlemen, I have yet to learn that the giving of 17 additional members to Upper Canada and 47 members to the eastern provinces will ensure us against the same state of things in the future. It was very well put by the hon. member for Wellington (Hon. Mr. SANBORN) when he said, if there was more patriotism on the part of our public men, and less desire to sacrifice the country for the good of party, we would not have had that state of confusion to which my hon. friend from the Erie Division has alluded. Then my hon. friend who represents the Erie Division, in order to fortify the position he took in supporting the scheme, took up the resolutions adopted by the Toronto Reform Convention in 1859. He stated that I was a delegate present at that convention; but I can only say that, although elected a delegate, I took no part in the proceedings, and know nothing more of them than I learned from the public prints. The hon. gentleman, however, conveniently read only a part of the resolutions. But it must be admitted that these resolutions were the identical basis upon which the present Government was organized. This Government was organized for the express purpose of carrying out the arrangements embodied in the resolutions of that body. And, hon. gentlemen, a committee was appointed by the Toronto Convention, and that committee prepared a draft address to the public. That was submitted to the executive committee, and considered on the 15th of February, 1860, and was revised and sent to the country as

the address of the convention, of which the hon. member for Erie was a member, and over which he also presided as one of the vice-chairmen. And what did they say? That convention never intended that Parliament should change the Constitution or give us a new Constitution without consulting the people and allowing the public an opportunity of passing its judgment upon the proposed new Constitution. And how did this convention propose to secure the people the right of passing judgment upon so important a scheme as the adoption of a new Constitution? Here it is, in large type—and I have no doubt my hon. friend has often read it in going through his large, wealthy, and prosperous division.

HON. MR. CHRISTIE—It was not presented to the convention.

HON. MR. CURRIE—I wish to put my hon. friend right. The meeting was held on the 23rd September, 1859, and was presided over by the late Hon. ADAM FERGUSON; and my hon. friend, the member for Erie Division, and Mr. D. A. MACDONALD were vice-presidents. A special committee was appointed at that meeting to draft an address to the people of Upper Canada on the political affairs of the province in support of the resolutions then adopted. A draft of the address was submitted to the executive committee.

HON. MR. CHRISTIE—I was not a member of that committee.

HON. MR. CURRIE—The public meeting was held on the 15th February, 1860.

HON. MR. CHRISTIE—And when was the address published?

HON. MR. CURRIE—It was published in this shape in February, 1860. Well, one of the provisions contained in that address was this:—"Secure these rights by a written Constitution, ratified by the people, and incapable of alteration except by their formal sanction." Hon. gentlemen, I fear the hon. member for Erie Division will hardly be able to justify the course he feels called upon to take on this occasion by anything contained in the address or the resolutions of the Toronto convention. The hon. gentleman would never have thought of preparing such a scheme as this to be submitted to the members of such a convention. But think you that had such a scheme been presented they would not have demanded that it should be left to the people? Think you, hon. gentlemen, that that scheme would have met the approval

of that body in its present shape? I am sure that my hon. friend, warm as he now is in support of the scheme, could hardly have accepted such an issue. I am sure that even the present Government, backed as they are by a large majority in both branches of the Legislature, and possessing as they do a large amount of the talent,—I may say a majority of the talent—of Parliament, dare not bring such resolutions down as a Government measure and ask the Legislature to support them in carrying it through. Then my hon. friend thought that the scheme had gone through the length and breadth of the land. Hon. gentlemen, it is quite true that the resolutions have gone through the length and breadth of the land; but where has there been that discussion in Canada to which resolutions of so much importance are entitled—except in Lower Canada, where I am told that fifteen counties have repudiated the resolutions when they were submitted to public meetings? And in Upper Canada, where is the single instance of discussion of the facts having taken place except in the city of Toronto, where there was little or no discussion, and where it was promised that that city, like Quebec, should be made the seat of one of the local governments? I understood my hon. friend from Erie Division to take issue on the fact that the delegates to the Conference were not self-elected, and I heard my hon. friend from Montreal deny it also. But if you take up a copy of the resolutions and the despatches accompanying them, you will find that they were in every sense of the word self-elected. And if they were not self-elected, who deputed them to come and do what they have done? Did the basis on which the Government was formed authorize them to enter into this compact? The basis on which the Government was formed speaks for itself. The measure they promised the people of Upper Canada was simply a measure to settle the existing difficulties between Upper and Lower Canada. They were to form Upper and Lower Canada into a Federation upon such a basis as would hereafter allow the other provinces, if agreeable, and if they could agree as to terms, to also enter the Federation. These are the bases on which the present Government was formed, and these are the bases on which the members of that Government went to the country and asked for the support of their constituents. And to bear me out in this

assertion, I have only to read the language of His Excellency the Governor General as I find it embodied in His Excellency's Speech at the close of the last session of Parliament. You will find it in the latter part of the Speech. His Excellency says:—"The time has arrived when the constitutional question, which has for many years agitated this province, is ripe for settlement." What province is alluded to in this paragraph? Most certainly the province of Canada. "It is my intention," proceeds His Excellency, "during the approaching recess, to endeavor to devise a plan for this purpose, which will be laid before Parliament at its next meeting." Hon. gentlemen, where is that plan? Where is the measure so promised in the Speech from the Throne. "In releasing you from further attendance," His Excellency goes on to say, "I would impress upon you the importance of using the influence which the confidence of your fellow subjects confers upon you to secure for any scheme which may be prepared with this object a calm and impartial consideration both in Parliament and throughout the country." Now, what does this mean? If it means anything, it means this, that the Government promised to bring down a measure to this Legislature to enable us to Confederates Upper and Lower Canada. "Well," hon. gentlemen say, "they have brought down a larger scheme." Yes, but who asked them to bring down that scheme? It is said that it makes no difference which scheme was laid before the House; but I contend that it makes all the difference, for if these resolutions had reference simply to Upper and Lower Canada, they would be susceptible of amendment by this House. In such a case, hon. gentlemen would not have come down as we now see them shaking their resolutions in the face of the members of the Legislature, and saying, "Here is a treaty which you must accept in its entirety or not at all." They would not be warning us at our peril to alter a word or erase a line on pain of being branded as disunionists, or perhaps something worse than that. Had they brought down the resolutions they were pledged to bring down, we would be sitting here calmly and dispassionately, aided by the Government of the day, framing a measure which would be in very deed for the benefit of the two provinces. But why do the Government seek to shelter themselves so completely behind these resolu-

tions—resolutions which, as they stand, are incapable of justification — resolutions which shew concession after concession to have been made to the eastern provinces, but not one of which (I challenge them to the proof) was made by the Lower Provinces to the people of Canada? Then look at the representation at the Conference. Both parties, I believe, from all the provinces were represented, except as regards one section of Canada. There was no one representing in the Conference the Liberal party in Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) While in the eastern provinces the Government of the day were magnanimous enough to ask the cooperation and consideration of the leaders of the Opposition in those provinces, the hon. gentlemen in Canada ignored entirely the existence of the Liberal party in Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) My hon. friend from the Erie Division tells us that he is strongly opposed to the details of the scheme.

HON. MR. CHRISTIE—I did not say so. I stated in reference to the elective principle that I was opposed to its abrogation.

HON. MR. CURRIE—If the hon. gentleman feels towards the elective principle as strongly as I do, he will oppose its abrogation to the last. I have reason to feel strongly in regard to that principle, being, like himself, indebted for it to a seat in the Legislature; and I will resist the measure very long before I vote against a principle giving the people power to send me here as their representative. The hon. gentleman also told us that the whole country is in favor of Federation. I have no doubt the whole country is in favor of Federation in itself, but there are many people throughout Canada who are opposed to the present scheme on account of its details. Then the hon. gentleman declared that the country understood the scheme. Now, what better illustration can we have of the falsity of this position than what was witnessed on the floor of this House last night? We then heard one of the most intelligent and one of the most able members of the mercantile community in Upper Canada, my hon. friend from Ottawa Division (Hon. Mr. SKELD) tell us it was only within the last twenty-four hours that he had understood the scheme as now submitted to the House. And yet we are gravely told that the whole country understands it! Do the people of the province generally know anything in reference

to the cost of working the scheme? Hon. gentlemen, it has been stated in various parts of the country, by leading public men of the country, that the local subsidies proposed in the scheme will be more than sufficient to carry on the local governments of the several provinces. But, hon. gentlemen, we must judge of the future by the experience afforded by the past. If you will look at the Public Accounts of Upper and Lower Canada—take for instance Upper Canada in 1838,—you will find that the expenditure on 450,000 of a population was \$885,000 for one year. But hon. gentlemen may assert that at that time Upper Canada had to bear the burdens of the militia and pay the cost of collecting the customs, and some other small charges which it is now proposed to throw on the Federal Government. But what were the charges of the militia for that year? The insignificant sum of £649. 19s. 11½d. Then there was received from fees and commissions £317 15s., thus making the total cost of the militia to Upper Canada no more than £332. 4s. 11½d. Then as to customs. Why, honorable gentlemen, the whole cost of collecting the customs revenue in Upper Canada, during the year 1838, amounted to £2,792. 14s. 2d.—just about one half the cost, hardly one half the cost—of collecting the present duties at the port of Toronto. Then if you come down to Lower Canada you will find that at the time of the union you had a population of 650,000 souls, and that the expense of governing the people was \$573,348. And I venture to say that no people in the world were ever more cheaply governed than were the people of Lower Canada before the union. (Hear, hear.) But if you can govern them after the union just as cheaply per head as before, what do you find? You will require \$980,000 to carry on the government of the country, independent of paying the interest upon the large portion of debt saddled upon you. In Upper Canada, we have been told that we really shall not know what to do with the large amount of money about to be lavished on the Local Legislature. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. MCCREA—Who said that—that we would have more money than we know what to do with?

HON. MR. CURRIE—You must have read it in the speeches made in the other House, and particularly in the speeches of the Hon. Mr. BROWN. Well, if we can govern the people of Upper Canada as cheap-

ly after the union as before, it will cost \$2,170,000 or \$1,054,000 more than the amount of the local subsidy. I am sure no hon. gentleman will believe that we are going to be more saving of the public money in the future than we were in those early days of our history. Hon. gentlemen, it is said that the people of the country have had those resolutions before them, that they perfectly understand them, and that they are prepared to pass a dispassionate judgment in the matter. It ill becomes the members of the Government to make such a statement. Why, what has been witnessed on the floor of this House? A simple question was put to the Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands as to the manner in which the members of the Legislative Councils of the various provinces were to be appointed. The Hon. Commissioner informed us that the appointments were to be made by the local governments, and he was confirmed in that view by the hon. and gallant Premier, who had the dignity conferred upon him of presiding over the Conference of delegates held in this city.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—I do not think that my hon. colleague said anything on the subject.

HON. MR. CURRIE—I understood him to confirm the statement of the Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands. But at all events, he heard the statement and did not object to it. But what did you find? After the absurdity of that position was pointed out, my hon. friend, the Commissioner of Crown Lands, asks a day to give an answer to the question, and he comes down next day and gives a totally different reply. A few days later, the question of the export duty on the minerals of Nova Scotia came under consideration, and I understood the Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands as saying that in his opinion only the coal and minerals exported to foreign countries would be liable to duty. But according to the explanations given by the hon. gentleman afterwards, I understand that the export duty will apply to all coal and minerals exported from Nova Scotia. My hon. friend went on to explain the meaning of this export duty. And what is his explanation? He tells us that it is nothing more than a royalty. The export duty is imposed simply upon the coal which leave the country. In Nova Scotia they now impose a royalty, and that royalty they intend to change for an

export duty, and the difference in their favor will be this—that on the coal they consume themselves there will be no duty, but on the coal they send to Canada there will be this barrier of an export duty.

HON. MR. ROSS—My hon. friend will see this, that had all the Crown lands in the different colonies been placed in the hands of the General Government, the General Government would have received all the proceeds therefrom. But those have been given to the local governments, and as in Upper Canada we will have timber dues, so in Nova Scotia they are entitled to a revenue from their coal.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Any one not acquainted with the subject would naturally fancy from the language of my hon. friend that under Federation we are to have something which we did not possess before. But the Crown lands are the property of Upper and Lower Canada now, and we are entitled to the revenue from them.

HON. MR. ROSS—And so is Nova Scotia entitled to a revenue from their coal.

HON. MR. CURRIE—But you give them a privilege not accorded to the other provinces of imposing export duties. Hon. gentlemen, I would now desire to allude to another matter which I think the people do not thoroughly understand, and that is the apportionment of the public debt. I stated before and I again assert that revenue is the only true basis on which the people should go into Confederation as regards their debt; and I think my hon. friend from the Saugeen Division (Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON) saw the matter in the same light.

HON. MR. MACPHERSON—Not in this case, because we have not the revenue to base it upon.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Why have we not the revenue to base it upon? Hon. gentlemen, the Trade Returns of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, are in the Library below, and twenty-four hours' work of a competent accountant would shew what each province would contribute to the general revenue from her trade under our present tariff.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—But does not the hon. gentleman see that when the tariffs are assimilated, they will not bring in the future what they have brought in the past?

HON. MR. CURRIE—This I can see, that you are giving to the Lower Provinces privileges which we do not enjoy. Hon. gen.

men speak of the imports from the Maritime Provinces. But take the import of coal from Nova Scotia, and we find that in 1863, its whole value amounted to \$67,000. Then they refer to the fish trade. But why need we go there for fish, when in our own waters we can have for the catching as fine fish as the world produces? But Confederation will give us no privileges over the fisheries which we do not at present enjoy. Canadian fishermen can as well go, and have as much the right to go, and fish in the waters below before as after Confederation. We will continue to go there if we desire it, not because we are members of the Confederacy, but because we are British subjects. But I was going to speak of the trade of these countries. We derive now little or no duty from the trade of the Lower Provinces, at the same time much of the revenues of the Lower Provinces is derived from exports from those provinces to each other, all of which will be lost to the General Government, as the Confederation will only be entitled to collect duties on goods imported from foreign countries. We are told, too, that our tariff is to be greatly reduced under Confederation. I am sorry to hear that statement, because it is impossible that it can be correct, and there is too much reason to fear that it was done with a view of influencing legislation elsewhere, by holding out the hope in Newfoundland and in the other provinces, that if they joined us, the tariff would be less burdensome than it is at present. But if the tariff is reduced, the people of Canada may rest assured that they will have \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 to raise in some other way; so that if you take it off the tariff, you must put it on the land. I wish now, however, to speak of the unfair apportionment of the debt. I have always taken the ground that revenue is the true gauge by which you can measure a nation's ability to pay debt. Well, taking the tables of the Finance Minister, we find that New Brunswick, with a revenue of \$1,000,000, goes into the Confederation with a debt of \$7,000,000, while Canada, with a revenue of \$11,500,000, is only entitled to go into the Confederation with a debt of \$62,500,000. Is this fair?—is it right?—is it honest? Take the revenue as the basis of ability to pay—and it is the only true basis—and instead of Canada going into the Confederation with a debt only \$62,500,000, she would be entitled to go in with a debt

of \$80,000,000, or more than her present indebtedness. Then it is said that the people understand the whole scheme, and that they are perfectly satisfied with it. If that were so we should have petitions coming down. But I have yet to learn that, when the people, especially of Upper Canada, understand the scheme and how it is going to work, they will be at all satisfied with it. Take the little Island of Prince Edward, with its population of 80,857 souls, or a less population than a single constituency represented in the other branch of the Legislature, and we find it getting \$152,728, while it is relieved of a debt of \$240,633.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—And what does it contribute?

HON. MR. CURRIE—It simply contributes custom and excise duties by the operation of the same tariff and under the same law as the people of Canada.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—But how much does it contribute?

HON. MR. CURRIE—I find the whole revenue of the island set down at \$200,000. But, hon. gentlemen, pray do not run away with the idea that all this comes to the Confederate Government. All that comes to the Confederate Government are simply the duties from excise and customs on goods imported from foreign countries.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—Which is the whole amount of their revenue, except \$31,000.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Surely my hon. friend does not wish to get up and argue that the people of this little island—a frugal and industrious people—contribute more to the revenue per head than the people of Upper Canada? Well, let us proceed now to Newfoundland, and what do we find? That with a population of 122,600 souls—less than the population of Huron, Bruce and Grey—less, in fact, than the constituency represented by my hon. friend, the member for Saugeen—they get \$369,000 a year for all time, and are relieved of a debt of \$946,000.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—And what do they contribute?

HON. MR. CURRIE—Simply the revenue from customs and excise, and nothing more.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—And what does that amount to?

HON. MR. CURRIE—I am aware that—

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—They will contribute, under the present tariff, \$479,000 per annum.

HON. MR. CURRIE—My hon. friend surely does not intend to say that Newfoundland has no other source of revenue than customs and excise?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—No other; and that is the reason why they get \$150,000.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Newfoundland is to have \$106,000 a year, not for this year only, but for all time to come. She gets as well 80 cents per head for all time to come. Then she gets also, what I am sure the Commissioner of Crown Lands can hardly justify, that is a bonus of \$165,000 for all time to come; and this, if capitalized, amounts to \$3,000,000—and all this that she may come into the Confederation. And why does she receive so large a sum? My hon. friend tells us that she gets it in consideration of the valuable Crown lands and minerals which she surrenders to the General Government. But we have yet to learn as a matter of fact that a ton of coal has ever been raised in the island. And what other minerals have they? We know of none. Their Crown lands, too, are of no value, as is proved by their not having yielded anything at all for many years past. Then why should we give them \$3,000,000, or \$165,000 per year for worthless lands? I will not say, however, that they are altogether worthless; but I know this, that for years past a statute has been in force, giving the lands free of charge to anybody who will go and settle on them for five years. And these are the valuable lands for which we are to pay an equivalent of \$3,000,000. But my hon. friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands, perhaps, when he addresses the House, will tell us these Crown lands and minerals, whatever their value to Newfoundland, are worth \$3,000,000 to the Confederation, and will argue as that they give up these lands and minerals, and have no local source of revenue, it is necessary they should receive this subsidy in return. But why have they no local source of revenue? Why not adopt the same means to raise revenue in Newfoundland that we adopt here? Why should we be called upon to contribute from the public chest \$165,000 for a purpose that we in Canada tax ourselves for? Hon. gentlemen, I stated that the country was taken by surprise in regard to the manner in which this measure was brought down to the House; and I think I have good reason for making that statement. Before we came here we had very little explanation of the financial part

of the scheme; and that is a most important part. I am not one of those who, while favorable to Confederation as a principle, would put a few hundred thousand dollars in the scale against it. But my grounds against the scheme are these—that if it is commenced upon a basis which is unjust to one portion of the community, it will be based upon a false foundation, and the tenement thus proposed to be erected will not withstand the breath of public opinion. We had reason to suppose that when we came here the measure promised at the close of the last session would be submitted; but instead of that we have a very different measure altogether. But supposing this Address passes—supposing these resolutions are carried, and the other colonies do not concur in the same Address as ourselves, what is to be the consequence? As I understand it, the consent of all the provinces must be had, and if they do not concur, the scheme falls to the ground. What we ought to have had in Canada was the promised measure to put an end to the sectional difficulties between Upper and Lower Canada. But, instead of that, we are placed in consequence of the Quebec Conference in this position—a scheme is brought down which is declared to be in the nature of a treaty, and we are told that we are to have no voice in its alteration. No matter what the details may be—our discussion of them is to be a mere farce. Even the reasonable delay I am now asking for will, I fear, be opposed by the Government of the day. Hon. gentlemen, in order to shew the necessity which exists for the measure being equitable and just to all classes of the people and all sections of the country about to be affected by it, I will read the remarks of a distinguished statesman—one of the ablest men, perhaps, that Canada can claim. This is his language:—

No measure could possibly meet the approval of the people of Canada which contained within it the germs of injustice to any, and if, in the measure which was now before the people of Canada, there was anything which bore on its face injustice, it would operate greatly against the success of the measure itself.

These were the views of the Minister of Finance as expressed by him only a few months ago, and it is because I feel that there are parts of the scheme which will do gross and wanton injustice to portions of the proposed Confederation, that I feel it to

be my duty to oppose it. It may be said that it is not proper for this branch of the Legislature to delay the measure, but I quite concur, on this point, in the views of the hon. gentleman who represents one of the largest and most important constituencies in Canada (Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON), when he said :—

Although the Legislative Council is precluded by this Constitution from originating money votes or making money appropriations of any kind, they have it nevertheless in their power zealously to guard your interests, protecting them against hasty and ill-considered legislation, and preventing improper and extravagant appropriations of the public funds.

HON. MR. MACPHERSON—I approve of all that.

HON. MR. CURRIE—I fully concur in all the hon. member from Saugeen stated in his address to his constituents, with reference to this subject, and I hope the hon. gentleman will now, when the opportunity is offered him, act up to the professions he made, and I feel confident he will do so. Now, hon. gentlemen, what have we here before us? We have a scheme which is calculated to do manifest and untold injustice to that section of the province which the hon. gentleman has the honor to represent. We have a scheme pledging us to construct the Inter-colonial Railway without our knowing whether it is to cost fifteen, twenty or thirty millions of dollars. The only estimate is that alluded to by the hon. member from Toronto, who stated that Mr. BAYDENS was prepared to build it for seventeen and a half millions of dollars.

HON. MR. MACPHERSON—This House has nothing to do with money matters.

HON. MR. CURRIE—If my hon. friend entertains that opinion, he will very soon learn a very different and important lesson respecting the privileges of this House. It is our duty as honest legislators to protect the country from the baneful effects of hasty and ill-considered legislation. Well, is not this hasty legislation that is now proposed to be transacted by the Government of the day?

HON. MR. MACPHERSON.—I do not regard it so, and I tell you why. My constituents have considered the question and are fully satisfied that the proposed legislation should take place.

HON. MR. CURRIE—It has been said by hon. gentlemen that the whole scheme con-

sists of concessions. I would ask what concessions have been made to Canada? What concession has been made to the views of the people of Upper Canada? The people will understand why it is that everything was conceded on the part of Canada, and comparatively nothing on the part of the Lower Provinces, when they know that the little colony of Prince Edward Island, with its eighty thousand people, has as much to say in the Conference as Upper Canada with its million and a half, and as Lower Canada with its million and a quarter of people. (Hear, hear.) When we conceded to them that point, the series of concessions on the part of Canada began. Then we conceded to them the right of depriving us of an elective Legislative Council. (Hear, hear.) Who challenges this statement? I defy any hon. gentlemen to say that it was not at the dictation of the eastern provinces, that the character of the Legislative Council was changed. In order to settle this point, it is only necessary to refer hon. gentlemen to what the Hon. Minister of Finance stated in his celebrated Sherbrooke speech with reference to it. That was concession number two. Then look at the proposed Constitution. The Lower Provinces had only a population of 700,000 people. One would think they would be satisfied with the same representation in the Legislative Council that Upper Canada with double the number of people should have, and that Lower Canada with nearly double the population should be given. But instead of being satisfied with 24, they must have 28 members. There are three distinct and most important concessions on the part of Canada to the people of the eastern provinces. And then we go into the Federation with a debt of only \$62,500,000, instead of with \$82,500,000 as we were entitled to. Then we are to saddle ourselves with a burden of \$15,000,000, and give them a bonus for coming in, in the shape of an annual payment for local purposes, which we defray in Upper Canada by direct taxation.

HON. MR. MCCREA—That is because they are to help to pay our debt.

HON. MR. CURRIE—My honorable friend from the Western Division says, they have to help to pay our debt; true they have to help to pay the debts of the Confederation, but that is no reason why they should receive money from us to pay their local expenses. Then look at the absurdity of giving each

province so much per head on its population for the expenses of the local governments. Every one knows that the population of the Lower Provinces will not increase nearly so fast as that of this province. We will therefore have to pay a greater proportion of this amount through the increase of our population than we can receive under the proposed arrangement. This is concession number four. The next concession is to New Brunswick. We are to give New Brunswick a bonus of \$630,000 in addition to building the Intercolonial Railway through a long section of the country—leading the people to believe that the road is to pass through nearly every town in the province. Then Nova Scotia gets the right to impose an export duty on its coal and other minerals coming into Upper Canada, or going elsewhere. Then Newfoundland, as I have said before, is to have upward of three millions of dollars, if you capitalize the annual gift, as an inducement to come in and join us. Then, hon. gentlemen, my hon. friend from Port Hope spoke of the common schools of Canada, of about one million and a quarter of dollars that is to be abolished by a stroke of the pen—that is another concession, I suppose, made to the people of the eastern provinces. What do we get for all these concessions? Do we get anything that we are not entitled to as a matter of right. We get 17 additional members of the Lower House for Upper Canada—but that is nothing more than we are entitled to—at the same time that we get 47 added from the east. We are told that the reason for having so large a number of members is to avoid narrow majorities. If everything works well, therefore, under the new constitution, we are told we will always have a strong Government, somewhat similar to that with which we are now blessed. Hon. gentlemen say, that this question is perfectly understood by the people of Canada, and that they are satisfied with the arrangement; then what danger, I would ask, can there be in allowing the people a few months to consider the matter still more fully? In my opinion, it is far better to take the thing up deliberately and proceed cautiously with it, than to attempt to force a measure upon the people so hurriedly, that they will feel hereafter, if they do not now, that you are doing them a very great injustice. (Hear, hear.) It is most extraordinary, the grounds on which these resolutions are supported by different classes of people. Some hon.

gentlemen support them on the ground that the Confederation is to build up an independent nationality in this part of the world. Others, on the ground that it is going to cement us more closely as colonies. And a third party uphold the resolutions on the ground that the injustice of the thing will disgust the people and float our country over to the American Republic. I feel myself that unless the people have due time to consider the matter, and are not driven into it against their will, these resolutions will amount to nothing more than so many withees to tie the provinces together until we all drift like a raft into the American Confederation. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

HON. MR. DICKSON—Honorable gentlemen,—Every honorable member of this House must be aware of the difficulties which an individual member has to encounter in rising to address the House at this late period of the debate, when the subject, after a fortnight's discussion, is almost exhausted. I have, however, refrained from offering any observations at an earlier stage, in consequence of a desire to confine my remarks more particularly to the principle embodied in the amendment of my honorable and learned friend from the Niagara Division. I shall now briefly refer to the introductory remarks of the honorable and gallant Knight at the head of the present Government, when he submitted the matter for the consideration of this honorable House. That honorable gentleman told us that the unsatisfactory state of things which had existed in the politics of this country for the twenty-five months prior to the TACHÉ-MACDONALD Administration, rendered it necessary that some great political exertion should be made to remedy those difficulties. Well, gentlemen, what were those difficulties? Why, it was that five different administrations had been formed, and five different administrations had been unable to carry on the administration of public affairs, and had either resigned or become so weak, in consequence of their small majority in the popular branch, that they could not conduct the Government in a satisfactory manner. The TACHÉ-MACDONALD Government had arrived at the same state as the five preceding administrations, and finding themselves in this political dilemma, were again about appealing to the country, when a "still, small voice" was heard in the distance; and what was that "still, small voice," and where did it come from? It was the voice of a great man, and came from an individual who solicited an opportunity of

pouring oil on the troubled political waters. (Hear, hear.) Permission was granted, the oil poured on; the effect was miraculous—the commotion ceased, and a calm succeeded—a circumstance which caused no surprise when it was discovered, as it speedily was, that the magical oil came fresh from the wells of Bothwell. (Great laughter.) The Government, as the honorable and gallant Knight told us, received a communication from the “real chief” of the Opposition. And there is no doubt but that he was the real chief of the Opposition, and by his apostasy—this individual from whom the still, small voice came—is the real chief of the Government party. (Laughter.) Well, he was desirous of making overtures, and he did, as a matter of fact, make overtures, with the view, as the honorable and gallant Knight has told us, of sinking all previous differences. We are told he went into the Government for the purpose of settling this one question of a new political existence, and we are therefore justified in inferring that he is either going out of the Government again at an early day, or else is going up to a higher position. Well, gentlemen, what difficulties have been settled? None as yet, but the scheme now before the House was to be a panacea for all the difficulties and dissensions that have afflicted the country for the past five and twenty years. From whom does this panacea emanate? Why, from the very individual who has been more instrumental than any other man in creating those difficulties. (Hear, hear.) The honorable gentleman at one time stated that he was a governmental impossibility, but it does not appear that he has been so in reality. After the oil was thrown on the troubled waters, then came the period for making some little delicate arrangements between the Government and the gentleman possessing the still small voice. Well, what were the little arrangements? Why, the honorable gentleman insisted on being an outsider. He would not go into the Government under any circumstances whatever. (Hear, hear.) No, no, he would not. (Laughter.) Well, the members of the Government said: “But we must have you among us; we are too well aware of the power you can bring us, to consent to your remaining on the outside.” Well now, it is astonishing the sacrifices public men will sometimes consent to make. (Laughter.) It is really surprising, gentlemen, what sacrifices they do feel called upon to make for the good of their country. (Laughter.) And here we have a very notable example of it. We have

an instance of how much can be sacrificed at the shrine of patriotism for the salvation of one's country. (Laughter. Towards the last of the delicate arrangements before alluded to, he thought he would go in—this still, small voice gentleman. (Laughter.) Well, this being determined upon, he thought it would be necessary to go in upon some principle, but that was a most difficult operation. What principle could be found applicable to the case? (Laughter.) Some inventive genius suggested that he might go in on the homoeopathic principle. Well, he finally went in on that principle, and took with him an infinitesimally small dose of Grits. (Renewed laughter.) And the result of his going in on that principle is that we have now a Government composed of three Clear Grits and nine Conservatives. The honorable gentleman, to whom I have alluded, went to the country and got returned to his seat in the House and Government. My honorable friend from Toronto says he got returned by acclamation. Well, when we look at the individual and consider that he has been for years the leading spirit and guiding genius of a large political party, made up of a majority of the representatives of Upper Canada, and look at the acknowledged intellect of the man, and take into account the influence of the pen which he has the opportunity of wielding so powerfully—when we take all these things into consideration, it is not at all surprising that he should be returned by acclamation. (Hear, hear.) He came back from the country and has since taken part in the Government; and here I wish to make a few observations with reference to the Government as it stands to-day. You must recollect, honorable gentlemen, that we are enjoying, or at least have enjoyed, a system of government in this country which has a great many admirers, and which some honorable gentlemen admire a great deal more than the quality of the people. The system is known by the name of Responsible Government. If I understand the subject properly, that system of government is defined in this way—that the Government of the country must be carried on according to the well-understood wishes of the people, as expressed through their representatives on the floor of the House of Assembly. (Hear, hear.) Well now, I take exception to the formation of the present Government, on the ground that it was not established on that principle, because they are not a government emanating from the people. I cannot hold them in the same respect that I

did before the three Conservative members from Upper Canada, who retired in favor of the three Grit members, left it. The Government then all belonged to one political party, were all consistent members of that party, and taken together, were equal in talent to any Administration that has ever had charge of the affairs of this or any other province. All holding the same views on leading political questions, even those who opposed them could not but feel a very large degree of respect for them as sincere, honest, consistent Conservatives, and as I believe, entertaining sound political principles. But the introduction of the three other members altered the whole face of the Government. And the first thing this unholy alliance does is to go to work at the suggestion of the chief with the still, small voice to upset our Constitution. (Hear, hear.) When a great constitutional question comes before this House, designed as it is to sweep an entire constitution from our Statute Book, and replace it with another, I think you will agree with me, honorable gentlemen, that this is one of the most important measures that could come from any government on the face of the earth. (Hear, hear.) Well, I would ask those people who are so anxious to see responsible government carried out in this country in its integrity, is this a government that you can recognize as representing the well-understood wishes of the people? A government claiming to be a responsible government ought to have for its basis returns made from the polls, and ought not to have its origin through the instrumentality of ministerial convenience. (Hear, hear.) I would like to ask if, at the last general election, this subject was mooted to the people in any section of the province?—whether it was a subject to which the slightest reference was ever made by the votes of the people when they returned their representatives? I do not think that it could have been, because it is a measure that has emanated from the particular individual to whom I have referred, since the TACHÉ-MACDONALD Government got into that unfortunate political dilemma. The people were not aware at the last general election that any such measure as this was to come before the Legislature. Honorable gentlemen, I would not stand up here and speak in this manner if the subject brought under our consideration was any ordinary measure which could be passed this session and repealed at the next, if found unsatisfactory. But these resolutions, if adopted by all the legislatures, will become embodied in an

Imperial Act, and the people of Canada will find some difficulty in having any change made in respect to them. The power that creates Confederation, by passing the act for that purpose, will be the only power by which any change can be effected in that act. Therefore, after passing these resolutions, it will be out of our power to alter them in the least degree. This, honorable gentlemen, is one of the reasons why I have refrained from addressing the House until the resolution which has just been proposed by my honorable friend from the Niagara Division should be brought forward. I would take this opportunity of saying that I do not think the observation made by an honorable gentleman, to the effect that it would be in bad taste for this House to suggest a dissolution of the other branch of the Legislature, should have any influence in disposing of the amendment now before us. Why, honorable gentlemen, there is nothing of the kind in the amendment. We argue for delay, and we are perfectly willing you should delay the measure until after the next general election. But, if the Government think that delay will be so dangerous to the measure, there is a constitutional remedy open to them, which, of course, it would not be proper for me to refer to in a more pointed manner. I do not argue for a week or a month's delay. I think there ought to be a much longer time allowed. I think the question ought to be submitted to the people of this country for their approval. I do not want the thing to be gone about in a peddling kind of style, one honorable gentleman running here and another there, and endeavoring in that way to learn the views of his constituents. If we cannot have the usual constitutional mode of arriving at the true views, opinions, and impressions of the people in relation to the scheme, I do not want any delay at all. I do not want the opinion of the people taken, unless it can be done in such a manner as will give us something upon which we can depend. If an honorable gentleman consults the electors in one portion of his constituency and they are opposed to the scheme, while those of another section of the same constituency are in favor of it, he is no better off than when he began. Nor do I believe in taking a vote of the constituencies, "yea or nay," on the measure, in the manner in which the people have to vote with reference to stopping the supply of intoxicating drink under the Temperance Act. (Laughter.) I go for the whole British constitutional mode, or nothing. I have no idea of wishing to see honorable gentlemen going

round among their constituents, knocking at every door, and asking: Do you go Confederation? (Laughter.) I would as soon see them going around peddling wooden clocks. (Renewed laughter.) I say, honorable gentlemen, that the whole scheme has emanated from the fertile and imaginative brain of one individual. That individual suggested the scheme to the Government; the Government took that individual in amongst them; he proposed this arbitrary mode of carrying the scheme through with the assistance of a united following—and it is going to be done. The whole thing, I say again, proceeds from that individual, who has sown to the storm and reaped the whirlwind long enough, and does not intend to reap it any longer if he can help it. But my opinion is that he is, perhaps, unwittingly sowing a greater storm than ever, and that a whirlwind will ensue of a most fearful character. It is just possible, however, that it will be found the most advantageous measure for the country that has ever been introduced to the Legislature, and if so, the honorable member for South Oxford is entitled to the whole credit of suggesting it, and taking the initiatory steps, without which it could never have been brought about; while on the other hand, if it should prove the most disastrous to the country that has ever been mooted, as I fear will be the case, unless submitted to the people in the constitutional way, that honorable gentleman will be entitled to, and will receive, the most bitter condemnation. (Hear, hear.) Well, I now come to the position which the measure now occupies before the House, and the relation in which I stand to this House in dealing with it. When the proposition was made to change the character of the constitution of this House, I did everything in my power to prevent its becoming law; but all my efforts, with those of a number of honorable colleagues, were of no avail. And those gentlemen who, on that occasion, agreed with me that it was a most unwise step to alter the Constitution in that respect, when they and I found we could do no more, we filed a protest against it, because—

First.—The Act of Union conferred upon the people of Canada a Constitution as nearly similar to that under which Great Britain has attained her place among nations, as their colonial position would admit; and the Legislative Council, an integral part of that Constitution, was early established on its present basis as a check equally upon the hasty action of the popular branch, as upon the undue influence of the Crown. *Second*—

ly.—Because the introduction of the elective principle into the Constitution of the Upper Chamber gives an undue preponderance to the popular element; diminishes the proper influence of the Crown, and destroys the balance that has acted as a proper check upon both since representative institutions were given to the colony. *Thirdly*.—Because the measure now proposed tends to the destruction of executive responsibility; the adoption of a written Constitution; the election of the highest officer of the Crown, and the separation of Canada from the parent state.—Signed, P. B. DEBLAQUIERE, JOHN HAMILTON, GEORGE J. GOODHUE, WM. WIDMER, JAS. GORDON, J. FERRIER, R. MATHIESON, G. S. BOULTON, WALTER H. DICKSON.

Well, honorable gentlemen, the change took place in spite of all we could do. I condemned the proposed change on that occasion from my own personal views respecting it, for I had no constituency, as some honorable gentlemen now have, to consult, and I now take exception in the same manner to the scheme before the House. I do not take such strong exception to the details of the measure as some honorable gentlemen do, because when I reflect upon the number of individuals that took part in the Conference, and the ability possessed by those individuals, I would not, as a matter of course, have the temerity to rise in my place and proceed to point out an error here and another error there, even if they seemed to me to be errors, as some of them do seem, unless I felt satisfied not only that I possessed sounder judgment than they, but also that I was better acquainted with all the circumstances having a direct as well as indirect bearing upon the question. But, honorable gentlemen, let me ask who is going to be chiefly affected by those changes? Why, the people of Canada. And therefore it is that I ask, and all I ask is what appears to me to be only what is reasonable, as applied to the every day transactions of life, and that is, that those who are going to be affected should have some voice, at least, in these proceedings. (Hear, hear.) This appears to me to be a sound mode of viewing the question; and claiming to myself the right of exercising my own personal judgment, with the limited means of doing so which the Almighty has thought proper to place me in possession of, I feel it my duty to stand up in this House and record my views and my vote in such a manner as that, while I live, I may look back with some degree of satisfaction upon the view that I took and advocated upon the floor of this House.—(Hear, hear.) I do not think some honorable gentlemen who have stood up and argued

against continuing the elective principle in this House, can have done so with as much satisfaction to themselves as if they had not, on a previous occasion, pursued a different course. I well recollect that when I found it was the determination to introduce the elective principle in relation to the membership of this House, I said—Gentlemen, if the principle is good in one case, it is good in another; let us make the Speaker elective. No, no, they said, that will not do; that is republicanism. They would not have the Speaker made elective. You know there was a little patronage at disposal by keeping the appointment of the Speaker in the Government. At that time I could make no progress in getting the House to go for making the Speaker elective. Since then, however, they made the Speaker elective, and therefore the House must admit that I was right on that occasion. I opposed the House being made elective, but honorable gentlemen made it elective, and now they are going to reinvest the appointments in the Crown. So it is clear that when the first change was made I was also right on that occasion. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) When the proposal was made to grant three millions of money to the Grand Trunk, I saw it was being done for political support, and I therefore opposed it. I also opposed the grants to the Arthabaska, and Port Hope and Peterborough railways, because I considered them only convenient methods of acquiring parliamentary support on the pretence of getting money for the Grand Trunk proper. Those roads were termed "feeders" for the Grand Trunk, but I called them Grand Trunk "suckers." (Laughter.) I take to myself some little credit for having taken this view of those questions. I am willing to admit that the Grand Trunk is a very great benefit to the province in a material point of view, but I do believe that we paid very dearly for the whistle. (Laughter.) Having paid so dearly for that road, running, as it does, through the very finest portion of the country, I am disposed to be very cautious about entering upon the construction of this Intercolonial Railway. (Hear, hear.) I have often availed myself of a leaf out of the book of my honorable friend (Hon. Mr. Ross) and I like to stick pretty close by him, because if I get off the track he has the happy faculty of putting me on again. Now, I would like to ask him whether or not, in the remarks he made this afternoon, he stated that there had been no demand on the part of the people for an elective Legislative Council since the union.

HON. MR. ROSS—What I said was, that there had been no general demand for the change on the part of the people of Upper Canada. I am well aware that there was agitation on the subject in Lower Canada.

HON. MR. DICKSON—Well, I find here in the *Journals of the Legislative Assembly* for 1855, that on the 21st of May, when the second reading of the Bill to make this House elective was defeated, the following was entered on the *Journals* by eight honorable members, in the shape of reasons for their dissent from the vote, viz.:—

DISSENTIENT—Because public opinion has long and repeatedly been expressed on the necessity of rendering this branch of the Legislature elective; because the almost unanimous vote of the Legislative Assembly, irrespective of party, has, in the most unequivocal manner, ratified the opinion of the people as hereinbefore expressed; because the opposition of this House to the universal desire of the inhabitants of Canada, unsustained either by a party in the other branch of the Legislature or out of it, is unprecedented, and of a nature to cause the most serious apprehensions.

The first name, honorable gentlemen, signed to that protest is the Honorable JOHN ROSS, and the second is my honorable and gallant friend, Sir E. P. TACHÉ. Then there are the Honorable Messrs. PANET, BELLEAU, ARMSTRONG, PERRY, LEGARÉ, and CARTIER. Well, I can now exonerate all those gentlemen, after observing, as I have done, how well the elective principle has worked in its application to this House. But I cannot understand how honorable gentlemen could have entertained the view that great disaster would be the result of refusing to grant the elective principle, and then inside of ten years, when their ideas had been put into practical effect, and had worked so admirably, they could again rise in this House and advocate a return to the system which then was so bad, and which the people were so determined to have altered. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. ROSS—I was then a member of the Government, and spoke their sentiments.

HON. MR. DICKSON—Well then, honorable gentlemen, it seems I am to understand that the honorable gentleman did not then express the sentiments of Hon. Mr. Ross as an individual, but of Hon. Mr. Ross as a member of the Government. I have never been in the Government, and therefore, perhaps, I am pardonable for not having understood that the gentleman carried about with him a double set of sentiments, either of which could be used as occasion seemed to demand. (Laughter.) But, in furtherance of the argument for delay,

I desire to say that I am anxious to have the further consideration of the scheme in this House postponed for other reasons than those which I have given expression to. My honorable friend the gallant Knight, in his remarks last evening, made allusion to the burning of the Parliament buildings. I agree with him that that was a thing sincerely to be regretted. But he stated that, if the conservatives in the Legislative Council had had the prudence and good sense to exercise the amount of wisdom that they might have exercised, they would have put off the Rebellion Losses Bill another year, which course of proceeding would, in all probability, have prevented the deplorable occurrence to which he referred. Now, honorable gentlemen, I stand here to ask you to take the advice the honorable and gallant Knight has given, and apply it to the present scheme. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) You do not know what disastrous consequences may ensue, if this huge scheme is carried out without an appeal to the people in a constitutional manner. I do sincerely hope you will allow that powerful argument for delay adduced by the honorable and gallant Knight to bear upon this question. (Hear, hear.) This is a revolution, gentlemen, not a mere payment of a few thousand pounds, that is proposed. A revolution may be carried out by the exercise of political power, as well as by physical force. If the Government of the country is subverted, it makes no difference how it is done. It is a revolution all the same, no matter how it is brought about. The effect is the same upon the country. The proposal is to sweep our present Constitution away, and supply its place with another, which may be better or a great deal worse. As I see by the clock I have only five minutes left before six, and do not desire to speak at any greater length, I will have to draw my remarks to a close. (Cries of "go on," "go on.") Well, as honorable gentlemen seem to desire it, I will make a few further remarks after dinner.

A message was here received from the Assembly, after which the House took a recess until 8 P.M. That hour having arrived, and the House having re-assembled—

HON. MR. DICKSON said—The great reason for delay I conceive to be that it is proposed by the adoption of the resolutions of the Government to wipe out the present Constitution of the country without consulting the people affected thereby. I have not yet heard one single observation from the Government, or from any honorable member of this House, tending to show that there is any necessity for

the unseemly haste with which the matter is being pressed. I think it ought to be laid over until after the next general election; and I beg honorable gentlemen to observe that I make no suggestion respecting a dissolution of the other branch of the Legislature. But if there is really any necessity for haste, then there is a constitutional mode of hastening an appeal open to the Government. My honorable friend opposite argued that the prerogative of the Crown was taken away, in reference to the appointment of members of this House, without an appeal to the people, and that therefore no harm could result from taking away the boon then given them without any demand on their part or any appeal to them. Gentlemen, we were then experimentalists, and the experiment succeeded well. Then why not stick to it? We improved on the Constitution on that occasion. And you may give the people privileges they do not ask, very safely. But what is now proposed to be done? It is proposed to take that power from them without consulting them, and I hold that such a thing ought not to be done. Having raised them to the highest state of political exaltation, without their even asking for it, it is now proposed to reduce them, almost without notice, to the lowest possible position of political degradation. It is the main principle of the Government under which we live, that the people, through their representatives, shall be consulted as to the composition of their Government. As for a mutual understanding between the electors and the elected, in relation to this scheme, there is none whatever, and I have thus urged delay because I do not think there is any need of hurry. There is a constitutional mode of ascertaining the views of the people, and it ought to be made use of. But honorable gentlemen say, "Oh, don't throw out any hint about bringing on a general election before the proper period; we have had elections enough during the past five years." Why, honorable gentlemen, what is proposed to be done by the passing of these resolutions? Will their adoption not bring on a new election inside of eighteen months? There is another observation I desire to make with reference to honorable gentlemen endeavoring to obtain the views of their constituents by knocking at their doors, and asking whether they favor the first resolution and the second, and so on, through the entire list. I do not think that even by such a proceeding you could arrive at a thorough understanding of the views of your constituents. The common way of doing it is for a

member to call his constituents together in a large room in some hotel or other building, and lay the whole subject before them, expressing his opinion on the various clauses as he proceeds. In so doing he is more than apt to imbue their minds with the same view that he himself holds. I have only heard one member allude to having received the resolutions, and he merely opened and sealed them up again in consequence of their being marked "Private," without endeavoring to ascertain the views of his constituents. I do hope that some course of procedure can be devised by which the spirit of the amendment proposed by my honorable friend from the Niagara Division may be carried into effect. The amendment simply states—

That upon a matter of such great importance as the proposed Confederation of this and certain other British Colonies, this House is unwilling to assume the responsibility of assenting to a measure involving so many important considerations, without a further manifestation of the public will than has yet been declared.

Well, honorable gentlemen, is this House willing to assume the responsibility of depriving the people of the opportunity of expressing their wishes on so momentous a question as an entire change of their Constitution. Those who are willing to take the responsibility will vote against this amendment, while those who are willing to have the matter referred to the people, will vote for it. My sentiments are well expressed in the amendment, and exercising my own individual judgment, having no constituency to be governed by, I shall vote for it, and if it is defeated it will strengthen the hands of the Government in carrying out their great principle of Confederation without an appeal to the people—and, as a matter of course, according to our present system of responsible government, they must assume the responsibility.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL said—I would like, honorable gentlemen, to continue the debate in that excellent and happy spirit in which my honorable friend who has just sat down has addressed the House. I envy my honorable friend very much for the possession of that happy faculty of amusing and instructing the House in combination. I am somewhat grieved to feel obliged to call the attention of honorable members to that which is, perhaps, more of a business character and less interesting than the remarks which fell from my honorable friend. I must say that I very much regret that my honorable friend should have thought that on this particular amendment

being proposed, it was his duty to come to its support, because it is evident to my own mind, and must also be so to every honorable member present, that my honorable friend, while giving his support to the amendment, entertains very different views from those which were enunciated by the honorable member for Niagara, who moved it. My honorable friend says, "If there is to be delay, let it be a substantial delay; let it be such a delay as will ensure a dissolution of parliament; such a delay as will enable the people to speak in that manner, and in that manner only, that is known to the British Constitution." I can respect that sentiment. There is something real in an argument based on that foundation. I do him the justice to believe that he takes that view with a sincere desire that the delay should not militate against the scheme, but that it should be adopted by the people when referred to them. But, honorable gentlemen, contrast that view with the idea suggested by the honorable gentleman who moved this resolution. What view does he take? Not that there should be such a delay as would enable the people to express themselves in the manner in which Great Britain and all her colonies speak, but in that sort of way which, as my honorable friend (Hon. Mr. Dickson) has graphically described, is more nearly allied to the peddling of clocks than to anything connected with British constitutional procedure. What does the honorable gentleman say? He says, give us twenty days or a month.

HON. MR. CURRIE—I said that was the least time I would ask.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—What could be done with twenty days or a month's delay? Is it possible for the people to speak in any constitutional way in twenty days or a month? The honorable gentleman knows very well that it is not possible, and that under no system of government could such a plan, as his mind has suggested, by any possibility be sanctioned by the Legislature. Would the people of New York state, or any of the States of the Union, sanction a proceeding of that kind? On the contrary, they would adopt the course at once of having the scheme submitted to a direct vote of the people. If you adopt the British constitutional way, then there will have to be a dissolution of Parliament; but, if you adopt the American system, the people will be called upon to vote "yea or nay" on the scheme as it stands. Let it be expressed in one way or the other, fairly and constitutionally, in accordance with our system of government.

My honorable friend does not contemplate that. He contemplates a postponement of the subject, in some way or other, for twenty days or a month, and I am sorry that my honorable friend, who spoke last, should have felt himself called upon to adopt a scheme so entirely contrary to what I know are his views as to what is correct and proper, according to those constitutional and British views which he entertains. I am sorry that he should have been led to adopt a scheme which is evidently not advocated by him from the same motives as those which actuate my honorable friend from Niagara.

HON. MR. DICKSON—I approve of the resolution as it stands, and I entertain the views that I have expressed. I have always held that a general election was the proper constitutional mode of learning the people's views, and I distinctly stated that I did not care to have a short delay.

HON. MR. CURRIE—All I suggested was that the Government might at least give twenty days or a month, if they would grant no more. Of course, I desire to get what my honorable friend Mr. DICKSON has asked.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—Then I do hope my honorable friend will withdraw his support to the amendment, when he sees that he does not concur with the mover of it, who evidently contemplates some other course than is known to the British Constitution for ascertaining the views of the people—for instance, by members going from door to door, or by holding meetings in convenient places and making themselves agreeable to their constituents by indulging in hospitalities, &c. I am quite confident that is not the idea which my honorable friend opposite entertains; nor, I am satisfied, is it the view which any honorable gentleman of this House can entertain who is desirous of promoting Confederation of the provinces—that these resolutions, important as they are, and necessary as it is that we should arrive at some conclusion in reference to them, should be laid aside until my honorable friend from Niagara goes about from door to door throughout his large and intelligent constituency, knocking at each and asking the views of the electors on each separate resolution. My honorable friend is charged with the duty of representing his constituency on the floor of this House, and it is to be supposed that he is well capable of representing them in point of intellect and good judgment, when he is called upon to say whether or not he believes the scheme, as a whole, to be a desirable one for the

country. (Hear, hear.) But he seems to ignore all that. He does not seem willing to pronounce his judgment upon this scheme. He will not say that it is so objectionable that he will vote against it on the merits of the case. If he is unable to come to a decision, he ought to resign his position, and give place to some one who can come to a decision. But look at the position of a man who says in effect, "I have no opinion of my own; if the people whom I represent are favorable to the scheme, I have not a word to say; I will vote for it to please them, though I disapprove of it." Gentlemen, let him give his constituency the benefit of his best judgment, and consider whether, reflecting upon the fact that there are five different provinces to be consulted, and constituencies upon constituencies to be canvassed, that which he desires can be ascertained in any better way than by this House, considering itself a fair representation of the sentiment of Canada, coming to an immediate decision. He says his constituents have not charged him with the duty of altering the Constitution. Well, but he is charged with the duty of exercising his best judgment upon every subject brought before this House. We are not here for the purpose of altering the Constitution. We have not the power to alter the Constitution if we desired to do so, but we have the sacred duty incumbent upon us of expressing our views in relation to such alterations as may be considered advantageous to the country. (Hear, hear.) Do these resolutions alter the Constitution of the country? Not at all. They merely state that such alterations are desirable. The Constitution itself can only be changed by the Imperial authorities. We are not exceeding what our French Canadian friends called the *mandat* with which we are charged. We have no power to alter the Constitution, but we have the power of expressing our views in an address to Her Majesty, which it is proposed to adopt in all the legislatures, stating that such and such changes would, in our opinion, prove advantageous to the country. We are exercising exactly the duties which are incumbent upon us. We are giving to our constituents the benefit of our experience and honest convictions upon the topics which are committed to our charge, and which events force upon our attention. Has not the House, on previous occasions, adopted resolutions, the effect of which has been to bring about changes of the Constitution? And has it ever before been argued that this House had no right to debate such resolutions? Nothing

of the kind. The first alteration asked for, was for the purpose of allowing the use of the French language in the House of Parliament. Honorable gentlemen might have said then that they had not the power to ask for such a change, but such an idea was never mooted.

AN HON. MEMBER—It was carried unanimously.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—I had not the honor of having a seat in this House at the time, but I am happy to hear that it was unanimously carried. Next, a change was asked for in the composition of this House. This House was at one time nominative, and was, in 1856, made elective. Was that not a change of the Constitution? Nobody, however, urged at that time the idea that this House had no power to pass such a resolution. We stand exactly in the same position now, and it seems to me a most futile and illogical argument to say that we have not the power to do what it is proposed to do in passing those resolutions, that is, to pray the Queen so to change the Constitution of this province that we may unite in one Government with the other provinces of British North America. I am quite satisfied that, when honorable gentlemen reflect upon it, they will see that they are not in any way exceeding the powers committed to them by their constituencies. My honorable friend from Niagara suggests this amendment in a spirit that is comparatively poor to that in which it is supported by my honorable friend opposite. He says he is in favor of the union, but is opposed to some of the details. It is painful to me that any honorable gentleman, who professes a desire to advance the union, should yet shelter himself, in opposing it, under an objection to some of the details. Does my honorable friend seriously propose to submit to the country all those various details? Can he imagine that he could get an intelligent expression from any part of the country on those details? All he could get would be a general opinion in favor of Confederation, and we are all satisfied that he would have that. I believe there are but two or three honorable members in this House who are really opposed to Confederation. Take ten thousand people from the country, and you will find nine thousand of every ten in favor of Confederation.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS—No, no.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—Well, I will submit to the opinion of honorable gentlemen from Lower Canada, for I do not pretend to be so well acquainted with the feelings of their

people, but I am in as good a position to speak for Upper Canada as any other honorable gentleman, and I have no hesitation in saying that the people of Upper Canada are almost unanimously in favor of Confederation. I am satisfied that, if the question were put before the people by means of a general election, there would be an unanimous vote in Upper Canada in its favor.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—My honorable friend from Niagara says "Hear, hear." My honorable friend cavils at every statement which is made, attempts to throw doubt and distrust upon the figures which have been produced in advocacy of the measure, and has not restrained himself from using every method of opposition which his imagination could invent or his ability turn to account. I must say that I can hardly believe an honorable gentleman to be in favor of the scheme, who takes every opportunity to attack it, and, when accused of hostility, shelters himself under objections to the details. (Hear, hear.) It shows to me that his feelings are not sincere, but that he desires to upset the very foundations on which Confederation rests, not perhaps because he is opposed to Confederation in the abstract, or a Confederation such as he would like to see established, but because he desires to thwart and defeat the efforts of those who have been honestly and industriously engaged in bringing about the scheme which is now before this House. I say, honorable gentlemen, if the people could express their opinions as we may express ours to-night, they would all concur in the first resolution. (Hear, hear.) Well, gentlemen, it being granted that we are all in favor of union, how are the details to be settled? Is it possible that the nearly four millions of people who compose the provinces to be affected by the union, should meet together *en masse* and settle those details? It is not possible, and those who argue that the scheme should originate with the people, know very well that it is not possible. Well, then, could the parliaments of all these provinces assemble together and agree upon a scheme of Confederation? Look at the difficulties that we have to encounter on every point of the details in carrying the scheme through this House, and judge for yourselves whether the parliaments of all the provinces could meet together, and originate and decide upon the details of Confederation. There is no other practicable way than that delegates should meet together as they have done, and frame resolutions on the subject, upon which

the act constituting the union could be founded. Honorable gentlemen have asked who authorized those delegates to meet together for the purpose of framing those resolutions. Honorable gentlemen know very well that the present Government of Canada was formed for the very purpose of considering and submitting a scheme of this kind. My honorable friend from Niagara again takes shelter under the statement that what the Government proposed to do was to bring down a scheme for the Confederation of Canada alone, and that the bringing of all the provinces into the Confederation was only a secondary idea. The honorable gentleman knows very well that that statement of the case is a mere pretence. Everybody knew that the Government would endeavor to overcome the difficulties which presented themselves in working the government of Canada, either by one project or by the other. The honorable gentleman has quoted from the Speech from the Throne delivered at the close of last session, in which an allusion was made to the formation of a Federal union between the two sections of this province, and not to a Federal union of all the provinces. Why does he not refer to and quote from the Speech from the Throne at the opening of this session? My honorable friend will find there, and I suppose he will place the expression on even terms with the other, the following:—

At the close of the last session of Parliament I informed you that it was my intention, in conjunction with my ministers, to prepare and submit to you a measure for the solution of the constitutional problem, the discussion of which has for some years agitated this province. A careful consideration of the general position of British North America induced the conviction that the circumstances of the times afforded the opportunity, not merely for the settlement of a question of provincial politics, but also for the simultaneous creation of a new nationality.

Now, my honorable friend says in effect that we were not right, when the opportunity presented itself of endeavoring to carry out the idea, in seizing upon it, and endeavoring to combine these provinces in one nationality, under the common flag of Great Britain, and under the rule of a Viceroy of the British Crown. Every honorable gentleman feels in his heart that we were not only right and patriotic in thus assembling, but that we were doing that which was promised to the Legislature of this province at the close of last session of Parliament. Honorable gentlemen, I am surprised and grieved that my honorable friend from Niagara, whom I know to be a patriotic and loyal subject of Her Majesty,

does not feel it his duty to unite with us in bringing about that which is so dear to all of us—a closer connection with the Mother Country, and a better means of perpetuating British institutions on this continent. (Hear, hear.) My honorable friend says the whole scheme is characterized by concessions to the Lower Provinces. Why, honorable gentlemen, place him in any portion of the Lower Provinces and let him listen to the opposition that is made there to the scheme, and he will find that the whole cry of those who, like him, do not reflect on the necessity of yielding something for the common good, is, that everything has been conceded to Canada. It is said, "We are going to be united with a province which is infinitely beyond us in point of population and wealth, and whose public men are able to command, by their ability, a much larger influence than our public men." They profess to believe that they are coming under the shadow of Canada, and that everything which they desire for themselves will be trampled under foot. My honorable friend, forgetting those duties which he owes to the Government, and forgetting the duty which he owes as a patriotic citizen to his country, contents himself with finding fault with the details of a scheme which he believes will be for the benefit of the country, and picks holes in every part of these details which he does not happen fully to understand. He not only complains that the people of Canada have not been consulted, but that in every respect the interests of Canada have been bartered away. Does he forget that the members of the Government all love their country, and have interests as great and as dear to them as the rest of the people of Canada? Is it likely that my honorable friend at the head of the Government, the honorable and gallant Knight, would give up everything that is dear to his race and to the people of this province? Is it likely that any of us would ruthlessly throw away any advantage which we could reasonably retain? On the contrary, if my honorable friend could be brought to look upon the measure with that liberality which ought to characterize a public man, he would concede that, although we had to give away some things, we did that which was best for the interests of our country. Let him find himself surrounded, as we were, by diverse interests—peculiarities here, prejudices there, and strong interests in the other direction, and let him produce, if he can, a scheme which, on the whole, is more advantageous to the people of this province, or which promises better for the country at large than that which

is now on the table of this House. Let him do this, and then I will forgive him for the illiberality which he exhibits towards those who have honestly endeavored, to the best of their united ability, to arrange the scheme which is now under your consideration. (Hear, hear.) I could forgive my honorable friend altogether, if, like my honorable friend opposite, he took the ground that the scheme ought to be delayed until after a general election. But, instead of that, he leaves no stone unturned to prejudice this House against the measure. It seems to me that if he could prejudice the House sufficiently against it to insure its defeat, as a whole, he would leave no stone unturned to accomplish it. So far from showing that he is in favor of the scheme, I cannot for one moment imagine how any one can believe him to be a sincere friend of Confederation under any circumstances. It is all very well to say, "I am in favor of the scheme, but opposed to some of the details." Was not every one of those details tested and tried in all its bearings, so far as such a thing was possible, by gentlemen as intelligent and well informed upon the subjects embraced as any honorable gentleman in this House? Every honorable gentleman now listening to me knows very well that it was not possible to adopt a scheme that could not be found fault with. No matter what scheme was put upon the table of this House, even if my honorable friend had been able to submit a scheme infinitely superior to this, does anybody believe that certain honorable gentlemen in this House would have supported it? The resolutions may be objectionable here and objectionable there, but it is for honorable gentlemen to consider all the circumstances out of which they have grown, and consider whether, under those circumstances, they ought not to be adopted as a whole by the House. Honorable gentlemen say, where is the advantage to be gained by Canada from Confederation? Well now, can any honorable gentlemen in his senses believe that the removal of the obstacles to intercourse between the provinces, the doing away with the customs duties, and the developing the trade of the St. Lawrence, is no advantage to Canada? Can it be said that to open up commerce with three millions of people along the St. Lawrence and the lakes will be of no advantage to the people of the Lower Provinces? Can any Briton, advocating as he does the continuation of our connection with the Mother Country, say—"I would rather be alone, be an Upper Canadian and be left to myself, and that my fellow-colonists be left to

take care of themselves." Then my honorable friend asks: "Where is the additional military strength?" Does my honorable friend pretend to deny that there is no additional strength in union over isolation? Does any man pretend to say that eight hundred or a thousand men belonging to a regiment are just as strong in units as when they are combined in a regiment and directed by the intellect of one man? And just so the forces of all these provinces are comparatively weak in their present isolated state. If we could say to the United States that we had the control of four millions of people to guard our frontier and repel attack, would not that form a strong barrier of defence? Would that be no weapon in the hands of a government desirous to avert an appeal to force of arms? It is the strength of a large number of people wielded by one mind, affording a power vastly superior to that which Canada alone could bring into the field, and giving the Government, when negotiating, an opportunity to point to what might possibly result from that power being called into active service. How can men be so lost to all that is true and useful and patriotic as to oppose a union of the powers of defence, and to oppose a scheme which is alone likely to afford the means of maintaining, for any long period of years, that connection with Great Britain which we all regard as so valuable? My honorable friend from Niagara took occasion, in the course of his remarks, to throw doubt upon one or two of my statements, and particularly in regard to the value of the mineral deposits of Newfoundland. I stated that I could satisfy the House that there were mineral deposits in Newfoundland of a valuable character. I will not detain the House by reading it at length, but I hold in my hand a copy of a report that was made on that colony in 1840, stating that those deposits consisted of galena, gypsum, marble, gold, iron, copper, etc. There are most important lead mines in operation, and Professor SHEPARD states that he saw 3,500 pounds of pure galena thrown from a vein at a single blast. He goes on in this report to describe the very convenient position of the mines, showing that they can be approached very closely by vessels drawing twelve or fifteen feet of water. This report plainly shows that my honorable friend was mistaken in supposing that there were no valuable minerals in Newfoundland. But suppose, for the sake of argument, that there were no minerals there; suppose we were simply giving the Province of Newfoundland \$150,000 a

year for the purpose of getting that island into the Confederation, would it not be better to have the Confederation complete than to refuse to agree to that condition? One would suppose, from the manner in which some honorable gentlemen treat the question, that the various sums to be annually paid to the Lower Provinces were to be paid by Canada alone; but it is nothing of the kind,—they are to be paid by the whole Confederation, the population receiving the benefit contributing as much per head to the amount as that of the Province of Canada. What does my honorable friend suppose the Province of Newfoundland gives up to the Confederation in return for the \$150,000? It transfers to us the whole right of property in its unsold lands, and the whole of its general revenue. In 1862, it had a gross revenue of \$480,000, only \$5,000 of which was from local sources, and it is calculated that the colony will bring a revenue of \$430,000 per annum to the Confederate purse, while the total amount it will receive will be \$369,200 per annum out of which to defray its local expenses. Is there anything so marvellously outrageous in that? In addition to the fact that Newfoundland will pay the Confederation \$430,000, and receive \$369,000, we have a complete yielding to the Federal Government of all her territorial sources of revenue. And so it is with all the provinces. Each of them will contribute to the general revenue, or to the Confederate purse, more than they will receive from it, so that the revenue of the whole country will show a surplus. The honorable gentleman from Niagara evidently contemplates much more by his amendment than my honorable friend opposite, who has so ably supported it, contemplates. My honorable friend who supported the amendment contemplates a delay until there shall be an expression of the people taken through a dissolution of Parliament. Well now, how can a dissolution of Parliament be brought about in a constitutional manner? Suppose this scheme to receive the support of an immense majority of the Lower House, as it plainly does, and also of a large majority in this House, how, I would ask, under our system of government, can a dissolution be brought about? A dissolution is unknown to the British Constitution, as carried out in this province, except when a measure, originated by the Government, does not receive the support of Parliament. Receiving the support of more than two-thirds of the representatives of the people, as the present Government does, how is it possible

that Parliament could be dissolved to suit the views of a small minority? That is asking quite too much, even if it were possible to grant it. (Hear, hear.) What, therefore, do honorable gentlemen ask, when they ask that the scheme be submitted to the people? They ask us as a Government to leave that which we consider the safe, sound, British constitutional mode of procedure, and resort to the American system of obtaining assent to constitutional alterations, by taking the votes, yea and nay, of the individual members of the whole community. What sort of a conclusion could be arrived at by that mode of procedure? Is it possible that any honorable member of this House desires that the people should have the opportunity of saying yea or nay to each clause of these resolutions? I am satisfied that that is not what my honorable friend from Niagara desires, because he only asks for a delay of a month; and my honorable friend opposite does not desire it, because he knows the British Constitution and loves it too well to contemplate such a course for a moment. What conclusion, then, can we arrive at, but that those who oppose the passage of the scheme through this House, by moving and supporting amendments to it, are desirous of defeating it, and make those amendments for that purpose? (Hear, hear.) I am satisfied, from the best information I can obtain, that the passage of the amendment would have a very great tendency towards defeating the measure. It has to be agreed to in both branches of all the other legislatures, and then in the Imperial Parliament. All the other legislatures are now waiting upon the action of this House. They are waiting to know whether honorable gentlemen of the Legislative Council of Canada concur in the scheme—whether you are satisfied to put on one side small objections to minor matters of detail—to put to one side your individual opinions on this point and on that point, and give it your support as a whole. Every person who reflects upon the subject must be satisfied that that would have to be done under any circumstances. Do you desire to have a union of all the British American Provinces, or do you desire to remain as you are? That is the issue. For myself, I feel that our connection with the Mother Country cannot be maintained for any great length of time without such a union. What have we found in the utterances of the public men of England from year to year? Have we not found them asserting, with more and more vehemence every year, that we were not doing our duty on this side

of the water in relation to our defences? If Great Britain should get into a war with the United States from circumstances over which we had no control, still our destinies were linked in with those of the great empire of which we form a part, and it is our duty, under all circumstances, to do something more than we have yet done, to prepare for events that may happen from one cause or another. But suppose that during the past summer armed forces from the United States had entered Canada in pursuit of raiders escaping into this province from the other side of the border, as they might have done had not Gen. DIX's order been withdrawn; and had we found that our integrity as a member of the great Empire was not respected, and Great Britain had coincided with the views of our Government and declared war against the United States, because that country had exercised liberties in one of her provinces to which no foreign power was entitled, where then would have been the cause of the war? It would have lain in the assertion of the right of the people of this province to maintain the position of an integral portion of the British Empire. Well, supposing the cause of a war with that nation to have been elsewhere, still we must partake with the Empire in upholding its integrity, and must stand or fall with that Empire. Shall we say that we will contribute nothing towards our defence except to keep up the volunteers, and depend entirely upon what the Mother Country, for prudential reasons, may do for us? Is that a feeling that any honorable member of this House ought to be actuated by in relation to this or any other question? I am sure no honorable gentleman would be willing to sit down and fold his arms under the protection which the money and arms of Great Britain give us; and I am sure my honorable friend from Niagara himself would not unite in such a view plainly expressed. Still, my honorable friend thinks these resolutions ought not to pass this House, but ought to be postponed indefinitely, leaving the colonies in the divided condition in which they now are. I believe, on the contrary, that the interests and destiny of this country are bound up in the union now contemplated taking place. Suppose, as many believe, the end of that unfortunate fratricidal strife in the United States is at hand, and a reconciliation takes place at any reasonable time between the Northern and Southern States, I am quite sure the maintenance of the integrity of these provinces will depend upon this union having been con-

summated. If the scheme is postponed now, it is postponed indefinitely. For years past the effort has been making to get the Lower Provinces to assent to a union with Canada, and, if the question is now postponed, there is no knowing whether we shall ever be able to get their assent to it again or not. Action in the parliaments of Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, and Prince Edward Island, is now hanging upon the proceedings in this House. If you pass an amendment, it will indicate to them that the people of Canada are not warmly in favor of the scheme. Honorable gentlemen, are you ready to take the responsibility of declaring that the people of Canada are opposed to Confederation? There is no knowing when circumstances will allow of its being brought to this forward stage again. Those of you who know what difficulties and objections were met with—the selfish interests of the various sections of this and of the other provinces, which we had to overcome—must feel that a very great advance was made when the measure was brought to the present forward stage. When again will it be likely to happen that the representatives of the various provinces will be brought together to consider the question? When will it again happen that the governments of the several provinces concerned will be able to lay upon the table of their respective legislatures a scheme so complete in all its details as this is? It is impossible to say when that happy coincidence of circumstances will again occur. Then my honorable friend from Niagara says, "You have not given us the scheme in detail. You have not given the whole of it. The House has not before it the proposed Constitution under which Upper and Lower Canada are hereafter to meet. You have not told us what are to be the rights and the powers of the local legislatures." Well, honorable gentlemen, all I can say is, that it would be impossible, and not only impossible, it would be useless for the Government to have brought down this scheme at the same time that they submitted the scheme now before the House. Until this scheme passes, until it shall be adopted in the other provinces, until we know whether or not we are to form portions of a Confederate Government, there is no occasion for introducing the scheme relating to the local legislatures. But, honorable gentlemen, is it likely or can it be possible for such a scheme to be adopted without the sanction of both branches of the Legislature? The plan, whatever it may be, for the constitution of Upper and Lower Canada, is it a matter

which the ministers of the Crown can carry in their pockets and put in force without the sanction of Parliament? No, it is a measure which must hereafter be laid on the table of this House, which must be debated, and upon which we shall all have an opportunity of pronouncing an opinion before it comes in force. At the proper time, a full opportunity will be afforded to those who dissent from the views of the Government, in regard to the constitutions of these provinces, of expressing their opinions, and of seeking to give effect to them. The same may be said in regard to the objections taken to the Intercolonial Railway. It is asserted that the Intercolonial Railway is something that we ought never to have agreed to. But honorable gentlemen will acknowledge, as a general proposition, that union is impossible without the railway, and such as believe that union is important and necessary, must be content to take the railway as a condition which is indispensable. But, honorable gentlemen, the Government cannot of itself build the Intercolonial Railway. There is no power either in this Government or the Governments of the other provinces to build it. We must come down to Parliament for the sanction—not to this Parliament, but to the Confederate Parliament, and the Confederate Parliament will have an opportunity of saying upon what terms we shall build the Intercolonial Railway. The fullest opportunity will be afforded for discussion before either the Intercolonial Railway is built, or the constitutions are adopted for Upper and Lower Canada. The former will be submitted to the Confederate Parliament; the latter, should the resolutions now before the House pass, to the present Parliament of Canada; for that must necessarily be a matter for the disposal of the Legislature of Canada. I am not one of those who would, as suggested, desire to take shelter behind the resolutions before the House for any unworthy purpose; but this I will say, that the amendment now before the House ought not to receive its sanction. I am quite satisfied that no honorable member of this House, who is really and truly an advocate of this scheme, and who believes that Confederation of all the provinces is important and desirable, will be found voting for this amendment, which would place a barrier in the way of Confederation, such as, perhaps, we could not overcome. Fancy the number of years during which this matter has been contemplated. As my honorable friend who sits near me pointed out, it is a measure which has

long been agitated. He shewed you that for years and years it has engaged the attention of almost every person who took any kind of interest in the public affairs of this country. I have only one thing to add to my honorable friend's elaborate statement on this point, and that is, to quote an extract from the resolutions proposed in this House many years ago by an honorable friend of mine, whom I am glad, and whom every one of his fellow members is glad to find still occupying his accustomed place in this House—I refer to my honorable friend Hon. Mr. MATHEWSON. In 1855, my honorable friend proposed a series of resolutions in this House against the elective principle, the last of which is in language prophetic of the result which now we are testing by actual experience. The resolution is in these words:—

8. *Resolved*,—That as the subject of a union of the whole of the British North American Provinces has for years occupied the public attention, it would manifestly be unwise to complicate future arrangements by a change in the Constitution of one of those provinces, which has not been sought for, and which this House believes, would not be acceptable to the others. It is, therefore, the opinion of this Council, that any proceedings on the subject at the present juncture would be premature, unwise, and inexpedient.

My honorable friend at that time looked forward to that which we now see about to take place—a union of these provinces—and he anticipated also that the elective system, if introduced into this branch of the Legislature, would be fraught with difficulty. It has been fraught with difficulty, and it is a difficulty which we must surmount—a barrier which we must strive to overcome. The personal objections which my honorable friend from Niagara division has started, are the poorest kind of objections. It is not what my honorable friend near me, or my honorable friend opposite, possibly thought or said at some remote period, that we have now to consider. We are all more or less exposed to this sort of attack; but fortunately the time during which I have had the honor of being in public life has been so short, and the position I have since occupied has been so obscure, that I am not so much exposed as many others to these accusations; but I am well aware that this is owing to my comparative insignificance. I must say that for my part I am disposed to put aside all these things. I am disposed to put aside all reference to what an honorable member may have done under other circumstances and in other times, and I would mere-

ly ask myself this: "Is this Confederation desirable? Do I wish for it as a lover of monarchical institutions? Do I desire it as a subject of the British Empire? Do I wish for the perpetuation of the connection between this country and Great Britain?" If I do I shall waive my objections on this point and the other, in my desire for the success of the principle. This Confederation has been sought after for years, but never until now has it approached so near a consummation—never was it a possibility as it is now a possibility. After years of anxiety, after years of difficulty, after troubles here and divisions there, the scheme is found possible, and I will not put it away from me because I object to this point or to that. If this harness of the Confederation of the country is to be put on, we cannot but expect that it will chafe here and chafe there; but time will give relief and provide the remedy, as it has done in other circumstances before. It was so in regard to the union of 1840. The Lower Canadians had a grievance in the French language being excluded from the Provincial Parliament. That chafed, as was to be expected, and provoked remonstrance. And what was the result? The injustice complained of was done away with, and both languages were thereafter permitted to be used. Then it was the desire of the people that the elective system should be introduced into this House. I believe myself that it was a mistake, but a change was desired, and a change was brought about. And so it will be in this case. If change is seriously desired, it will be had. It would be unwise and unstatesmanlike, in my opinion, to declare that because we cannot have our way on this point or on that point—that because the scheme in all its features is not exactly what we would like it to be—we will not have it at all. Where, honorable gentlemen, is the union effected between any two countries, or any two individuals even, which has lasted for any length of time without mutual forbearance and mutual concessions? Let those honorable gentlemen who have had the good fortune of forming unions, and who can therefore speak from experience, say whether any union can be formed either happy or lasting without forbearance on both sides. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) You must give up all thoughts of union unless you are willing to give and take, and cease persisting for everything you think best. Nobody ever did effect a union upon such terms, and nobody ever will. You must forbear here and give way there. I trust and believe that in the present

instance this will be the opinion of the Legislature of this country. I trust and believe we are satisfied that Federation is desirable in itself, and that, without insisting on this point or on that point, we will be looking confidently forward to the future, when we shall witness, in this country, a population of four millions, with a valuable commerce, and, in point of naval power and supremacy, ranking fourth in the world. (Applause.) Particularly am I surprised that any honorable gentleman from Lower Canada should oppose himself to this union, for by union the people of Lower Canada will regain possession of those countries which were once belonging to their race, and in which their language continues to be spoken. I believe that for them, as well as for us, there is a future in store of great promise, to which we can all look forward with the most confident expectations. And shall we set aside all these promising prospects because we cannot obtain this little point or that little point? I hope honorable gentlemen who favor the scheme see as I see that there is imminent danger in postponing the measure, and I ask them not to pass this amendment, which is brought forward in the poorest of all spirits, which is based on the assumption that honorable gentlemen are not ready to give the country the benefit of their minds and their judgments, but which asks us to wait and go knocking about from door to door, asking what is thought about the scheme upon which we are now called to legislate. Federation is the future safety and salvation of the country. Let us then waive our small objections and vote for Federation. (Applause.)

HON. MR. SEYMOUR.—The Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands is right in supposing that I am opposed to Federation. I am opposed to it, and particularly on the basis agreed upon at the Quebec Convention. I do not say that I would be opposed to a legislative union on fair and equal terms; but I am decidedly opposed to Federation on the terms now before the House. My hon. friend has said that in all unions there must be forbearance; but in this Federation scheme it appears to me the forbearance has been all on one side. The forbearance has not been mutual. When parties enter into a partnership, there ought to be forbearance on the part of each, and mutual concessions. But in this case the concessions as well as the forbearance have been all on the side of Canada. My hon. friend, with all his eloquence and ability, has not answered a single

objection raised by my hon. friend from Niagara (Hon. Mr. CURRIE). He has found it convenient to pass them all over for the simple reason that he found them unanswerable. My hon. friend says:—"Was not the French language restored to Lower Canada, and was not this a change in the Constitution?" Hon. gentlemen, it was certainly restored, and by the Conservative administration of that day, and, as my hon. friend opposite (Hon. Mr. BOULTON) has said, unanimously. There was no opposition, for it was considered a right to which our French Canadian fellow-subjects were fully entitled. But is the restoration of the French language to be compared with the resolutions now proposed—with the great constitutional change which is intended to affect, not only ourselves, but our children and our children's children for all time to come? Is a change like this to be compared with the restoration of the French language? Certainly not. It seems to me to be the most extraordinary comparison I ever heard of. Then my hon. friend has referred to the change in the constitution of the Legislative Council. But was not that question over and over again before the people? Did not the people at the hustings frequently pronounce an opinion upon that change? Undoubtedly they did, and it being understood that the people were in favor of it, the change was brought about. My hon. friend says that in the Conference they were surrounded with difficulties. No doubt they were. And why? Because they allowed for Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland as many delegates as they did for Canada. No doubt they were surrounded with difficulties. No doubt they were overwhelmed by the demands of these gentlemen. The hon. gentleman says that Confederation is necessary to strengthen the defences of the country. In what way? Can any hon. gentleman tell me in what way? I have not heard one word to prove, to my satisfaction, how the defences of the country are to be strengthened by Federation, unless indeed it be by placing the whole of the provinces under one head. Why, hon. gentlemen, did I not shew here the other day what was the feeling of the Lower Provinces in regard to the defences of the country? At a time when our Parliament were proposing to pass an act which would entail the expenditure of millions on the defences of the country, what was being done in the Lower Provinces? Why the Financial Secre-

tary of one of the provinces came down with a proposed grant of \$20,000, and he was obliged to apologize to the House that the sum was so large! And the present Premier of Nova Scotia—the provinces second in importance in British North America—proposed to strike off \$12,000, and leave the appropriation at \$8,000. This was proposed by a province next in importance to our own, and at the time of the *Trent* affair, when there was an appearance of danger much greater than at present. And what did New Brunswick do? Appropriate \$15,000. The people that did all this are the people to whom we are to ally ourselves that we may be strengthened in our efforts for the defence of the country! Do hon. gentlemen believe that an alliance with provinces whose leading men hold such views as these would add to our strength? Certainly not. My hon. friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands has also said that 95 out of every 100 of the people of Upper Canada are in favor of Federation. My hon. friend is mistaken. I once had the honor of representing a portion of his constituents, and I would inform my hon. friend that I know as much of the feeling, not simply of the people of Upper Canada, speaking of them generally, but of his constituents, as he does; and this I would say that were my hon. friend to go before his constituents and tell them that, in order to get Federation, Upper Canada is to pay two-thirds of the cost of the Intercolonial Railway, and two-thirds of the cost of maintenance of the road for all time to come, and that the roads of the Lower Provinces are to be made Government roads, and to be kept up in future at the expense of the Federal Government, and that Upper Canada will have two-thirds of the burden to bear, I will venture to say that my hon. friend would find himself wrong in his estimate of being able to satisfy 95 out of every 100 of his constituents.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—Tell them of all the circumstances, and I would be able to satisfy them.

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—My hon. friend is greatly mistaken. If my hon. friend is to be one of the life members under the Federation, he would not require so much to satisfy them.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend is altogether too fast. I do not look forward to any such thing.

HON. MR. SEYMOUR—My hon. friend has the power in his hands; but if he does

not desire the honor, of course he can avoid its being thrust upon him. But my hon. friend could not for a moment go before his constituents—and he represents a constituency which for intelligence is second to none in Upper Canada—and tell them that they are to contribute to the revenue of the Confederation in proportion to their import duties—that they are to contribute according to their wealth—and that they are only to receive back in proportion to their population—that largely as they contribute, the return will only be the same as to the fishermen and lumberers who form the floating population of the Lower Provinces, and carry so large a majority as he has named with him. A doctrine such as this is any thing but conservative. I would submit to any thing rather than vote for such a scheme. Were I to support it in its present shape I should consider myself as betraying the interests of my country. Hon. gentlemen are of course entitled to their own opinions in this matter; but these are mine, and I shall continue to maintain and uphold them. I assert that the amendment of my hon. friend for delay is a just and reasonable one, and I cannot see how it can possibly be objected to in a matter of this importance, where the dearest interests of the whole country are at stake, and where we are legislating not for ourselves alone but for future generations. Such being the importance of the measure, I cannot conceive how hon. gentlemen can vote against so reasonable a proposition. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. FERGUSSON BLAIR—I seek for information from the Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands, as to the scheme respecting the local legislatures. Did I understand my hon. friend to say that it would be submitted to the present Parliament?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—It is so intended.

HON. MR. FERGUSSON BLAIR—I also understood my hon. friend to say that before the House pronounced upon the general scheme of Federation, it would not be proper to submit the scheme for the local legislatures. I cannot see the force of that. But still I will not raise that as an objection to proceeding with the present scheme.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—Perhaps my hon. friend from Brook is right in the view he takes. But it was thought by the

Government that it would be premature to bring in the scheme for the local governments until it was seen whether Parliament was in favor of these resolutions.

HON. MR. FERGUSSON BLAIR—But many members of this House, before making up their minds as to how they ought to vote on the resolutions, would like to be informed as to the nature of the local scheme, which is to have such an important bearing on the question at issue.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—The Parliament of the country will have the fullest opportunity of pronouncing upon it.

HON. MR. SIMPSON—When?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—After these resolutions have been passed. We thought it was unnecessary for us to give our attention to the local constitutions for Upper and Lower Canada until we had ascertained whether Parliament was in favor of Federation. That ascertained, we shall feel it our duty to give our minds to the preparation of the scheme for the constitutions of the two provinces; and these constitutions will be laid before Parliament.

HON. MR. ROSS—I do not know what the views of the Government may be upon this point, but it seems to me that it would have been an extraordinary proceeding had they brought down at this juncture the proposed constitutions for Upper and Lower Canada. There may a great difference of opinion arise as to the constitutions proper to be proposed for these provinces; and it is quite possible that these differences may occasion the withdrawal of some members of the Government. (Cries of "hear, hear.") Hon. gentlemen cry "hear, hear." But I say that such may possibly be the case. And it would be absurd and impolitic for the Government to throw the country in a state of confusion as regards the scheme for the local legislatures if they failed in carrying the resolutions here submitted. Hon. gentlemen will see that they would be unworthy of the position they hold were they to do so. I am not sure whether I understood my hon. friend to say that the scheme for the local legislatures would be brought down on the passing of these resolutions. I hope that I misunderstood him, because I think we should wait the result of the action of the Lower Provinces. We should see if Federation succeeds there, inasmuch as in case of its failure in the Lower Provinces, even if we adopt the reso-

lutions here, the arrangement would not go into effect, and we would be placing the country in a state of turmoil and confusion in discussing measures which would be altogether unnecessary. We ought, it seems to me, first to carry out this arrangement as far as it is possible to carry it, and if we can secure the assent to it of the two larger provinces below, there will be a reasonable certainty of the scheme being effected. And then, and not till then will the proper time arrive for the discussion of the proposed constitutions of Upper and Lower Canada. I am perfectly amazed at the proposition of my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. FERGUSON BLAIR), because he is friendly to these resolutions, and gave us the expression of his views thereon in an admirable manner at the opening of the debate. And how the hon. gentleman should desire to have the scheme for the local legislatures quoad this project is beyond my comprehension.

HON. MR. FERGUSON BLAIR—I think it is only reasonable that, as hon. gentlemen argue, they should see before voting for or against Federation what are the proposed constitutions for the local legislatures. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend should add this to the reflection—that at all events hon. members will have a full opportunity of pronouncing upon it.

HON. MR. VIDAL said—Honorable gentlemen, you may probably regard it as presumptuous in one so inexperienced as I am in parliamentary debate, to enter the lists against the Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands, and to venture to dispute the validity of the arguments adduced by him in his eloquent speech against the amendment now under consideration; yet, great as is the existing disparity in point of ability and influence, I do not shrink from the contest, for I believe that I have truth and justice on my side, and have confidence that in its own inherent power, the truth will ultimately prevail. I have listened with delight to the hon. gentleman's address, and cordially concur with his views on many points, but there are some in which I differ, in none more so than that which regards all who support the amendment of the hon. member from the Niagara Division (Hon. Mr. CURRIE) as insincere, nay, even as wanting in loyalty to the Crown and to the country.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—What I said was this, that I was slow to believe in the

sincerity of those who advocated a measure and sheltered themselves behind details.

HON. MR. VIDAL—It was more pointedly put than that. It was said that the terms of the motion were such as clearly showed that it was made simply for the object of defeating the measure.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—And I repeat that it is so. But that is very different from what you charged me with saying.

HON. MR. VIDAL—The hon. gentleman made the remark that we were not altering the Constitution, but that the question before us was one simply for an address to the Crown. Now, strictly speaking, and taking the words of the motion in their mere literal sense, this statement is correct; but I ask hon. gentlemen if it is fair or candid to endeavor to lead the House to believe that this motion, which is undoubtedly for an address, is not in effect for a change in the Constitution? Are we not plainly told that no Imperial legislation will take place on this subject unless such an Address as this receives the assent of the Canadian Legislature? I hold, therefore, that the motion before us, though it be for an Address to Her Majesty, is in effect a measure, which has for its object a change of the Constitution. Such being the case, the subject is one which demands our most careful consideration, and for which we ought to be allowed all the time requisite to the fullest and freest discussion. The changes which have been referred to, and with which it has been sought to compare this change, cannot with propriety be regarded as similar. I contend, in the language of the honorable gentleman (Hon. Mr. SLYMOUS) who has just preceded me, that this is in fact a revolution: the word is not too strong. So far from its being as has been stated, a simple change, like the mere introducing or reintroducing the use of the French language into the Legislature, or even the more important step of altering the constitution of this House, it is an entire alteration of our political condition and relations, and affects most deeply the whole country in all its varied interests. Whatever may be the correctness or incorrectness of the opinion of my hon. friend as to hon. members covering their hostility to the scheme of Confederation by objecting only to its details, it will not apply to me; I shall take no shelter under details. My course in voting for the amendment of the hon. member for Niagara is based on broad and constitutional grounds. I differ from that hon. gentleman in regard to some of

these details, and on the whole, I am not sure if my views do not more nearly coincide with those of my hon. friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—I am very glad to hear my hon. friend say so. I would like him also to state if he goes with the hon. member for Niagara in desiring the delay of a month or delay for a longer period.

HON. MR. VIDAL—That question will be fully answered when I come to touch upon that point. But I may state, that instead of offering a factious opposition by the course I intend taking, it is my loyalty to our Sovereign and country which induces me to support the amendment now before the House, not with the object of defeating this measure, but for securing its adoption on a broader and more permanent basis. How singular are the different views which are taken of our position and powers according to the manner in which we may vote upon this question! In one breath we are told that we are the representatives of the people, and we have a perfect right to vote upon it as we may see fit; and in a few minutes afterwards, we are informed that if we do not vote upon it in a certain manner, we do not represent the people. I cannot possibly reconcile the two statements. It is also said—and it is the only argument I have heard on the point—if indeed it can be called an argument at all—that if the present opportunity of securing the union of the provinces is allowed to pass unimproved, it will be a long time before we may look for another. I admit that the opportunity is one which has been long desired, and one which it will be wise policy to improve; and it will be my humble endeavor to seek to do so to the best advantage. But if the measure is in reality fraught with the benefits which have been claimed for it, I cannot see how it will be jeopardized by a little delay; because the more its benefits are looked into, the better, it is reasonable to suppose, the people will be satisfied with them. I cannot see how the measure will be endangered by giving both the people and their representatives a little longer time to become acquainted with its principles and its details. Since the commencement of the debate in this House, much light has been thrown on the scheme, and we have had the advantage of the explanations in the other Chamber, and I am sure that the minds of hon. gentlemen must now be much better informed on parti-

cular points of the scheme than they were before we came here. For my own part, after having had my mind frequently directed to it, and after having listened attentively to the arguments of all the speakers, I am more and more impressed with the magnitude and importance of the various interests on which our action is invited in this matter, and I think we should proceed cautiously and slowly in taking the step before us—a change so great as that contemplated by the framers of these resolutions—a change amounting to nothing less than, as I before observed, a revolution in the whole system of governing the country. This is a step which, in order to be permanently successful, must rest on the principles of truth and justice, and these principles must be intelligently apprehended by the people to be governed. Notwithstanding all that has been advanced in this chamber—all the assertions which have been made—in reference to the information said to be possessed by the people of this country relative to this measure, I must say that I do not coincide in that opinion. I believe that the people of the country, as a whole, are not acquainted with the details. What new light has there been thrown on the resolutions since we assembled here? Have we not had our attention directed to the fact that even some who assisted in framing the resolutions, did not themselves know precisely what some of them meant? Moreover, is it not the fact that the attention of the country has not to any great extent been called to any arguments against the scheme? Now, in order to a right appreciation of the value and importance of the proposed Confederation, it is right that the people should know and understand both sides of the question. They should not be carried away with the pleasing prospect held out to them of the advantages to be derived from forming part of a great Confederation, without being told at the same time of the cost at which these advantages are to be purchased. And this is all the more necessary because the movement did not originate with the people. All great constitutional changes ought to and usually do originate with the people. But this is an anomaly. Here we have a proposed Constitution framed by a self-elected body—I do not use the term reproachfully, because I hold that these hon. gentlemen did perfectly right in so meeting together—this, I say, is a Constitution which was not framed by a body appointed for the

purpose; and it is sent down to us as a perfect document, which must be regarded as resembling a treaty which we have no power to alter even in the smallest detail.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend cavils at the question of authority. But he must know that the Parliament of this country had sanctioned the formation of a Government with the avowed intention of bringing about Federation; and therefore there was authority for what was done from the people of this country. But my hon. friend is a monarchist, and recognizes other sources of authority than those vested in the people. There is the authority of the Crown; and on this point I would beg to refer him to the despatch which was received on this subject from the Secretary of State for the Colonies. It says: "With the sanction of the Crown, and upon the invitation of the Governor-General, men of every province, chosen by the respective Lieutenant-Governors, without distinction of party, assembled to consider questions of the utmost interest to every subject of the Queen, of whatever race or faith, resident in those provinces, and have arrived at a conclusion destined to exercise a most important influence upon the future welfare of the whole community." So here was the sanction of the Crown so far as the action of the other provinces was concerned; whilst our own Parliament directly sanctioned the formation of a Government having this object in view.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I have stated clearly and emphatically that I was satisfied with the formation of the Conference and what it did, so why my hon. friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands should have thought it necessary to make the explanations he has just now done, I really do not know. I admitted—I never in the least disputed—that the Conference was properly, legally, and formally constituted. I gave the members composing it all praise for the intelligence and fidelity to the interests of the country with which they carried on their laborious negotiations. But I must still reiterate my former statement, that on account of this movement not having emanated from the people—and the fact of there being no petitions before either branch of the Legislature asking for it establishes this—we ought before its adoption to have some expression of the views of the people, and consequently that the motion in amendment made by my hon. friend the member from Niagara is one which I ought to support. I

believe, after this debate has been concluded in both Chambers, and the full report of it which is being prepared has gone forth to the country, the people will be in a position to form a correct judgment on the merits of the case. They will then have before them perhaps all that could be said on one side or the other, and if they cannot then form a reliable judgment, it will be their own fault. There is no reason why this House should be at the very great expense—some \$2,000 I believe—of printing so large a number of the debates as is being done, if the people are not to be consulted; for unless they are to be asked for a decision—if the scheme is to be carried into effect without consulting them—where is the necessity for placing before them speeches and arguments which will only have the effect of disturbing their minds? In addition to saying that the plan has not emanated from the people, I contend that it has not even emanated from the representatives of the people. Had these resolutions been framed by our own Government, brought down like other Government measures into our Legislature, and there discussed, voted upon, and adopted by the majority, I should not think it necessary that there should be any reference to the people, though perhaps I might still think such reference desirable. But the fact is that the representatives of the people have not been consulted in the matter; there has been no way left open whereby they can effect the amendment of any objectionable feature in the resolutions, or influence the Imperial Legislature on the proposed union. I presume honorable gentlemen will concur with me that if, after all that has been stated, the country should not desire the change—if the people at large should think they are really paying too much and making too considerable a sacrifice to secure the anticipated benefits of this measure—it ought not to be passed. (Hear.) Where, I would ask, is the danger to be apprehended in submitting the measure to the country? Danger is to be apprehended from forcing upon the people a measure of which they may not approve. (Hear.) But nothing can be endangered by submitted this project to the people, if, as has been so strongly asserted and as I believe, the majority are in favor of it. If I thought an immediate reference to the people would jeopardise the scheme, perhaps I might hesitate in urging it, as I now do—(hear, and laughter)—but I believe its object is really one desired by the country generally,

and there would be no risk in submitting it. Where is then the danger of delay?—and delay is all we ask for. What struck me very much in the eloquent and able address of the Honorable Commissioner of Crown Lands was, that he never touched upon the real question of the amendment. It is true he said delays were dangerous, delay would lose the measure, but not a shadow of argument did he advance in proof of this view. I think delay is safety, in that it will enable the country and the Legislature to look into the scheme, to weigh all its advantages and disadvantages, if it has any, and so more certainly secure the passing of it if good, and the rejection of it if the reverse. Of course, honorable gentlemen, divers views may exist as to the way in which the opinion of the people on this question is to be obtained. I am not to be deterred from expressing my views by the taunt of republicanism; a sneer never disturbs me when I have good ground for what I do or say. I have had to bear with many a sneer on account of my adhesion to the temperance cause, but they never moved me from my course. My belief is that the views of the people may be ascertained without any such delay as will endanger the scheme. It is to be presumed that the debate will not extend beyond a week or two, in both Houses. A very short time after it is concluded, and the pamphlets containing the speeches printed, a direct vote of the people might be taken with propriety and safety. The proposition to submit the plan to the vote of the people seems at the first glance not to be British—our prejudices rise against it. We are, however, not to be guided by prejudices, but by reason and reflection; and if we can find the best means of clearly and satisfactorily ascertaining what the people wish, that means ought to be adopted, call it by what name you may. I think that to put the matter to a direct vote in this way is the best plan. The people should be told: "Here is the measure; will you take it or will you not?" We should not ask them to discuss amendments; we could not bring the people of all the provinces together for such a purpose, and if we allowed amendments to be discussed, we should have inextricable confusion. The plain question should be proposed: Do you wish for this Confederation or not—yes or no?

HON. MR. ROSS—No power to alter its details?

HON. MR. VIDAL—No. That is the way the question is proposed to this House, and if it be wrong to submit it thus to the people, it is also wrong to submit it in such a manner to the Legislature. (Hear, hear.) An additional motive for suggesting this mode of proceeding is, that I should be extremely unwilling to subject myself to the censorious remarks of hon. gentlemen in the other Chamber who might reasonably say, if we propose to have a dissolution and a new election on the subject, "It is all very well, but you keep your seats, while you send us home." I do not indeed see why we might not with great propriety wait until the next general election, when, after two years of reflection and discussion, the people would be still better able to give an intelligent vote. I can see no objection to the wish of the people being thus ascertained in this *pur excellence* constitutional way; but as ministers tell us we cannot wait, then I say, let us rather have a direct vote of the people on the scheme than precipitate a general election. I should prefer a direct vote to a general election, because during an election other influences are at work besides purely political ones. In many places the personal popularity of a candidate outweighs the political leaning of the electors; in others, a well-filled purse carries the day, or some local question prejudices a constituency and influences the minds of the voters. But upon a scheme such as this, if submitted directly to the country, none of these considerations would have any effect, and the electors would be guided by patriotism alone. So that while constitutionally the House represents the will of the people, and no fault could be found if the House, after a new election, were to pass upon the matter, still the object desired, viz., to know the desire of the people, would be more expeditiously and less expensively attained by a direct vote. It is of no use to call this method "Yankee" or "Republican." It is well known that it prevailed as far back as the days of ancient Rome.

HON. MR. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—You may call it French, too.

HON. MR. VIDAL—Yes, or, if you please, you may call it imperial; it has been resorted to in France and in Mexico. It would certainly in this case be fair—no one could have any object for tampering with the votes of the people, or obtaining a decision which was not a

truthful expression of their wish. We could obtain the views of the whole country in a short time—perhaps not within one month, but still in time enough to enable the measure to be adopted within the current year. The Legislature of New Brunswick is not to meet for some time yet; the question therefore cannot be soon settled there; and if it were, it has still to go home to England, there to be embodied in an Imperial enactment before being acted upon. The Imperial Parliament has assembled and will probably continue in session, as it generally does, some five or six months. Surely then there will be time to take the vote here. I should like to have some reason adduced to convince me that there is danger in delay. I have heard an indistinct allusion to such danger as being great in case war should suddenly come upon us. Now, hon. gentlemen, I hold this to be an objection which has no weight whatever. How long will it be, if we adopt the resolutions, before this scheme can be got into operation? I presume it will be twelve months, and if we can wait a twelvemonth, can we not wait two years without risk? For, what immediate strength is the measure to bring to us? The mere uniting together of these provinces will not give us one additional soldier; it will give us no more money; neither will it lessen the extent of frontier to be defended, nor give us any increase of military power. As for its placing all the provinces under the direction of one mind—the only argument which I have heard applying to this part of the question—if we were in a state of war to-day, the forces of the whole would be under the direction of one mind. Do we think for one moment, that if a hostile force set foot on the shores of Canada, New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, the heart of the Empire would not thrill with indignation, and the whole force of the Empire not be brought to bear against the foe who thus insulted and defied the British Crown, just as readily in our isolated as it would be in our united condition? I think the danger from war is one on which no argument against submitting this measure to the people can possibly be based. (Hear, hear.) An hon. gentleman has stated that the defences of the country must remain at a stand-still until Confederation is accomplished. I do not know the source from which that opinion came, or whether it was spoken by authority. If it were, it is certainly a startling announcement.

HON. MR. ROSS—We have certainly been given to understand so, in this House.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I do not, and cannot think the British Government is going to leave us unprotected and undefended, even if Confederation should not take place.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—We may assume that the preparations the Imperial Government may make for the defence of these colonies may be materially affected by the result of our deliberations on this Confederation scheme—they may be influenced by our capacity for defence, and the willingness shown to exert ourselves.

HON. MR. VIDAL—They may be eventually, but I am speaking of to-day, and I am sure Her Majesty's Government will readily send us to-day every assistance we might need.

HON. MR. MACPHERSON—No progress is being made with our defences—the whole question of defence seems waiting for Confederation—nothing is being done. That fact must be patent to every honorable member of the House.

HON. MR. VIDAL—They may seem to be waiting, but why I cannot conceive, for every argument that can be brought to bear to show that our defences will progress under Confederation, can be equally available for that purpose now. (Hear.) It has been said by the Hon. the Commissioner of Crown Lands, in reply to the member from Niagara, that the country has not been taken by surprise by these resolutions. In this I differ from him. It is quite true that as far as the question of union is concerned, it is not new—the thought of union has long occupied many minds—but I do contend, that with reference to many points comprised in the scheme, the country has been taken by surprise. No thought, no knowledge whatever of the character of many of the changes proposed to be introduced ever entered the minds of the people at large.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—It is a satisfactory surprise. (Hear.)

HON. MR. VIDAL—It may be a satisfactory surprise; I have no doubt it is to many. It was a satisfactory surprise to find that gentlemen from all the provinces, of different political parties, could meet together in such an amicable way, and make such mutual concessions as to enable this scheme to be presented at all. (Hear, hear.) This is just what ought to have been done. To represent me as opposed to Confederation

is a great mistake. It is just because I appreciate its advantages, and wish to see them secured without any chance of danger resulting from the scheme having been too hastily adopted, that I speak as I do. (Hear, hear.) It is said the people were not appealed to when the unions between England and Scotland, and Great Britain and Ireland, were brought about. That is quite true, but it is equally true that these unions were brought about by the Parliaments of those countries—the representatives of the people. The measures were arranged with them, and the people were represented as to those unions by their Parliaments.

HON. MR. ROSS—That is just what is the case here too.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I beg the honorable gentleman's pardon. If he can find anything in this scheme which has emanated from the Parliament, it is new to me. Are we not told that, if even one amendment is passed by Parliament, it will destroy the scheme?

HON. MR. ROSS—The course taken here is exactly that which was adopted in England. Negotiations first, then the submission to Parliament of their result.

HON. MR. FERGUSSON BLAIR—The unions between England and Ireland, and England and Scotland, were not negotiations merely; they were treaties; they were called treaties—

HON. MR. ROSS—They were negotiated first, and submitted to Parliament afterwards.

HON. MR. VIDAL—As it is not my intention to occupy the time of hon. gentlemen on any other occasion during the debate, I shall venture to touch on another point, not directly connected with the amendment before us, on which I said a few words when I last addressed the House on this subject. We have heard much about the proposed new constitution of the Legislative Council. We have been told it was political necessity that first forced the elective system on minds that were by no means enamoured of it, and this, I think, has been fully established. Now, it would ill become me, as an elected member, to dwell on any merits or excellencies the elective system may have possessed as applied to this branch of the Legislature—it is a subject we can none of us touch upon with the same freedom which we might if we were not ourselves elected—but I may call the attention of the House to this, that none of the evils that were dreaded, as likely

to flow from the elective system, have yet shown themselves, and I do not think it at all reasonable, much less necessary, that they should be anticipated in time to come. My own views were in perfect accord with those of hon. gentlemen who protested against the system when it was first introduced. I did not then consider it an improvement, and my views have not changed since; I have, consequently, no personal predilections for an Elective Council, but far prefer a Chamber nominated by the Crown. But I am not here to carry out only my personal views or predilections, but to guard the rights and privileges of my constituents; and I would remind hon. members that it is one thing to concede a privilege, but a very different thing to take it away. (Hear.) A privilege may be conceded unasked, but it is a dangerous thing to take it away unasked or unassented to. (Hear, hear.) I cannot find either that the Canadian Government made any endeavor to maintain the elective principle; I cannot see that the nomination system was forced on them by the wishes of the Lower Provinces. It may have been the desire of some of the Maritime Provinces to maintain their nomination system, but the change in ours was one which obviously met the wishes of the members of this Government, and no effort appears to have been made by them to preserve to the people of this country the privilege they now enjoy of electing members of this House. (Hear.) I think, also, that there are objectionable features in certain provisions of the scheme for which the Canadian Government are responsible. I speak not as an opponent, but as one of their truest and best friends—one who is desirous to keep them from doing a wrong. It is not as an opponent to them or to Confederation that I support the amendment of the hon. member from Niagara.

HON. MR. ROSS—I think that amendment is a vote of want of confidence.

HON. MR. VIDAL—So it has been said; but the assertion is not warranted by the facts of the case; it is merely an arbitrary declaration. I cannot consent to be put in such a position as I should occupy if I thought it were not. It is true, my hon. friends in the Government may say, "You will not do for us if you vote that way;" but I cannot sacrifice my views and vote contrary to my convictions, in order to be counted as a friend.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend

must see that if all our friends entertained the same views, we could never get our measure through.

HON. MR. VIDAL—In compelling the first selection of legislative councillors from the members of the Chamber, the Conference have put a restraint on the prerogative of the Crown which they had no right to impose. I am unwilling for a moment to suppose that any low or unworthy motive actuated the Canadian delegates, who alone are responsible for this detail, or that they did this in hopes of securing the votes of any members of this House in favor of their scheme, which they could not otherwise have been sure of; still that part of the scheme has an awkward appearance, and some honorable members may feel with the member from Wellington (Hon. Mr. SANBORN), that if it be not a bribe, it looks something very like it. I, however, do not see it in that light. I do not think there has been anything worse than a desire to make the system of appointment palatable to the people, by taking a certain number of their representatives, whom they then sent to this House, to be members of the new one. (Hear, hear.) As to the boasted impartiality apparent in the 14th resolution, I do not attach any importance to its provisions. If it were not the understanding that the selection would be made in the manner there laid down, there would be a strong party opposition to the measure, which was a thing to be avoided. (Hear, hear.) One more subject connected with this part of the scheme remains for me to speak on, and I think it is an important one. Twenty-one members of this Honorable House are to be dismissed. It is quite true we do not know who they may be.

A VOICE—Ballot for them.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I am not speaking of the mode of selection. (Hear, hear.)—Twenty-one members of this Legislative Council are to be told that they are no longer wanted. Are they to be those called by Her Majesty in former times to sit here, or those representing the people? It seems to me only fair that those who hold appointments from the Crown for life are entitled to retain their seats, to go first into the new House, and the rejection will then be of the elected members. It will involve nearly half of these, and it is quite obvious that it places all honorable members of this Chamber in a very anomalous position to be called upon to vote on such a question as this. I may

remark that it would have been much the wiser plan, and certainly much more congenial to the feelings of the members of this House, had the Government thought fit to have passed these resolutions in the Legislative Assembly first, and then, if those who are more especially representatives of the people had chosen to pass this clause, we should have felt less hesitation. As it is, I feel it to be my duty to the constituency I represent to lift my voice against it. I have no right, without their consent, to vote away from them a right they may cherish, a franchise they may value, even though I should thereby vote myself in for life, which would be a betrayal of my trust. Even my hon. friend from Saugeen—so recently sent here as the representative of that division—must admit that a great many of his constituents would vote "nay," if they thought the scheme of Confederation was to be purchased at the sacrifice of their representative. (Hear, and a laugh.)

HON. MR. MACPHERSON—I believe a large majority of them would vote "yea." (Laughter.)

HON. MR. VIDAL—There is a difference of opinion between my honorable friend and myself on this point. (Hear, hear.) Honorable gentlemen, I have said I am favorable to the scheme of union—I say it sincerely and honestly—and notwithstanding the Honorable Commissioner of Crown Lands may say "It cannot be so; by supporting the amendment you are destroying the scheme," I cannot see it so. My course, I think, is that which is most conducive to the success of the scheme. I consider myself one of its best and most faithful friends in seeking to have it more firmly based upon the approval of the people, at the cost of a trifling delay. A great deal has been said, as an introduction to this measure, that was unworthy of it. We have had long accounts of political and party difficulties, which have been spoken of as appertaining to it. These were too small matters to have led to this great constitutional change. It was clearly seen by the people, as well as by Her Majesty's representative, that these difficulties were not based upon what they were said to be by some of our politicians. What does His Excellency say in a memorandum to the Executive Council, communicated to this House on the 30th of June last?—"During this period, (of the late successive governments since the election of 1861,) no question involving any

great principle or calculated to prevent politicians, on public grounds, from acting in concert, has been raised in Parliament. The time had arrived when an appeal might, with propriety, be made to the patriotism of gentlemen on both sides of the House to throw aside"—what? Their party measures? their political interests? No—"their personal differences! and to unite in one endeavor to advance the great interests of the country." A little further on he again mentions "the absence of public grounds for antagonism between them," and intimates plainly that "such a state of things was very prejudicial to the best interests of the province." As I have already stated, the people were rapidly coming to the same conclusion, and this evil would soon have been removed by their action at the elections, without resorting to any change in the Constitution.—Such were His Excellency's views, communicated to his Council in a memorandum, and I rejoiced to hear them enunciated by him. They are views which, if held also by the people, would have led to a thorough cure for the evils under which we labored, even without resorting to Confederation, for the people themselves were beginning to see that their political leaders were too much under the influence of bitter personal feelings; prominence was no longer given to the constitutional difficulty of unequal representation; it was dropped both by its friends and its opponents. Yet representation by population was a question of such political importance, that its satisfactory solution would justify the bringing about such a change as this. That was a sufficient motive to induce statesmen to join together and seek some way of escape from it. I think the scheme now submitted is perhaps the best that could have been found attainable, and I give its framers all credit for it. I am satisfied with nine-tenths or perhaps more than nine-tenths of the whole, and I am willing to take the other tenth, if really necessary, for the sake of the rest. I think the very name, and the prestige of our larger union will have a desirable influence upon our future prosperity. It will infuse into us that feeling of national pride—those patriotic sentiments connected with our country, which it is worth much to possess. (Hear.) I think, also, that our credit in money matters will be improved by the union, and it is worth some sacrifice to accomplish such results. I believe, further, that when this scheme is completed it will

have the effect of attracting emigration, and thus adding largely to our population. As we are, in our presented isolated condition, we either fail to attract emigrants or do not manage to retain them; but if we were known as one great country, we should find homes for many of those able-bodied, enterprising and industrious men who constitute the great strength and wealth of a State. It would also, undoubtedly, promote our commerce and develop our trade and resources. It is well to weigh all these considerations; they may not promise advantages so great as some of the sanguine advocates of the measure predict, but they are well entitled to fair and honest consideration. (Hear.) As to Confederation cheapening our government, that idea, I think, is a fallacy; and here is one of the causes which may lead to future dissatisfaction, if the eyes of the people are not opened to it until too late. The proper and the true way to act is to let the fact be known, that so far from Confederation being likely to lessen the expenses of government, it will be directly the reverse, and that to these must be added the cost of those defences which are to be constructed—of this Intercolonial road which is to be a necessary part of the scheme—of these other works on the canals, &c., we hear so much about. Confederation will, doubtless, be expensive; then why not say so—why not say to the people, "Here are great advantages, but they will inevitably cost a large sum." I for one am willing to take these advantages at that cost. I have not analyzed the numerous figures set before us by my hon. friend from Niagara, for profusion and confusion in matters of figures in a speech are very much the same to me. I will not pretend to follow him. But I have such confidence in the financial ability of those who watched over our interests, that I am unwilling to receive, except with great caution, those objections brought in figures against the measure. One honorable gentleman remarked that the hand of an over-ruling Providence might be observed as bringing about this scheme and reconciling so many conflicting influences. That is very true. I delight to recognize an over-ruling Providence influencing the lives of individuals and nations. I rejoice that the blessing of an over-ruling Providence on the deliberations of this House is daily asked, and I have faith to believe it will be granted to us. But I should have

the same comfortable feeling if the question were referred to the people; so that as an argument in favor of our making an immediate decision does not amount to much, and it certainly does not impose on us the duty of hastily taking the whole scheme as it is. (Hear, hear.) I have endeavoured, hon. gentlemen, to show that I am guided by an honest, earnest desire to advance the interests of the country by the course I now propose to take in reference to this amendment, and I have endeavored to disabuse the minds of those who think that in supporting it I am acting in hostility to a scheme which I believe will be advantageous to the country, but the advantages of which I think cannot be secured without referring it to the people. I presume it is altogether likely—perhaps I may consider it a certainty—that this is to be the last time I shall appear as a representative in the Council of my country. I am anxious, short as my parliamentary career has been and is probably destined to be, that it should be unsullied by anything that can even have the appearance of selfishness. I am, therefore, unwilling to record a vote which might either have the effect of making me a member for life, or of helping to take away the privilege which my constituents at present enjoy, of having a representative in the Legislative Council. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. BUREAU—It is not my intention to take part in the debate on the amendment which is now engaging the attention of this Honorable House; but I really do not feel justified in passing over in silence the declaration which has just been made by the hon. member for Toronto (Hon. Mr. Ross.) That gentleman said, with perfect *aisiété*, that if the Ministry submitted a bill respecting the organisation of the local governments, the course would be a bad one; for, said he, difficulties would probably arise in relation to the matter, which might result in the resignation of several members of the present Cabinet. In those few words the hon. member for Toronto has furnished the best argument in favor of the delay for which we ask; but such was not his intention. In a similar sense, some other hon. members have, in my opinion, exhibited a degree of force and logic which is truly remarkable. But can it be possible to make a request more essentially legitimate in its character than that of the hon. member for Niagara? For my part, I do not think so. And indeed, what can be more reasonable than the wish

to know, and to be in a position to form a sound, complete and satisfactory opinion, both for ourselves and for our constituents, respecting the scheme which is proposed to us? Has not this House a right to require the present Government, within a reasonable period, to lay before it, not only in a general way, but also and more especially in detail, the various aspects of the Constitution which it is wished to have voted with such strange and imprudent precipitation? Let us remember that sometimes no difficulty whatever is raised to devoting an entire session to the consideration of a measure of secondary importance. Last year no attempt was made to pass a new Militia Bill at railroad speed, as it is now proposed to do with the measure for Confederation; on the contrary, all the time necessary to complete it and to examine it in all its aspects was devoted to its consideration. And yet, how immense the difference between these two measures, in regard to their importance and the solemn consequences which might result from them! And further, it cannot be denied, the plan which it is sought to make us adopt is as yet but imperfectly known to the Canadian Legislature, and the people hardly know its outlines, not having yet had time to examine into it, so closely have our ministers invested it with mystery and secrecy. I consider that the hon. member for Toronto shewed rather too much zeal in the cause of his friends when he proceeded to make that declaration, which was heard by the House with well-marked surprise. I am prepared to acknowledge that in so doing he has done us a very great service. I have no doubt whatever, in fact, that as we have been told by the hon. gentleman, the disclosing of the organization of the local governments during this phase of the discussion would, for the Administration of the day, be an act of imprudence, and one which, it is highly probable, would subject it to serious difficulties. I am also of opinion that one of the difficulties, of by no means the least importance, which is feared is that respecting the distribution or division of the part of the public debt which will have to be borne by the different provinces. Indeed it may, with very great reason, be asked whether it will be possible to come to an understanding on this point. With a degree of courage worthy of a better cause, the Ministry now comes to us and says: "First vote the Address, and afterwards we will lay before you the scheme for the organisation

of the local governments." But let us note the contradiction in this on the part of the Government, and how illogical its conduct is. Let us for a moment suppose that this measure gives rise to difficulties in the Cabinet, during the discussion on the details of the scheme, of sufficient importance to entail the resignation of the Administration. What happens? The Address having been voted by our Legislature, is sent to England, and whilst the Imperial Government is engaged in ratifying it and incorporating it in a bill, which is to become our Constitution, the present Ministry succumbs under the details of the scheme respecting the local governments. A new ministry succeeds them, an appeal to the people probably takes place in the interval, and when the new Constitution comes to us from Great Britain, we have a Government and a Legislature ready to reject it before its promulgation. In view of such a prospect as this, ought we to be in a hurry to accede to the request of the Government and refuse the legitimate delay asked for by the motion now before this Honorable House? I have, then, considered that I ought not to pass over in silence the declaration of the hon. member for Toronto, for I am of opinion that it is of a nature to convince us that precipitation in so highly solemn a matter is most dangerous. The Constitution of a country should not be changed from base to summit until those who are appointed to watch over the public interests, and the very Constitution in question, have had time to see and to ascertain, in a positive manner, that such a change is necessary and called for by the people. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. OLIVIER—Honorable gentlemen, in again rising to address the House, I beg to assure you that I do not propose to repeat the observations I have already made on a previous occasion; but being pressed for time, I was obliged to omit to refer to certain aspects of the scheme on which I proposed to offer a few remarks when the present motion should be before the House. I was aware that this motion would come up for discussion, as it appeared upon our *Minutes of Proceedings*. With these few preliminary observations I shall proceed, honorable gentlemen, to offer a few remarks on some few points in the scheme which I was compelled to pass over in silence on the occasion of my first address on the plan of Confederation now submitted

for our consideration. I must refer here, honorable gentlemen, to a wonderful incident of this afternoon's sitting. A declaration, novel in every respect to each one of us, fell from the lips of the Honorable the Minister of Crown Lands, who has only had this one sole reason to offer us in explanation of, and excuse for, the precipitate haste with which his Government is endeavoring to obtain the adoption of the new Constitution:—"We are anxious to obtain the vote of this House, to transmit it to New Brunswick and to the other Maritime Provinces which are to enter into the Confederation." This, then, is the real reason of this incomprehensible and indecent haste, for I cannot believe that the reason given by the hon. member who sits immediately opposite to me (Sir N. F. BELLEAU), in explanation of this haste, can be a serious one. It is difficult, indeed, not to consider as somewhat absurd the reason alleged by the Hon. Sir N. F. BELLEAU:—"The Ministry are anxious that this scheme should be adopted forthwith, because Lord PALMERSTON is already an old man, and might die at any moment." I would rather accept the reason given by the Hon. Minister of Crown Lands than that of my honorable friend, because I cannot believe he was authorized to give it. Thus this House and the country now know the secret of this precipitate haste on the part of the Government, and I have no doubt they will bear it in mind. But I will venture to enquire of the Honorable the Minister of Crown Lands, who has given us this very absurd reason, whether he hopes to deceive the people of the Lower Provinces by the vote which he desires to precipitate. I will ask him whether it is to be desired that this House should forthwith give a vote on this question, a vote which will undoubtedly have the effect of leading them into error as regards the feelings and opinions of the people of this country in relation to the project of Confederation. Well, honorable gentlemen, I do not for one moment hesitate to declare to this House, that the fact alone of the anxiety of the Government to obtain forthwith a vote of this House on this important measure, is that which ought most of all to put us on our guard, and ought to cause us to determine not to give it lightly, and in a manner unworthy of prudent and wise legislators. Indeed, honorable gentlemen, our vote will have a significance which it will be vain to seek to diminish.

We constitute the highest branch of the Parliament of this country, and when the Lower Provinces hear that we have voted for this measure in the shape in which it has been laid before us, they will naturally and with reason believe that our vote has been given with a thorough knowledge of the matter, and that we fully indicate the popular feeling on this important question. They will never for a moment imagine that we have set at naught and ignored the opinions of those whom we represent in this House; they will never believe that the country has been solittle consulted in the matter as it in fact has been. I assert, therefore, honorable gentlemen, that the vote which it is sought to make us give to-day is calculated to deceive the people of the Lower Provinces, both as to the views of this Honorable House and as to the opinions of the vast majority of the people of this province, and that we cannot give it with satisfaction either to ourselves or to those whom we represent. I have already taken occasion to state before to-day, that the scheme of Confederation had not been submitted to us complete. I am prepared to prove this statement; I maintain that only one part of the scheme has been laid before us, and under these circumstances, I would ask this Honorable House, if it is prudent to accept and sanction that with which we are but imperfectly acquainted? When I accepted from my constituents their nomination to the Legislative Council, I did so with the firm determination never to accept blindly the various measures which might be submitted for my approval in this House. This resolution I have adhered to hitherto, and I hope that I shall never forget it in the course of my public career. A few minutes ago I remarked, honorable gentlemen, that the plan of Confederation had not been submitted to us complete; I now propose to prove this assertion. By art. 6 of the 48rd resolution, we perceive that the local legislatures will have the power of making laws in relation to education, saving, however, the rights and privileges enjoyed by the Catholic and Protestant minorities in relation to their separate schools at the time of the union; so that by this resolution we are to affirm that the minorities shall be bound by the school laws which will be in force at the moment when Confederation will take effect. On the other hand, we are told that a measure will be brought down for the better protection of the rights of the Protestant minority

in Lower Canada, whilst at the same time we are not informed whether the same advantages will be accorded to the Catholic minority in Upper Canada. Thus these school laws form a portion of the scheme upon which we are called to vote, and if unfortunately, after we have adopted these resolutions we are unable to obtain justice for the Upper Canadian minority, shall we not be guilty of having voted for the scheme without having known all about it? We ought then to be on our guard. If, as it is pretended, the measure will not endanger the rights of the Catholic minority in Upper Canada, why are we refused the details and the information which we ask to have afforded to us before pronouncing on the merits of the plan? I maintain that any one who desires that justice should be extended to the minorities in question, would not know how to vote as we are called upon to do. In the absence of the information which we are entitled to demand from the Government as to the nature of the guarantees to be offered by the new Constitution to the minorities of the two provinces of Canada, I do not for one instant hesitate to declare that this Honorable House is justified, and indeed fulfils a sacred duty in demanding the delay sought for by the motion of the hon. member for Niagara. If it should so happen that the people are called upon to pronounce on the merits of the measure, it becomes of the utmost necessity that we, their representatives, should be able to explain and point out to them the details of the scheme. We have then every reason to insist that this information should be supplied to us. The Premier will now permit me to put to him a question. May it not happen, after the adoption of these resolutions, that the Protestant majority of Upper Canada may ally itself with the Protestant minority of Lower Canada in the present Parliament, and deprive the Catholic majority of Upper Canada of the rights which they are entitled to enjoy in relation to the education of their children? Should such an event occur, I would ask the hon. Premier what means the aggrieved minority might be able to adopt in order to obtain justice?

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—I will inform you when the proper time comes.

HON. MR. OLIVIER—The hon. the Premier ought to give us the details of the measure on this subject. I do not mean to assert that I am opposed to every possible

form of Confederation; but what I can never consent to is to vote for a Confederation of which I know neither the exact nature nor the details. The article which I have already quoted is one of those to which I desired more particularly to draw attention. I will now quote the 67th resolution. I find by this resolution "that the General Government will fulfil all engagements entered into, previous to the union, with the Imperial Government, for the defence of the country." Now, strange to say, the authors of this document do not even take the trouble to state by whom such engagements must be made. No, they simply assert the obligation in the terms of the resolution I have just quoted. Suppose our Government had entered into an engagement to the extent of fifty millions of dollars, shall we—can we—affirm that the engagement was a necessary one, by voting for the measure without knowing the nature of the engagement? Coming now to the 68th resolution, I find: "The General Government will cause to be completed, without delay, the Intercolonial Railway, from Rivière du Loup, through New Brunswick, to Truro, in Nova Scotia." Now, hon. gentlemen, I maintain that this is another portion of the plan with which we are not acquainted. We do not know what is to be the cost of this railway thus described in the resolution I have just read. Here, again, we are kept in the most complete ignorance by the present Government. An honorable member of this House has declared, that though the Intercolonial Railway were to cost fifty millions of dollars, we should not hesitate to support a measure for carrying it out; for, even at that price—that exorbitant price—it would be for the interests of the country. Well, I ask you, would this House be acting in accordance with that spirit of wisdom and prudence which ought to characterize it, by voting blindly for such an enormous expenditure as that? I do not believe it, and for my part, I do not hesitate an instant to say that I would refuse. I am well aware, it is true, that the construction of this gigantic railway cannot cost so large a sum; but it is generally admitted, both in this House and out of it, that the work cannot be done for less than twenty millions. Moreover, does it not often happen that public works estimated to cost, say one million of dollars, are found to have cost, when finished, double and more than double that amount? This may happen with the

Intercolonial Railway, which, it is perfectly clear, will cost more than is supposed; and I repeat it, this House ought to hesitate before sanctioning such an enormous expenditure out of a public treasury already heavily charged, and which will scarcely be in a more flourishing position when the various British provinces of this continent are united under the Confederation. I am justified, then, in demanding that the details of the plan should be made known to us before we are called upon to sanction it. I have already stated that I do not pretend to be opposed to Federation of the provinces in every possible shape—that I might support a Confederation not of too onerous a character for this country—but it is obviously quite impossible for me to support a project of this kind, with which I am unacquainted, in its details and as a whole. It appears to me that the Ministry cannot complain if, under these circumstances, we vote against a project which we desired to know fully in order to form our opinions concerning it, and to ascertain that of the people we represent. I do not think it can be pretended that this House is not entitled to make so just and reasonable a request. As I have shown, hon. gentlemen, if we accept the resolutions presented to us, we endanger the rights of the minorities in both sections of the province; we expose ourselves to the payment of enormous sums for the construction of a railway which may prove to be utterly useless for the defence of the country. It seems to me that, before undertaking such onerous charges, we ought to reflect deeply and to weigh well all possible chances of such serious eventualities. I am quite aware that certain hon. members of this House will never yield to the reasons I have advanced, nor shall I undertake to bring them round to my views, for I feel that all my efforts must be useless. The fact that we refuse to accept the measure proposed to us before we are acquainted with it, certainly does not imply, as it is stated and supposed, that we are opposed to every idea of Confederation. Another provision of the project which we cannot approve is that by which the constitution of the Legislative Council is based on the nominative principle, instead of the elective principle which now prevails, as regards that branch of the Legislature, under our own Government. I have already had occasion to express my opinion as to the constitutional

changes undergone by our own Legislative Council, so that I need not recur to that subject. The Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands has asserted that we are justified in voting on the proposed reversal of the Constitution without an appeal to the people. I beg to differ from that opinion. I know the nature of a trust, whether civil or political; they both entail very much the same duties. Well, what is the charge entrusted to us by our constituents? That of working out the present Constitution to the best of our understanding and of our judgment. Such is the power entrusted to us; but never have our electors authorized us, as it is now proposed to do, to destroy the Constitution itself and to enter into a political alliance with the other British provinces of this continent. An instance of a similar constitutional subversion, without the authorization of the people, is not to be found in the pages of history. It has been stated in this House that the project of Confederation was known to a portion of the people, and that there was nothing to prevent its adoption being pressed. Here again, I beg to differ with the hon. members who express that opinion. I think that even though the project were, as stated, known by a portion of the people, that would not be a reason for precipitating its adoption, for the plan interests the whole country generally, and it is not sufficient that it should be acceptable to a certain portion of the inhabitants, but to the great mass of the people. Moreover, if the public meetings already held in Lower Canada serve to indicate the popular opinion relative to this question, in this section of the country at all events, it may fearlessly be said that the project has been condemned in fifteen counties. Will any one venture to pretend that Lower Canada is to be of no account in the Confederation, and that Upper Canada alone has a right to make its voice heard; that only its approval or disapproval of the scheme can entail the adoption or rejection of that scheme? Most assuredly, I do not believe that any one would ever venture to enunciate such a pretension. I know of but one single county in Lower Canada which authorized its representative to vote on the scheme in question as he should think fit. I therefore consider that I am justified in saying, that the reason which induces the Government to cause this measure to be adopted without submitting all its details, is that it fears to

have those details known by the people, who no doubt would have no course left save to reject them. After having displayed Confederation clothed in the most brilliant colors, the Administration fears to allow the people to examine it in its true light, and as it is intended to thrust it upon them. I have already stated that throughout the whole of Lower Canada, but one county has been found which granted to its representative the privilege of voting on this question according to his own judgment. In all the remaining counties in which the people have been called together to pronounce upon it, the scheme of Confederation has been formally condemned.

HON. MR. GUEVREMONT—Several counties pronounced themselves in favor of the scheme; among others, the county of Vaudreuil.

HON. MR. OLIVIER—I am not aware that the county of Vaudreuil voted in favor of Confederation. The honorable member for Richelieu had also mentioned the county of Richelieu as one of those which had not rejected the scheme of Confederation.

HON. MR. GUEVREMONT—The meeting in question did not condemn Confederation. It merely declared itself in favor of certain resolutions which were submitted to it, which demanded that the people should be consulted as to the proposed constitutional changes.

HON. MR. OLIVIER—It is perfectly true that the county of Richelieu never condemned the details of the measure, and for a very simple reason: the Government had never allowed them to be known, and still persists at this present time in keeping the country in ignorance of them. But the honorable gentleman admits that the county of Richelieu directed its representative to demand an appeal to the people. To say that Lower Canada is favorable to the scheme of Confederation, is to make an assertion to which the public meetings which have been held within the last month or two give the lie in the most formal manner. I know what to think of the expression of public opinion in the district of Montreal; as to the district of Quebec, perhaps the honorable gentlemen who represent the several divisions comprised in it will be good enough to tell me whether or not there have been any meetings in favor of Confederation? Until I am shewn that the project has been approved there, I shall venture to believe that in the district of Quebec, as in the district of Montreal, public opinion has not approved

of the proposed Confederation. I do not wish to assert that the country at large is averse to any idea of Confederation, but I maintain that it cannot be in favor of a scheme with the details of which it is unacquainted, and of the entirety of which it is ignorant. The most effectual means of providing for the defence of a country is to make the people attached to the Constitution of the country; to attempt to force a constitution upon them is, in plain language, to impel them towards anarchy. Ah! we are already surrounded by dangers enough to abstain from aggravating our position. Let us conduct ourselves so that the people may be attached to their constitution, and then we may rest assured that they will be ready to defend it when it is threatened. Undoubtedly, it is not by acting as we are now doing that we shall attain that result. The reason assigned by the Honorable Commissioner of Crown Lands for urging on this measure does not appear to me to be sufficient. We are not here to please the Maritime Provinces or to legislate in their interests, but we are here to preserve the rights of our fellow-citizens. We did not come here with a predetermined resolution to throw impediments in the way of any plan of union. We are all interested in the prosperity and greatness of our country. The last time I had the honor to address this Honorable House, I stated that with respect to the questions which possessed the highest interest for Lower Canada, the proposed Confederation would be a legislative union, that is to say, that we should be at the mercy of Upper Canada and the Maritime Provinces. I expressed that opinion in good faith, and if I was incorrect in my conjectures, I hope that the members of the Government will be good enough to enlighten me on the subject, and point out my error. Such was not done at the time, for I cannot accept as a satisfactory reply the few explanations given on the subject by the honorable member who sits opposite to me. I say that the Federal Government will have power to declare that religious corporations, for instance, shall not be allowed to hold real estate of more than a certain value—more than is required for the immediate necessities of their establishments. It will also have power to enact that there shall be no connection between Church and State. I say that the powers of the Federal Government will be so great that Lower Canada will be a cypher in the affairs which most concern her.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—Yes! yes! of course.

HON. MR. OLIVIER—I am glad that the honorable and gallant Knight confesses so much.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—The hon. member must surely understand my meaning in saying "yes." He must be aware that I mean it in irony.

HON. MR. OLIVIER—If the honorable and gallant Knight says it in irony, I for my part can only tell him that I regret to see, when I ask questions in sober earnest concerning the affairs of the country, when I ask for information on so important a matter, I can get no answer but an ironical one. I ask for information, because I confess, for my part, that I may be mistaken in my opinions on this matter. My opinions are not infallible any more than those of the members of the Quebec Conference—any more than those of the Lower Canadian members of the Ministry; and it is for that very reason that I seek information which may serve to enlighten me and enable me to form a correct judgment on the question. Have those who devised this scheme the presumption to think that they are not liable to mistake? When I ask for the details of the scheme in the name of my constituents, I am answered ironically. But I know what such answers are worth. I know that some persons have recourse to irony when they have no serious answer to make, when they have no solid reasons to give. I know what discussion is; and, if I have not often mixed in the debates of this Honorable House, I have argued at the bar, and I am perfectly aware that those who have no valid reasons to oppose to the pleas of their adversaries, endeavor to shift their ground and blink the issue, by calling attention to some minor point and calling in the aid of irony. If I am denied the explanations which I claim in this place, how can I answer the questions which my constituents have a right to ask me? But I must now address myself to the consideration of the appointment of members by *mandamus* which is to be introduced into the new Constitution of the Federal Legislative Council. When I heard the honorable and gallant Knight tell the history of the last moments of the Legislative Council sitting under that authority, I took it as the strongest sentence of condemnation of the present scheme. He told us, in effect, that those members who had been appointed for life were honorable men, who by their position

and their integrity were rightly entitled to carry their heads erect; whereas, when they passed along the streets, it was with heads drooping. Why is this?

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—I did not say that they hung their heads as they walked the streets. I said they were honorable men who had a right to carry their heads high wherever they went, but that they were averse to coming here to sit in the Council on account of the prejudices of public opinion which had been misguided.

HON. MR. OLIVIER—The unanimous opinion of a country is not so misguided, and the opinion of the country was unanimous in condemning the system of nomination to the Council by the Crown. In order to produce as great unanimity of public opinion as prevailed in regard to that system, the cause which leads to it must be slow and deep-seated—the grounds of dissatisfaction must be real. Both Lower and Upper Canada must have suffered long under that system, to condemn it as they both did; and I regret deeply to hear from the honorable and gallant Knight that he is willing to return to it. It may be that as men advance in years they may change their views and opinions; but it seems to me that they ought not to change them in so short a space of time as the honorable and gallant Knight has changed his in regard to the Constitution of the Legislative Council. It is not so very long since the document which has been read this evening was signed. I say, then, that the history told us by the honorable and gallant Knight is the condemnation of the system now sought to be introduced. After what the honorable and gallant Knight has said about the councillors appointed by the Crown, with what grace can the new councillors come here to take their seats? Will not the prejudice against them be stronger than ever? inasmuch as it will be said that those who have voted for the scheme now before us have done it to keep their seats as long as they live. What respect can the people feel for such a House?

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—We know that you will not barter the rights of the people for a mess of pottage.

HON. MR. OLIVIER—Nor for a dish of gold either. I ask whether the Government of the honorable and gallant Knight have ever found me among those who ask their favors?

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—I did not accuse you of it.

HON. MR. OLIVIER—No, but you insinuate as much.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—It is you who say that the seats for life are a bait for councillors.

HON. MR. OLIVIER—I see the meaning of the honorable and gallant Knight, and when I am told ironically that I would not barter the rights of the people for a mess of pottage, I have a right to say that I would not sell them even for a dish of gold; for so far, thank God! no government have ever reckoned me among those who ask their favors. I live by my labor, and want nothing from the Government. I took notice of an expression made use of by the honorable and gallant Knight in speaking of the last moments of the Legislative Council appointed by the Crown. He told us that to restore the credit of the Legislative Council it had been found necessary to make it elective; but this was not the sole inducement for the change; there was another motive quite as reasonable for making the Council elective, and this motive was that in causing the Councillors to be elected, they would be taken from among all parties in the country, and would, therefore, represent the public opinion of the different parties in it. There was a time, under the old order of things, when the opinions of two or three men residing in the cities of Quebec and Montreal formed the public opinion of all Lower Canada. This had a bad effect, for the public opinions of the different parties in the country ought to be represented in this House as well as in the other. It was for the purpose of attaining this end that the country was broken up into divisions, that it was required that the councillors elected should be residents in the divisions, or should be the owners of real estate within their limits of the value of £2,000; but under the system of Crown nominations to seats in this House, the choice might fall, as it formerly did, on persons residing in the large cities; it would not be difficult for them to acquire £1,000 worth of real estate in the divisions, and the country would not be equally represented in this House. Another reason why the elective system is preferable to that of nominations by the Crown, is that on every fresh election the newly elected member represents the opinions of the people then prevailing, whereas councillors appointed for life may sometimes represent public opinion as it existed twenty

years before. The progress of the country requires that from time to time men should enter this House as representatives of the opinions of the day.

HON. MR. ARMSTRONG moved that the House do now adjourn.—Contents, 21; Non-Contents, 29.

HON. MR. OLIVIER—I shall now endeavor to answer an objection made by the Hon. the Commissioner of Crown Lands (Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL) to the motion of the honorable member for Niagara (Hon. Mr. CURRIE). He would make it appear that the motion is inconsistent with the position taken by the honorable member who seconded the motion, because he declared himself as favorable to Confederation. For my part, I can see no inconsistency in the proceeding of the honorable member, who merely asks that time be allowed that the people may give their opinions on the question. He does not care in what manner it is allowed. If the Government do allow time for the purpose, it will rest with them to say whether the question shall be submitted to the people by means of a general election, or some other way. The amendment of the honorable member for Niagara does not suggest any particular way of submitting the question to the country. He only asks that it be so submitted, leaving to the Government to choose the most convenient method of doing it. And this is exactly the position which I have myself taken. I have told honorable members who seemed to believe me altogether opposed to Confederation, that it is not the case, that I only want time to ascertain whether the people are in favor of the scheme or not. Only if the project is submitted to the people, it is desirable that it be presented to them in all its details, and not in the skeleton shape in which it is now laid before us. I have no intention to weary the attention of the House, but I thought it right to express my views and say why I intend to vote in favor of the motion of the honorable member for Niagara. (Hear, hear.)

The amendment moved by the Hon. Mr. CURRIE was then put to the vote, and lost on the following division:—

CONTENTS.—The Honorable Messieurs Aikins, Archambault, Armstrong, Chaffers, Currie, Dickson, A. J. Duchesnay, E. H. J. Duchesnay, Flint, Leonard, Malhiot, Olivier, Perry, Proulx, Read, Reesor, Seymour, Simpson, and Vidal.—19.

NON-CONTENTS.—The Honorable Messieurs Alexander, Armand, Sir N. F. Belleau, Bennett,

Blake, Boulton, Bull, Burnham, Campbell, Christie, Crawford, De Beaulieu, Dumouchel, Foster, Gingras, Guévremont, Hamilton (Inkerman), Hamilton (Kingston), Lacoste, McCrea, McDonald, McMaster, Macpherson, Matheson, Mills, Panet, Ross, Shaw, Skead, Sir H. P. Taché, and Wilson.—31.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. AIKINS, the debate was then adjourned.

—o—

MONDAY, February 20, 1865.

HON. MR. AIKINS said—Hon. gentlemen, when I last had the honor of addressing the House, it will be remembered by those hon. gentlemen who were present that I spoke very strongly in relation to the changes contemplated by these resolutions in reference to this Chamber. Since then, although I have listened very attentively to the speeches of honorable gentlemen, I have heard no good reason to convince me that the elective principle as regards this honorable House should be abolished. It has been asserted by those who are strong advocates of Confederation, that if any amendment is passed affecting the general principles of the resolutions, it will be considered a defeat; that the scheme will have to be considered again, and that negotiations with the Maritime Provinces will have to be resumed in order to meet the altered view of the case. Had the amendment of the hon. member for Wellington (Hon. Mr. SANBORN) been carried, this might have been the case; but as the motion which I am about to move applies only to the Canadas, that would not be so. It will be remembered that that amendment affirmed not only the elective principle for all the provinces, but that the life members who are now sitting in this House should continue to hold their seats. It went further and declared that a number to correspond with the life members should be admitted to the Chamber from the Maritime Provinces. In referring to the vote which was taken on this amendment, I find that in the 41 votes cast against it, 11 of the life members of the House voted against, while only three voted for it; thus they, by a large majority vote, negatived the principles therein affirmed. I refer to this particularly, for this reason, that the ground may be taken by the life members in this Chamber that my amendment is specially directed against, and if carried, would be applicable to these hon. gentle-

men. The vote they have already given on the resolution referred to is my vindication, and they, in affirming the general principles of the Confederation resolutions, will vote for that which may deprive them of their seats.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. AIKINS—The hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands cries "Hear, hear!" But, after the life members of the House have affirmed by their votes that they do not desire that the elective principle should obtain, I do not think they can find fault with me, an elective member, for affirming that it should prevail. And it does appear to me, hon. gentlemen, that this House, if constituted as foreshadowed by these resolutions, would be one of the most independent and irresponsible bodies that could possibly be created, the Crown possessing no power whatever over it. There is no power of dissolution; the Crown has no power to add to the number; and whatever difficulties might possibly occur under the elective system, when the opportunity is afforded to the people of correcting those difficulties, it will be found that these difficulties will be largely increased under the proposed system. It has been stated by some hon. members that a dead-lock might occur. That was the impression which prevailed when the elective principle was introduced; but few have thought proper to use such an argument during the present debate, because it has not been proved by the result. But if it were possible for a dead-lock to occur under the elective system, it is far more probable under the system proposed in the resolutions. If a feeling had been manifested by this Chamber since the elective principle was introduced—if we had attempted in any one respect to usurp the exclusive privileges of the Legislative Assembly—it might then with truth be affirmed that the introduction of the elective principle in this Chamber was a dangerous one. But such has not been the case. I think that the elective principle has worked well, and that so far as the danger of a conflict is concerned, it is as far removed under the present system as under the nominative system. Holding these views, I have thought it proper to place my amendment before the House, and I trust that the question will be discussed fairly on its merits. I beg now to move, seconded by Hon. Mr. BUREAU,—

To resolve, in amendment to the resolutions of the Hon. Sir E. P. TACHE,—That the Legislative

Councillors representing Upper and Lower Canada in the Legislative Council of the General Legislature, shall be elected as at present, to represent the forty-eight electoral divisions mentioned in schedule A of chapter first of the Consolidated Statutes of Canada, and each such Councillor shall reside or possess the qualification in the division he is elected to represent.

The ground may be taken by many hon. gentlemen who are strongly in favor of this scheme, that there is much more symmetry in the scheme presented by the resolutions, and which this motion, if carried, would mar. But really there is very little harmony in them. Under them the appointed councillors will, in Lower Canada, be required to reside in certain divisions or to hold their property there. In Upper Canada the same property qualification applies, but as to residence there is no restriction; whilst in one of the Maritime Provinces (Prince Edward) qualification is based on personal property only. Hence there is in reality very little symmetry about the scheme. (Hear hear.)

HON. SIR N. F. BELLEAU raised the point of order that the amendment had in substance been already disposed of by the vote on the amendment of Hon. Mr. SANBORN.

THE HON. THE SPEAKER—The question of order raised by the hon. gentleman is whether the amendment now proposed is not substantially the same as the one voted on by the House and brought forward by the Hon. Mr. SANBORN, and if it is, whether it is in order? Before giving my decision, I wish that the mover of the amendment should himself explain the difference between his motion and that already decided by the House, if he thinks proper to do so.

HON. MR. AIKINS—I contend that it is not the same, in effect, as the motion brought forward by the hon. member for Wellington. It is true that the elective principle is affirmed in both; but then the motion of the Hon. Mr. SANBORN went further and applied the elective principle to the Maritime Provinces, and was favorable to the retention of the life members, and it also extended the life principle to the Maritime Provinces, and contemplated the addition of ten life members to this Chamber from those provinces. My motion simply affirms the elective principle so far as Canada is concerned, and between the two I think there is a material difference.

HON. MR. ROSS—There is no doubt that the motion of the honorable member for

Wellington embraced all that this contains, and a great deal more. So that if in the motion that was disposed of the other day, there was embraced what this motion contains, the present motion is out of order, containing as it does a principle which has already been pronounced upon by this House.

THE HON. THE SPEAKER—There may be some difficulty in deciding on a matter of this kind, because the two motions, although not exactly identical, are very nearly so in one particular. The argument that the motion of Hon. Mr. SANBORN contained more than is embraced in this motion does not apply. The question is, does this affirm what was contained in the motion already voted upon? That in deciding on this particular matter, we have decided on other things connected with it, does not affect the position. Rules on questions of this kind have been made to prevent Parliament deciding one day contrary to another, and to avoid also surprises, by questions being introduced a second time in the absence of members who may have previously voted on them. Were this motion to carry, it would affirm a principle which was negatived when the motion of the Hon. Mr. SANBORN was before the House. It is not necessary that the two motions should be exactly the same; it is sufficient if they are substantially alike. I will quote a few words on this point from MAY:—

It is a rule in both Houses not to permit any question or bill to be offered which is substantially the same as one on which their judgment has already been pronounced during the same session. This is necessary to avoid different decisions being given, and to prevent surprises by a question being resolved first in the affirmative and next in the negative.

Should we pass this motion now before the House, we should be doing what MAY says the rule of Parliament has been framed to avoid, for it would be affirming a principle on one day, and in another day the contrary. I am bound to say that in my opinion the resolution is substantially contained in the resolution already decided upon, and that therefore it is out of order. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. AIKINS—I must confess that I would like to have had the opinion of the House on the motion; but I am quite willing to abide by the decision of the Speaker. (Hear, hear.)

THE HON. THE SPEAKER—That the decision I have given may be well understood—to remove all apprehension on the score of a

motion once negatived not being supposed to be finally disposed of, I may say that we find this in the rules of the Imperial Parliament: "A question once carried or negatived cannot be brought forward again."

HON. MR. FLINT said—Honorable gentlemen, I deeply regret that the amendment of my honorable friend could not have been placed before the House, in order to a more direct vote being elicited on the principle therein contained, that of the application of the elective principle to this House. It is true that the honorable member for Wellington embodied the same principle in the resolution which he brought before the House, and which was negatived. I confess I hardly expected, when I saw this amendment on the notice paper, that it would be allowed to be proceeded with. Still I was in hopes that the House would have borne with the honorable gentleman, and would have allowed his motion to be placed on the *Journals* of the House. Having been sent here by a constituency which embraces about 75,000 souls, upon the elective principle, I feel that I should but ill discharge my duty to that constituency, without having received from them their direct and positive instructions to the contrary, were I to stand up on the floor of this House and advocate the taking away from them of the privilege of the elective franchise which has been conceded to them by Parliament. If this principle had not been granted, the position would be altogether changed; but having once granted to a people the right of saying whom they will have to represent them in this Chamber, they ought also to be asked, before we are called upon to vote, whether they desire to give back the privilege into the hands of the Government. I would not for a moment think of placing them in so false a position. I cannot, therefore, look with favor upon that portion of the resolutions which goes to take away from the people the right to nominate and select members to this Honorable House. So much has been said on this subject that it would be hardly worth while for me to consume the time of the House in going over the ground which so many others have gone over already. I have not heard, however, in all the speeches which have been made in advocacy of this measure, anything to cause me to swerve for a moment from the views I have always entertained after reading this portion of the resolutions. I may say that when I was

elected, it is true that Federation was before the country, but it was before the country in a very different shape from what it is at the present time. After the Government of the day was defeated last session, and after arrangements had been entered into, it was understood by these arrangements that we were to have Federation of the two Canadas. That was all that was placed before us. In issuing my short address, I stated I was in favor of Federation. I am so still—(hear)—but while in favor of Confederation of all the provinces, I desire it should be carried out in such a way that it will conduce to the best interests of all concerned. I wish that no advantage may be taken by any one of the provinces over the others. When I came before my constituents for election, as hon. gentlemen may be aware, I had no opposition—I was elected by acclamation. All I could say to the people on the measure was simply this, that I approved of the scheme marked out by the Government when the new administration was formed, but I knew nothing as to what had subsequently taken place. I told them that I was in favor of change—that I was in favor of a Federation of the two provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, in order that we might live together in peace, as I was satisfied, from what we had witnessed as transpiring for many years, that it was impossible to live longer together—that it was better to separate, and in separating we would probably be better friends. I also stated that the time must come when the Confederation of all the provinces would take place, and that if Confederation was formed upon a just basis, it would no doubt be the means of a vast amount of good to our common country. (Hear, hear.) The first knowledge I had of Confederation was, as a matter of course, when the delegates met and passed the resolutions which are now before us with a slight alteration or two of no moment. When these resolutions were printed by the Government I received one from the Honorable the Provincial Secretary, marked "Private," and I also at the same time received a note from that honorable gentleman, stating that these resolutions were not then intended for the eye of the public. The consequence was, I felt that I could not read these resolutions, and meet my constituents and tell them that I knew nothing in reference to Confederation. Thus feeling my hands tied, I placed

the resolutions in my desk, and left them there; and never did I examine them to ascertain what honorable gentlemen had done until I took my seat on the floor of the House. I could not feel free to place myself in a position before my constituents, and on being asked from time to time what were the prospects of Confederation and what were its details, give a truthful reply with the restrictions placed upon me, were I to have read the resolutions; and therefore I did not read the resolutions, so that I might honestly say I knew nothing about them. I feel, honorable gentlemen, that it would be impossible for me, under existing circumstances, to vote away that right which has been granted by the Constitution of our country to those who now have the privilege conferred upon them of exercising the elective franchise so far as regards this Chamber. I feel that I should do a great wrong and perpetrate a great injury to the electors who sent me here, were I to vote for that portion of the scheme which contemplates the taking away of their franchise altogether. I have no objection, as a matter of course, to the life members, if they so desire it, voting away their rights, or of placing their seats in the hands of the Government to be dealt with as they please; and so far as I am individually concerned, I would have no objection to sacrifice my seat in the House for the good of the country and of my constituents. They have sent me here, not because I was anxious to be placed in this position, however honorable it may be, but because I was their choice. And I must say that it was one of the proudest and happiest days of my life when I found, after having battled politically for so many years on the side of reform, that I could go into a constituency embracing 75,000 souls, of all descriptions and shades of politics, and that I had so far given satisfaction that not a man was to be found who raised his voice against my re-election. (Hear, hear.) I have gained, I may say, all that I desire in the way of earthly honor; but I feel, like many other honorable gentlemen, that in being placed in this high and honorable position, it is my duty to act faithfully towards those who sent me here; and I feel I should do wrong if, on an occasion like this, I should give my vote for placing that portion of Upper Canada which I am sent to represent in a worse position than they occupied before. Having made these few remarks

with reference to the elective principle, I desire now to speak about one or two other things in connection with these resolutions. And one thing in particular, I find, has not been spoken of by any member on the floor of this House. I refer now to the sixth clause, with reference to education. Now, hon. gentlemen, it strikes me it was decidedly wrong on the part of the delegates to place anything in reference to the education of the people of Upper and Lower Canada in this scheme. I will give my reasons for it, and I think those reasons are good. I think it should be left fully and entirely to the people of Upper and Lower Canada to decide what is best with reference to this matter. We see already that both in Upper and Lower Canada both parties are actively engaged endeavoring to press upon the attention of both Houses of Parliament the necessity of granting them greater privileges than they already enjoy. They seem to be determined to have nothing less for their Catholic education than a full staff of officers, together with model and normal schools, and all the paraphernalia which attach to the present common school system. That which in Upper Canada was regarded as a finality in school matters is now scouted at, and the advocates of separate schools go so far as to insist upon having a college; and the object is no doubt to place themselves in a position to be wholly independent of the proposed local government of Upper Canada. So far as I am individually concerned in reference to schools, I would far rather that the school system was worked out in both provinces on the principle of the common schools. I see no reason why in any neighborhood a portion of the children should be sent to one description of school, and a portion of the children sent to another description of school. I believe it is wrong in principle, and that the children of our common country should grow up together and be educated together. In our public schools there should be nothing taught which would have the effect of preventing any person from sending their children to them. These are my views in reference to schools. I believe that the effect of giving exclusive rights and privileges to certain parties has had a tendency to weaken the good feeling which should subsist between all classes of the community, and which is now seen in the demand from both sections for different systems of education. (Hear, hear.) The next thing to which I desire to call the attention of the

House is that of the Intercolonial Railway. I am opposed in *toto* to that great road. I am opposed to it for the best of all reasons. In the first place, I am not satisfied with it, because I do not know what it is going to cost. There is nothing in these resolutions to indicate what is to be the expense; nor have I been able to discover from what has taken place on the floor of the House, any data on the subject. Consequently, I do not feel that it would be my duty to vote for a measure which is going to entail upon Upper Canada a large amount of debt, without first knowing what that debt is to be. So far from this being regarded as a commercial undertaking, I cannot for the life of me see how it is possible that it can be worked commercially. The hon. member from Montreal (Hon. Mr. FERRIER), who spoke in his place the other evening, never touched upon this subject. All he told us in reference to this great scheme was simply this: that there were 100 odd cars lying at Montreal laden with produce, and that they could not go forward because on the other side of the lines they had so much to do that they could not send the cars through. But this was no argument at all in favor of the Intercolonial Railway. But supposing the road were built, do hon. gentlemen believe for a moment that it would pay running expenses? There is no doubt in my mind that to keep it open a subsidy would be required, like that which is paid to the ocean steamers. It was stated the other day by the hon. member from Montreal that two cents per ton per mile was a very small rate for railway carriage. But taking it at that figure, what do we find? From Toronto to the seaboard, over the Intercolonial Railway, the distance may be estimated at 939 miles, and to send a barrel of flour that distance by railway, at a cost of two cents per mile per ton, the charges on the flour would be not less than \$2.08. But supposing one-half this tariff were charged—one cent per ton per mile—and we are told that at such a rate the road would be run at a loss, the cost would be \$1.04; and by the time the barrel of flour was laid down in Liverpool, there would be charges on it for carriage of eight or ten cents per each bushel of wheat over what was formerly paid. These figures are based on the authority of hon. gentlemen opposite. "Oh! but," say they, "the farmer gets the benefit of his money during the winter." I do not see that this is any argument at all in a commercial point of

view. We have the advantage of getting the money in the winter, it is true, but how do we get it? By losing a large amount. For my part, I do not believe in getting only 3s. 9d. for a dollar's worth of produce. (Hear, hear.) And I am satisfied that when our farmers get to understand the question, they never will consent to be taxed for the construction of any such road. Taking the cost of transportation at two cents per ton per mile, and the distance from Halifax to Belleville at 831 miles, we find it would cost \$16.62 to transport a ton of goods between the two places. And at such figures, does any honorable gentleman who has the slightest knowledge of commercial transactions believe for a moment that merchandise could be sent over the road at any such rates? Supposing you reduce the rate one cent, it would still cost \$8.81, which would preclude the possibility of carrying freight over the road; so that, in a commercial point of view, the road would be perfectly useless. It is true that under our present system of banking, our bankers endeavor to enforce on the purchasers of produce the necessity of immediate shipments and immediate sales, and with that view cause them to draw for their accommodation at short dates; but it is also true that by such a practice the farmer is in every instance the loser. The reason of this custom is that the banks want quicker returns. But I contend that the banks should be prepared to advance money at such dates as will enable the producer to sell his produce as to get from it a remunerative return for his labor. But this is not done. It seems that the tendency of everything is to force freight down the railways during the winter season, and to this end money is advanced at short dates, the farmer being the chief loser by the transaction. Then the Intercolonial Railway is advocated as a military necessity. It is said that it is essential for the defence of the country, to enable the transportation of troops and military stores. I think, hon. gentlemen, we have only to look across the lines and see what has taken place during the war in the State of Virginia and in other states, to convince us at once that for the purpose of moving troops and heavy supplies, such as artillery and ammunition, these roads are of very little use. You will find that they have been cut in almost every direction, and the facilities they were supposed to possess for transportation have been proved to be well nigh worthless for any practical

purpose,—and that, too, in a country where they are able in a short time to rebuild any portions of the roads which may be destroyed. But how would it be on the Intercolonial Railway? That road is intended to run through a country near the boundary of the State of Maine, over which troops could be distributed at given points so as, in case of necessity, to break up the Intercolonial Railway in every direction and to prevent the transportation of troops and munitions of war during the winter.

AN HON. MEMBER—They would be unable to reach it so as to cut it.

HON. MR. FLINT—That is a very curious idea: "They cannot reach it!" I look upon the Americans as a class of persons who can cut their way wherever they wish to go. Nothing would be easier than for them to cut the Intercolonial Railway. But if it were really the case that the country to be traversed by the Intercolonial Railway is of such a nature that no one could get through to it, the sooner we cease saying anything further about it the better. (Hear.) For if the country is in such a state that it is impossible for men to travel through it, I see no benefit in having such a railway. (Hear, hear.) These are my views in reference to the railway. In the first place I do not feel inclined to pay the large sum of money it is going to cost, without knowing how much will be required. There is no knowing how much it will cost Upper Canada for her proportion—whether it is to be \$12,000,000, \$15,000,000, or \$20,000,000. But taking into consideration the amount of debt we will have to assume, together with our apportionment of the \$62,500,000 assigned to Upper and Lower Canada, as also that portion yet unprovided for by the resolutions; I think that by the time the Intercolonial Railway is built, Upper Canada will be saddled with at least \$50,000,000 as her share of debt. I do not see how it is possible for the people to bear up under such a weight; nor do I believe that, if they understood this matter as they ought to understand it, they would give their consent to us to vote for it. It may be thought, perhaps, that I am not in favor of Confederation. But such is not the case. I would much desire the Federation of all the provinces; but while I would desire the Federation of all the provinces, I do desire that that Federation should be based on true and proper principles—that every portion of these provinces of Her Majesty's dominion should share and

share alike. I do not believe in one portion of the provinces being placed in a position of inferiority to the others. I believe Upper Canada should have its just rights—I believe Lower Canada should have its just rights—and I believe that the other provinces should have their just rights. We should come together not with a feeling of distrust, but with a feeling of mutual good will, ready to take each other by the hand and to press forward to what I would hope might prove an honorable destiny. (Hear, hear.) I am well satisfied that the more this question is discussed—notwithstanding the remarks of some hon. gentlemen to the contrary—the more the question is discussed and ventilated, the greater will be the dissatisfaction of the people with it. I have received but one letter from my constituents on the point, and the simple reference of that writer is this: "Do not you vote for the Intercolonial Railway." He says, "I should like Federation; but do not vote for the Intercolonial Railway." But, hon. gentlemen, whether I had received such an admonition or not, I could not see my way clear to vote for the resolutions as they now stand. I have paid all possible attention to the speeches which have been delivered in this chamber. I have listened with every degree of respectful attention to the hon. and gallant Knight who leads the Government, and also to his hon. colleague the Commissioner of Crown Lands, and I should be happy if it were in my power to go with them in the vote which is about to be cast; but I do not see how that is possible, if I am at the same time to discharge my duty to my constituents, to myself, and to my country. I can never consent to vote away the rights which belong to the people, without first asking the people for their consent. If the time is given them necessary to make up their minds on this subject, and they then say to this House: "We are willing to try this scheme—we are willing to take it with all its defects, in the hope that it will be found to work well," I will give my vote for it as it now stands. But, in the absence of this opportunity being afforded, I must say that if I am in the House when the vote is called on this measure, I shall have to record my name against it, and in so doing I shall be acting conscientiously. I shall do so because I think it a duty incumbent on me, however painful it may be for me to vote contrary to the views of the Government in this respect, and contrary to a large majority of this House. And while I would concede

to every hon. gentleman who may differ from me the same freedom of judgment that I claim for myself—while I would look with all charity on the course thought proper to be taken by my fellow members, I feel persuaded that they will not begrudge me the right of discharging my duty in accordance with the dictates of my conscience, and what I believe to be for the good of my constituents. And if my constituents do not agree with me in what I am about to do, they have only to say, "Mr. FLINT, your conduct does not accord with our views; we desire that you should retire from public life;" and I shall be most happy to conform to their wishes. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. DE BEAUJEU said—Honorable gentlemen, I think it an act of patriotism to support the resolutions submitted to us, having for their object the Confederation of several provinces, so as to bring them into a group, with the view of forming a nationality. This project will not surprise any one, when he recollects that this immense territory is occupied by the descendants of the two first powers of the world, and that the greatest portion of them are of Norman and Breton blood. They will also remember that the Normans were the most adventurous pioneers, fit for all hazardous colonizations, and daring navigators. After having established their dominion over the British Islands, and over a part of France, Naples, Sicily, even in Jerusalem, Antioch, and near Constantinople, they crossed the ocean and established themselves on the Canary Islands, and afterwards came close on the borders of the Saint Lawrence and the Mississippi—a voyage that their ancestors had commenced in the environs of Novgorod, and where a nucleus of their race is yet to be found. The French Canadian countrymen of this Honorable House ought more than others to be proud of the scheme, and it ought to bring to their memory that France had once this object in view, but even on a larger scale (having then a territory of 1,800 leagues), and of making on this continent a second to herself by calling it *La Nouvelle France*. She was then seconded in this great undertaking by her best military and civil administrators. Among the foremost was the Count DE FRONTENAC, and the Marquis of DENONVILLE, and LA GALISSONNIÈRE, and also the celebrated Intendant TALON. The French Government was then laboring under the same difficulty of seeking for an open sea-port in winter, so as to avoid being shut up by the ice during five months

of the year, having their powerful neighbors, as we have now, to contend with. The Chevalier D'IBERVILLE, one of the brave sons of Montreal, the equal, as it is admitted by the best navy historians, of the celebrated JEAN BART, after having made, in 1695, two glorious expeditions to the Hudson Bay, Newfoundland, and to some of the other present Maritime Provinces, wrote a *Mémoire*, in 1701, on the situation of Boston and New York and other coasts of the then British colonies, pointing out the necessity of possessing a seaport during winter. Well, honorable gentlemen, this now may be effected without shedding of blood or money, only by securing the Confederation as agreed at the Convention by the most distinguished parties *contractantes* of these British Provinces, in extending the present railroad from Rivière du Loup to the Maritime Provinces, so as to connect in winter the most remote parts of Western Canada to the sea. The advantages to be derived from the annexation of these Maritime Provinces have been most ably developed at the beginning of this debate by the brilliant speech and sound logic of the gallant Premier, and also by other able speeches in support of those resolutions. I will, nevertheless, add that the Province of Canada will also derive the immense advantage of beginning the nucleus of our future military being, particularly if you get the great assistance of the Imperial Government that we are entitled to. Let us all recollect that France commenced her Canadian being by sending divers companies of troops by rotation to the present Maritime Provinces, and also to Louisiana. Those companies were commanded by officers who held the rank of *capitaines des détachements de la marine*, equal in rank to a lieutenant-colonel in the army. Those companies were in the habit of being trained for navy purposes. I entertain no doubt that the frequent intercourse with those Maritime Provinces, coupled with the navy ship school that the Imperial Government, as I understand, has the intention of establishing at Quebec, similar to those in England and France, will promote this object; and especially if England open the door of her academies of Woolwich and Sandhurst to our youths, as France was in the habit of doing when possessed of these colonies—in admitting, as *cadets de marine*, at Brest and Rochefort, the sons of those colonists who, as military and civilian administrators, had deserved such a reward—and, by so doing, they formed a good colonial navy, and it was from it sprang up those able and brave officers—the glory of

the past history of the French Canadians; and the honor that they had so acquired reflected also over Old France. Amongst the great number whose memory ought not to be forgotten, not only by the people of this Province, but also by the Maritime Provinces, at the birth and development of a new nation, and to the defence of which those men have contributed by their intelligence and courage, I will name, amongst others, BONAVENTURE, SÉVIGNY, CHATEAUGUAY, D'ALLIGNY, TILLY, GRANVILLE, SOULANGES, VAUDREUIL, BEAUHARNOIS, LONGUEUIL, REPENTIGNY, BOISHÉBERT, ST. OURS, &c., &c.; and many of those distinguished navy officers became governors not only in the French colonies of America and India, but commanded also seaports in France. BENOIT, CHAUSSEGROS DE LÉRY, the two VAUDREUILS, and PIERRE BEDOUT rose to the rank of Rear Admiral, and one of them, ROUER DE LA CORDONNIÈRE, was even complimented by FOX in the English Parliament, for his generous and gallant conduct towards his enemies. Now, honorable gentlemen, besides the establishment of the colonial navy, we should also promote the military organization and martial spirit, the natural accompaniment and the best safeguard of freedom, by assuming part of the military defences of this colony, proportioned to our population and revenues, of course with the effective assistance of the Imperial Government. And I hope that England will call out, to exercise the highest functions of statesmanship, such of her subjects in those colonies as will render themselves fit to fill such situations in future. Why should she not even employ them in the diplomatic service, or as governors of her other colonies, as France did formerly, in granting those favors for eminent services? And in spite of the intrigues of those near the *soleil levant* at Versailles, the daring exploits of those brave colonists, in that glorious struggle from 1698 to 1759, forced the French monarch to do them ample justice, and by so doing the most of the military commands and governorships of the French colonies fell into the hands of Canadian born subjects. I have said so much to show that the policy of England ought to have been directed to promote, in these colonies, the appointments in the civil as well as in the military career to her colonial subjects, as well as those living in the British Isles.—(Hear, hear.) Referring again to the Maritime Provinces, I will say to my French Canadian countrymen that they have too many glorious pages in the past history of America,

and particularly in relation to these provinces, not to feel a sympathy towards them, as there still exist a large number of the old Acadians who will feel proud to renew old acquaintance, and to live with them as brothers, happy under the protection of the English Government. Let me call to their memory some of the places which were the theatre of the exploits of the brave officers I have already mentioned, such as Port Royal, or Louisbourg, now Annapolis; Chebucto, now Halifax; Port Lajoie, now Charlottetown; L'Isle Royale, now Cape Breton; Isle St. Jean, now Prince Edward Island, &c., &c. I hope, also, that the construction of a good route to Rivière Rouge, the Rocky Mountains and British Columbia, will bring those places to an easy access for commerce, trading and agriculture, to our growing population, and will prevent them emigrating to the United States, as they will find glorious *souvenirs* in the former places, where their Canadian brothers have already formed flourishing agricultural settlements, and opened up valuable mines. I trust that my French Canadian countrymen in this House will see the advantage of adopting the resolutions now laid before them, trusting as they should do to the good disposition of the Home Government, as this new Constitution is well calculated to develop the resources of this fine and immense country. And the best proof that we are taking the right steps to secure our happiness, is found amongst other articles hostile to British interests, in an article of the *Courrier des Etats-Unis*, when the question of Confederation was agitated in 1853, and which runs as follows:—

Notwithstanding all that may be said, written or spouted about English tyranny and rapacity, we must acknowledge that Great Britain has always known how to keep up with the spirit of the age, and to deal out privileges to her colonies by judicious instalments.

Should this great project be adopted, our importance would rise on the continent of Europe, and we would be on the same footing at least as our American neighbors, belonging to a large and important Confederation, and our credit will rise in consequence. The Lower Canadians will recollect that in 1840, after the temporary suspension of the Act of 1791, England granted us a new Constitution. They will recollect also the anguish, the pangs felt by them at that period; but notwithstanding that we had no voice then in the measure as we have now, still the rights and advantages granted us by the capitulation of Que-

bec and Montreal and the treaty of Paris in 1763, have not been abrogated, and I am of opinion that by adopting those resolutions, our future rights are as safe as they were formerly. (Hear, hear.) Before I close I will answer the remarks made by the honorable member for Lanaudière division, in a speech a few days ago, respecting the Monroe doctrine, alleging that we ought not to legislate upon this delicate subject, or words to that effect. I will quote two letters lately discovered and published by Monsieur PIERRE MERGOZ, Guardian of Archives of the Ministry of the Foreign Affairs in France, and his remarks on these two great honored navigators who discovered the Mississippi and other parts of America, and which remarks are as follow:—

We cannot shut our eyes to the affinity of the interests of the present times and those of former days, and which recommend the memory of LaSALLE and D'IBERVILLE. In 1699 D'IBERVILLE wrote on the subject of Louisiana: "If France does not take possession of this part of America, which is the finest, to have a colony strong enough to resist those that England possesses in the east from Pescadore to the Caroline, these colonies, which are becoming very extensive, will increase to such an extent that in less than a century they will be strong enough to seize upon the whole continent of America, and to expel all other nations." D'IBERVILLE wrote again in November, 1702: "What may be said against the establishment that the king has made at Mobile? It is the only one that could sustain America against the undertakings of the English on this continent. In a few years they will be able to forward in fifteen days, by means of their large navy, more than 20,000 or 30,000 men upon such of the French islands as they would be inclined to attack, the distance not being, at the utmost, more than 500 to 600 leagues, the wind being generally favorable to carry them on those shores, and by land they may reach Mexico." "These views (says Mr. MERGOZ), together with D'IBERVILLE's remarks, will account for the natural uneasiness felt by the European powers at what is now taking place in South America."

What I have just quoted is, I believe, sufficient to convince the honorable member for the Lanaudière Division that the European Powers were not disposed, even at those remote times, to favor the doctrine now called the Monroe; the British colonists of those times being now replaced by our republican neighbors. Having said so much, I will conclude by stating that I shall vote for those resolutions as they are laid before us. (Cheers.)

HON. MR. HAMILTON (Inkerman).—Honorable gentlemen, so much has been said during the course of the present debate with reference to the elected members of this House,

and the rights of the electors who sent us here, that I desire to make a very few remarks to explain why I, representing a Lower Canadian division, a majority of whom will be amongst the minority of the Lower Canada of the future, have decided that it is my duty to vote for the resolutions of the Quebec Conference as they have been laid before us by the Government, and consequently against all the amendments. I am free to confess, honorable gentlemen, that there are among the resolutions some that I would have gladly seen, as I conceive, amended; but considering, from the nature of the thing itself, and therefore fully concurring in what many of us heard from an eminent and distinguished statesman in another place, that the whole scheme of Confederation partook of the nature of a treaty, into which, as a matter of course, the spirit of compromise must largely enter; and the Government having, as I also consider they were bound to do, informed us we must accept the scheme as a whole, or reject it as a whole, I conceived it was my duty not to be a bar in the way, however humble, of the passage of the resolutions, and I came to this conclusion the more willingly because I have been for a long time an advocate for a union of the provinces, and I have been so because it is indisputable that a much greater share of our self-defence must rest upon ourselves than heretofore; and though at the best our means of defence may not be as great as we could wish, yet it must be manifest they must be greater by being consolidated under one head. Some hon. gentlemen, especially my neighbor from St. Clair, have ridiculed the idea of Confederation increasing our powers of defence, inasmuch as under the best of circumstances it must take a long time to perfect our arrangements; but I would ask hon. gentlemen to consider what will be the effect in England, as to our defences, if we reject or even postpone this scheme of Confederation, coming as it would on the heels of a rejected Militia Bill. During the discussion, we have had, if the term is parliamentary and may be used, many fancy finance statements. Now, without disputing the correctness of any of them, I would ask the honorable gentlemen who have made them, have they made any calculation as to the costs we would be at after we had been gobbled up by our neighbors south of 45°, or, to use the words of the honorable and gallant Knight the Premier, after we had slid down the inclined plane, and become merged in the neighboring republic? I for one would say that such a position was altogether too contemptible to

occupy. With reference to the change doing away with our elective Legislative Council, of which we have heard so much, I for one can say that I consider the delegates came to the only correct conclusion, and this is no new conclusion, and involves no change of opinion on my part, for I can appeal to an honorable member of this House as to whether, within half an hour of taking my seat in it, I did not express the opinion that though it was not right to speak ill of the bridge over which one had crossed safely, yet that I was opposed to the elective system as applied to this House. I also dissent from the sentiments I have heard expressed by many honorable members of this House as to our position here, for I never understood that I came here as the mere delegate of the men of Inkerman, to vote just as the most active village politicians happened to pull the wires for me. No, gentlemen, I came here, as I thought, as the representative of my division, to do my best according to my humble ability in legislating for the benefit of the whole country, and under no other circumstances would I have accepted the position. I shall not occupy your time, honorable gentlemen, in saying that which has been better said by others; but thanking you for the few moments' hearing you have so kindly given me, conclude by reducing my explanations as follows: I vote for Confederation because I consider it essential to the maintenance of British connection, and to preserve that, I for one am prepared to make many sacrifices. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. BLAKE—I feel it to be my duty, honorable gentlemen, to make a few remarks upon the general question of Federation before the vote is taken. A great deal has been said about the manner in which the scheme has originated. It has been said that the honorable gentlemen composing the Conference were self-elected. Now I hold that it is most unfair to charge honorable gentlemen who have, as members of a government, entered into this matter at the request of His Excellency the Governor-General, with a sincere desire to do the best that could be done for the interests of Canada, with being too precipitate, especially when the subject was surrounded with so much difficulty. Although I have been an advocate of a union of the provinces for very many years, yet I am fully prepared to admit that there are some matters of detail in those resolutions that are very distasteful to me. I refer particularly to the abandonment of the elective principle in the constitution of this branch of the Legislature.

I was always in favor of the elective principle as applied to the Legislative Council, and a very large proportion of my constituency is also in favor of it. I am opposed to the building of the Intercolonial Railway, on account of the immense expenditure which it will entail upon the country, not only now, but for all time to come. I think that that expenditure will be so great that it will fall very heavily on our finances, which are now so very poorly able to bear the burden, and that the road will be of very little use to the country. Much has been said about this scheme not being understood by the people. With regard to that, I can only speak of my own locality. Before coming here, I went through my own constituency, and conversed with a great many leading men of all political parties, and all urged me to go for Confederation, without a single exception. (Hear, hear.) I pointed out the objections which I had to the scheme. I told them that I disapproved of the elective principle being ignored—of the building of the Intercolonial Railway—and of the increased expense of maintaining two sets of government. I pointed out all these and other objections, but notwithstanding, they said that it would be far better to take Federation, even as proposed by the resolutions, than to remain as we are. They said: "The government of the country has come to a dead-lock; we have seen one strong party pitted against another strong party; we have seen two or three governments formed that were unable to pass a single important measure, and some change is therefore absolutely necessary." The question then arises, What are we to do? Now, I would ask the opponents of this scheme, if they have any other plan to propose that will relieve the country of the difficulties under which it has been laboring? (Hear, hear.) On the other hand, we have been told by high authority that we were on the brink of ruin. We were told by the honorable and gallant Knight at the head of the Government, that we were on an "inclined plane," on which we were fast sliding into the republic of the United States of America. I think it is therefore my duty to vote for the resolutions as they stand, and to vote for no amendments of any kind. (Hear, hear.) We are told that if we adopt any amendments to the resolutions, the whole scheme must fall to the ground. Are we to go back to the position we formerly occupied, or will it not be better to accept these resolutions, on which a new Constitution may be formed? If it is not formed to suit us, we

can alter it hereafter. It is not, I apprehend, to be like the laws of the Medes and Persians, totally unalterable. The Constitutions of Great Britain, of the United States, and of the different civilized nations now in existence have been altered, and why are we to expect that these resolutions are a finality? Gentlemen, the Constitution of the Confederation can be altered in future as easily as our present Constitution has been altered. I hope this scheme will go into effect at an early period, and I trust it will be productive of a vast amount of good to our country. (Hear, hear.) Honorable gentlemen say it is a revolution. It may be a revolution, but certainly it is not so violent a one as was proposed in 1837 and 1838. (Hear, hear.) There has been a great deal of heavy artillery brought into play since this debate began, but I hope that the revolution will be carried out without the shedding of blood. (Hear, hear and laughter.) I am prepared to give my vote for the scheme. (Cheers.)

HON. MR. READ next addressed the House. He said—Honorable gentlemen, I have voted for delay in the passage of these resolutions, believing that to be my duty; and if I have been wrong in doing so, it has been through want of judgment. I have had no other intention in so doing than to promote the best interests of the country. As, however, I observe that a large majority of this House entertains a different opinion, I shall no longer attempt to mar the scheme, but shall give it my support when the time for voting upon it arrives. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) I never intended to mar it, but I wished to be sure that the country was satisfied with it, and would appreciate it when they got it. (Hear.) I think human nature is the same now as it always was and always will be. As the hon. Premier and the hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands have used some comparisons with reference to the proposed union, I have also a comparison to make. They said that a union could not be effected without some sacrifices—a little giving and taking all round. I think so too, but I think there is a different way in which this proposed union must be viewed. I compare Canada to a young man who has had guardians appointed to take care of his estate; but having arrived at that age that his guardians think it is time he should be married, they arrange a matrimonial alliance for him. He is all the time looking on, and expecting to be asked how the arrangement suits him. But in this case it appears he is not to be

asked at all. (Hear, hear.) When they have all things in readiness, he says to himself: "You may have power to marry me, but you cannot make me live happily." Now, had he been consulted, he would probably have made the same choice and have been fully satisfied with the alliance. As human nature is always the same, I have thought these were sufficiently strong reasons for wishing to have some delay, in order that the people, after the matter was fully before them, might cordially enter into the proposed union. I am favorably impressed with a great many of the resolutions composing this measure. I cannot, however, agree with my hon. friend from Toronto (Hon. Mr. Ross), that Upper Canada would build the Intercolonial Railway herself rather than be without it. Upper Canada does not produce anything that can be profitably taken over the road. There is no alternative, however, but to build it, if Confederation is to be carried out. In 1862, we had a good bargain thrown open to us, but as we refused to accept it at the time, we cannot now get it without paying a higher price. Along with the matrimonial alliance into which we are about to enter, there will be fresh responsibilities, and I really do not think the country is quite prepared for them. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) It seems we are pretty certain to form the alliance, and it is equally certain that those little responsibilities will immediately spring up. (Laughter.) I think, however, that we must call them great responsibilities, and I repeat, much greater than we are prepared for. I would make a great sacrifice for the defence of the country, but if England tells us we must do more than the country is able to do, I do not think we will be willing to submit to it. We are prepared to do all we can, but I am not prepared to go to such an enormous expense as to involve our country in such debt as will render it an undesirable place to live in. With Confederation we will have to go to great expense, not only for our defences and our militia, but also for a navy; because I believe that, as soon as the Americans put an increased number of gun-boats on the lakes, we will have to put on an equal number, and it is very doubtful to me if we can afford it. (Hear, hear.) Where is the money to come from?

HON. MR. CURRIE—Yes—where is the money to come from?

HON. MR. READ—We are now very heavily taxed, and have a heavy bill to pay for interest on our large debt. I would like to see the Government adopt some method by

which this interest should not go out of the country. I do not like to see so much borrowed from abroad. Interest is a thing that accumulates very rapidly, and it has to be paid regularly. If some system could be devised by which this borrowing from abroad could be stopped, the Federation scheme would suit me much better, especially when we consider that the taxes of the people of this country, per head, have been running up at an alarming rate—from one dollar to three—since the union, in 1841. It seems that the Confederation is to increase our taxes; that fact is generally admitted, independent of the expense of building the Intercolonial Railway. I do not see where all the money is to come from, but I dare say the Finance Minister will find out some means of raising it by increased taxation. When the final vote comes on, I shall be prepared to support the motion rather than have it rejected altogether, and shall press my opposition no further. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. REESOR—Honorable gentlemen, I rise to move—

That the following words be added to the main motion: "Provided always, that His Excellency the Governor General be prayed to withhold the transmission of the said Address until the said resolutions shall have been approved of by the electors of this province, qualified to vote under the Act 22 Vic., cap. 6, to be signified by a direct vote on the said resolution, to be taken in the various municipalities throughout Upper and Lower Canada."

HON. MR. DICKSON—I am desirous of calling to the notice of the House the fact that this amendment appears on the face of it to embody the same principle as the amendment proposed by the honorable member opposite (Hon. Mr. CURRIE), and seconded by myself, and which, after a long and somewhat tedious discussion, was decided in the negative. I would like to know, therefore, whether the amendment is in order. I do not oppose it, but if it is not in order, time will be saved by disposing of it at once, and I rise to obtain the SPEAKER'S decision upon the point.

HON. MR. ROSS—The objection of the honorable member is, I think, conclusive with regard to the amendment. It appears to be the same in principle as that moved by the honorable member for Niagara, and seems to me to be out of order.

HON. MR. BUREAU—I think the motion is in order. It declares that before the scheme is finally adopted, it shall be referred to the people, for them to vote yea or nay upon it.

No such amendment has before been offered in this House.

THE HON. THE SPEAKER—The motion proposed in amendment to the main motion by Hon. Mr. CURRIE was in the following words:—"That in a matter of such great importance as the proposed Confederation of this and certain other British Colonies, this House is unwilling to assume the responsibility of assenting to a measure involving so many important considerations, without a further manifestation of the public will than has yet been declared." Now, the present motion is—"That His Excellency the Governor General be prayed to withhold the transmission of the said Address until the said resolutions shall have been approved of by the electors of this province, qualified to vote under the Act 22 Vic., cap. 6, to be signified by a direct vote on the said resolution, to be taken in the various municipalities throughout Upper and Lower Canada." Although there may be some similarity, still it is not substantially the same motion. (Hear, hear.) The "further manifestation of the public will" may be quite a different thing from the manifestation of that will by a direct vote, as provided for by this amendment. I believe, therefore, that the motion is in order; and, as in a case of this kind it is my opinion that a liberal interpretation of the rules and practice of the House should be made, I cannot declare that the amendment is included in the motion decided by the House yesterday. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. REESOR—It will have been observed that the course of this debate has taken a most extraordinary turn. At first, honorable members addressed the House in favor of the resolutions—members of the Government more especially, and then some honorable gentlemen supporting them; but latterly we have heard several honorable gentlemen expressing their views very strongly and emphatically against many of the resolutions embraced in the scheme of Confederation, but while expressing themselves so strongly, they seemed to feel it to be their duty to support it as a whole. (Hear, hear.) Now, it strikes me, and I trust it will strike some other honorable members, also, that we have been elected to this Legislature with a view to perfect as far as possible every scheme or proposition that may properly come before it. If we have views on a particular measure which would lead us to propose amendments for the purpose of making it different in shape or scope from what it is when first introduced, I maintain that it is our duty to express our

views in that direction—not taking the measure without looking fairly and impartially into it, or accepting it in the belief that we have no right to dispute or alter any portion of it. For my part, I look upon the scheme now before the House as upon the whole very different from what we had a right to expect from the members of the present Government. They have been strongly supported in both Houses of Parliament and in the country, and I do not desire to see any difficulty thrown in their way, or anything done calculated to lessen their support in the Legislature; but at the same time I do say that, with the support and confidence they have received, they ought to have brought forward a better scheme than that which they have presented to the House and country. Why, take the question of the Intercolonial Railroad involved in these resolutions, and what do we find? More than two years ago the governments of the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia made a proposition to the Canadian Government to build this road and pay seven-twelfths of the cost, Canada to pay the remaining five-twelfths. Well, what arrangement have we now—what has time brought about—what advantages have these two years gained for us? This, that the Government of Canada come down to the Legislature with a scheme according to which Canada will have to pay towards the construction of this road nine-twelfths of the entire amount, and the other provinces the balance—thus involving additional expense on the part of Canada to the amount of several millions of dollars—certainly not less than six millions to build the Intercolonial Railway alone—more than was demanded of us two years ago—and a total additional expenditure that will add to the annual taxation of Canada more than a million and a half of dollars for all time to come. This heavy expenditure over the proposition made two years ago has, therefore, been needlessly undertaken. It is admitted, even by the promoters of this scheme, that the eastern provinces will benefit far more largely than Canada by the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. It is admitted by the best commercial men who have spoken upon the subject, that as a commercial undertaking it will not pay. It is admitted that it will be of little or no value whatever as a defensive work. This being the case, why then rush into this large expenditure with such precipitancy; why not, at least, postpone its passage in order to get a measure of a more perfect character, and one more in harmony with the

wishes of the people chiefly interested? Honorable gentlemen who betray such anxiety to press this scheme at once should remember that we are not voting away our own but the people's money, and that this should not be done to the extent that is now proposed, without consulting their wishes in the matter. This the law requires before a municipal council can make any special grant of money. In such cases a vote of the people has to be taken, which is conclusive as to whether the proposed expenditure shall be incurred or not; and yet we are here passing a measure of vastly greater importance to them, a measure involving a revolution in our political affairs—a measure involving an immense outlay of money without asking whether the people are favorable to it or not. (Hear, hear.) I maintain, honorable gentlemen, that before it is finally passed upon, the whole question should be submitted to the people, and that the law which requires a reference to them in minor matters, should be extended in a matter which so nearly concerns their future condition and prosperity. The people of the eastern provinces have very little to complain of in the plan of Confederation proposed. The fact is, they will be largely the gainers by it, if it is carried out. In Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, the members of the governments of those provinces, and other public men, see the great advantage they have gained over Canada, and are not slow to set them before the people. They are naturally anxious that the scheme shall be carried as speedily as possible, and are making every effort in this direction, for under it unprofitable local works in those provinces are assumed and paid for by the General Government; such, for instance, as the railways of New Brunswick, which, before five years go round, will, I have no doubt, be run at very considerable cost beyond the returns they will yield to the General Government. The Hon. Mr. TILLEY, in a speech to the electors of St. John, sets forth the advantages to be gained by New Brunswick by the union, as follows:—

New Brunswick is allowed to enter the Confederation with a debt of seven millions, and Nova Scotia with a debt of eight millions. Now, what was the nature of the arrangement by which we came in? It was found that the debt of Canada was not much larger per head than that of New Brunswick. We came in on better terms than that province.

Mr. TILLEY then proceeds to show how New Brunswick gained a clear advantage of \$610,000 a year for all time to come on the Interco-

lonial Railway alone. So much better are the terms to that province under the Intercolonial scheme than those upon which they offered themselves to join us in building that road, two years ago, Hon. Mr. TILLEY says:—

Of the cost of that road (the Intercolonial Railway) New Brunswick and Nova Scotia had guaranteed the provincial credit for seven-twelfths, and Canada for five-twelfths. Now, if the Confederation would build the road, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia would be relieved of the interest on the seven millions, amounting to \$420,000, as well as upon the interest of the three and a half-twelfths of the three millions sterling, amounting to \$190,000, making in all \$610,000 provided for by the General Government.

This liberal bribe to bring New Brunswick into the union, one would think, was quite enough to satisfy the little province; but Hon. Mr. TILLEY adds:—

Over and above all these advantages, we get for ten years a subsidy of \$63,000 per annum. Our local expenditures summed up amount to \$320,630, and we get from the General Government, without increased taxation, \$90,000, in lieu of our import duty and casual territorial revenue, 80 cents per head on the population, making \$201,637, and a special subsidy of \$63,000 a year for ten years, making in all \$354,637, being \$34,000 over and above our present necessities.

These (says Hon. Mr. TILLEY) are the principal points looked to. Hon. Mr. TILLEY is very candid, and acknowledges these advantages in the name of "subsidies." He further assures his audience in the following words:—

But we are asked, what guarantee have you that you will continue to receive these subsidies promised by the General Government? Most unquestionable security—we are not at the mercy of the Canadians. ••• So close is the contest between parties in the Canadian Legislature, that even the five Prince Edward Island members by their votes, could turn victory on whatever side they choose, and have the game entirely in their own hands.

This is the success with which Hon. Mr. TILLEY has acted on behalf of the people of New Brunswick, and I think the Commissioner of Crown Lands, when he reflects upon the advantages that the eastern provinces have received over those obtained by Canada, will admit that I was not far astray the other day when I said that our public men had acted with a great deal of recklessness. It appears to me that they went to work with the determination to get Confederation—to get it on fair terms if they could, but to get it on any terms that might be found necessary to con-

cede to the Lower Provinces. (Hear, hear.) Another of the delegates to the Quebec Conference, Hon. Mr. WHELAN, of Prince Edward Island, enumerates all the advantages that will be secured to that province by Confederation, and winds up by saying, that that little island will have \$40,000 a year more than necessary to carry on its local affairs. (Hear.) Taking all these circumstances into consideration, I do think the Government ought to have given more time to deliberate upon and perfect this measure; and, at any rate, to leave it over till another session of Parliament before demanding a final decision upon the question. Failing to do that, and failing to consent to any alteration in any one of the resolutions, however objectionable, I think it is our duty to refer it to the people for their decision upon it. I know I will be met with the objection that this is contrary to British practice—that a reference to the people in the manner I propose is unknown to the British Constitution. We may say the same thing in regard to every branch of legislation and public business in this country, that it differs in some respects from the mode of conducting it which prevails in England; but we must remember that we are differently situated in this country from the people of England, and that our feelings and habits of thought upon public affairs are altogether different. And since we have adopted the principle in the conduct of our municipal affairs, to refer all matters involving the expenditure of money for special purposes to the people, it will do no possible harm to apply it to this measure; and if the people adopt it, and it should afterwards prove that they had entered into a bad bargain, they would have no one to blame but themselves, and I have no doubt would, under such circumstances, bear it more patiently. But if we take the opposite course, if we close this arrangement on terms disadvantageous to us, it will be many years before a change can be effected. Would Prince Edward Island, at the demand of Canada, give up the lien, the constitutional right she will have obtained under this scheme, to the money she receives over and above what is necessary to meet her local requirements? Not at all. Would Newfoundland give up her bonus of \$160,000 a year for all time, should the looked for coal not be found to pay? Not a bit of it. Would Nova Scotia give up her right to impose an export duty on coals and other minerals, because Canada found that this right gave her undue advan-

tages? Certainly not. Would New Brunswick surrender her right to levy an export duty on timber, or, at the call of Canada, give any extra assistance towards the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, which will benefit her far more largely than any of the other provinces, inasmuch as it will open up a large tract of country within her borders, and render the land and timber it contains far more valuable? Undoubtedly she would not; we would have to abide by our agreement, no matter how invidious might be the advantages it conferred, no matter how unfavorably it might affect western interests. (Hear, hear.) The complaint that has been made against the working of the present union is that in Lower Canada the people do not pay as much in taxes to the general revenue, man for man, as the people of Upper Canada. It was contended, I believe, by the present Attorney General East, at a speech delivered some years since to his constituents at Verchères, that the expenditure for the redemption of seigniorial rights did not affect Lower Canada very much, because Upper Canada paid two-thirds of the revenue of the country; and all the advocates of the western section, who have urged its rights before the people, have taken the ground that it contributed in that proportion to the public exchequer. Now, if there be any truth in this statement, it must follow that under this arrangement Canada, at all events, will have to pay more, man for man, than the eastern provinces to the general revenue, because it cannot be contended, I apprehend, that Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland, or either of the other Maritime Provinces, however prosperous their condition may be, have a population as wealthy as that of Upper Canada, or one that will contribute as much in taxes to the General Government. If then, during the past, Lower Canada has paid less than Upper Canada to the revenue, while enjoying the benefit of as large or perhaps a larger expenditure than that section, what is proposed to be done now? Why, to remove that difficulty which led almost to a dead-lock in our legislation, to get rid of the embarrassments that have beset the Government of this country for many years past, we are asked to adopt a scheme that will perpetuate them on a larger scale than before, and involve, in the construction of the Intercolonial Railway alone, the expenditure of a million or a million and a half annually for ever. (Hear, hear.) How absurd then to urge on this scheme without at least sharing the responsibility of it with the

people? Why not take time and maturely consider it? Why not submit it to the verdict of those who have to pay its cost, and if they accept it, let them bear the consequences. (Hear, hear.) With regard to the constitution of the Upper House of the proposed General Legislature, a good deal has been said, but I think the main point has too often been lost sight of. The course of the debate upon these resolutions has seemed to run in some instances as though we regarded a membership of this branch of the Legislature a position which we ought to occupy by right, as though we had some sort of a constitutional right to remain here, and as though governments and parliamentary bodies were instituted by the people, not for the benefit of the community, but for the advancement of those who compose them. We would seem to have overlooked a fundamental principle of all free governments, that governments should be carried on for the good of the governed; and the principle of responsible government, according to which government must be carried on according to the well-understood wishes of the people.

HON. MR. MCCREA—As expressed by their representatives.

HON. MR. REESOR—As expressed, my honorable friend says, by their representatives. Very well; we must remember that those who constitute the Government of this country have brought down here a very curious scheme, and have held out to you the inducement that if you support it you have a chance of being appointed for life to the seat you occupy; and there is thus a probability of your being blinded to what you owe to the people, of your ignoring the constituencies that sent you here, and of your forgetting the duty you owe to the country. Now, I hold with regard to the elective principle in this House, that the oftener a man is brought in contact with the people in a legitimate way, to learn their wishes as constitutionally and properly expressed, the more likely he is to use his influence and talent in conducting the government in such a manner as to secure the happiness and prosperity of the country. (Hear, hear.) It is said that, as you have a responsible government, the Government of the day will be held responsible to the people, through their representatives in the lower branch of the Legislature for the appointments, it may make to this House. Admitting this to be the case, we know what the tendency is in England, and what it was in this country when the Government

had the appointment of the members of the Legislative Council; the effect will be to find a place in this House for men distinguished for the aid they have given at elections to certain men or parties, and not as a reward of true merit or legislative ability. Furthermore, if this House is to be of any value at all, it is as affording a wholesome check over hasty and unwise legislation. But if you place the whole legislation of the country in the hands of a single man or body, I care not whether it is democratic or aristocratic in its tendencies, a power like that in the hands of the Executive to create the Legislative Council is a dangerous one. Unrestrained or unchecked action by a single elected body of the most democratic character is apt to go astray if they feel they have only themselves to consult. This is what is proposed to be done under this scheme; but let this House be elected, as before, by the people; let them be returned for a period of eight years as at present, or even longer if desired, and then, if there is a demand for legislation of a selfish or ill-considered character—a demand which, founded on ignorance or passion, is likely to right itself after the lapse of a few years—the members of this House would take the responsibility upon themselves of rejecting it, and public opinion would eventually sustain them and acknowledge that they have done some service to the country. But inasmuch as you appoint these members for life, you have no check over them, nor are they so likely to check legislation of an immature and ill-considered character. While the Ministry of the day which appoints them remains in power, it will expect and receive a cordial support from them; but let it be defeated, and a ministry, formed out of the opposite party, obtain office, there will certainly be difficulty—there will be a tendency to dead-locks between the two branches of the legislature, and a repetition of those scenes which were witnessed in this country some years ago, and which formed one of the principal causes that brought about the rebellion of 1837. Honorable gentlemen say that we will have the power to remedy those defects in the scheme if they are found to be injurious in their action, but it is well known from the experience of the past that no power can be brought to bear to bring about any change that may be required, without a great deal of agitation and labor. What has been the agitation to secure a change in the representation of the two sections of Canada in Parliament? It has been going on for ten or twelve years,

and yet, on the eve of accomplishment, those who have advocated it have not effected a change of the nature that was desired, but have jumped into a new and totally different scheme, that really seems to me to have been brought about for the sole purpose of advancing their own personal aims, rather than satisfying any demand on the part of the people. (Hear, hear.) The honorable and gallant Knight at the head of the Government stated that we were on an inclined plane, and in danger of sliding into the republicanism of the United States. This phrase has been referred to so often by honorable members who have spoken, and so many deductions have been drawn from it, that I may perhaps be permitted to say a few words upon it. I think all must see that the tendency of the scheme now before the House will be in a few years to impose direct taxation upon the people for the support of the local governments. Let us then have direct taxation, and what will be the result? If there is a large expenditure on the part of the General Government, in addition to this taxation, political agitators will arise, who will cry out that the public burdens are unequally borne—(hear)—that two-thirds of the revenue is borne by the people living west of Quebec—that is, the population west of this city will, man for man, pay twice as much to the public exchequer as the population east of it. There will undoubtedly be the same tendency, under such a state of things, as has been charged to exist on the part of the Lower Canadian representatives since the union was formed—namely, a tendency on the part of those who pay the smaller portion of the revenue to spend the public money freely and extravagantly. They will naturally say when any appropriation is proposed for their own section—“We will go for this expenditure, for it will benefit us; and we will support a corresponding expenditure in the other section, because we have not so much to pay of it as the people of that section—we will have only fifty cents to pay of it, while they will have to pay a dollar.” This argument will be used in support of all extravagant and wasteful expenditures, and you may depend upon it that they will soon be incurred. Then you will have political agitators who will constantly keep these things before the people, who will demand a dissolution of the union of the provinces as a remedy for the evil. Then a further difficulty will be found in the fact that breadstuffs, the American market for

which will probably be closed, cannot be transported to the Lower from the Upper Provinces without being protected by a heavy import duty. Will the representatives from the Lower Provinces allow that import duty to be imposed? No, undoubtedly they will not. Attempt to carry it in the interest of Upper Canada and you will at once transform the whole of them into advocates for the repeal of the union. Thus you create cause for agitation in all the sections, and it will not long continue until you will again see another dead-lock. You will again have three administrations formed and three general elections occurring within two years, and again you will have sufficient excuse for another change in the Constitution. And you may rely upon it, that before such an agitation goes on five years it will be made an excuse for sliding further down the inclined plane than would have been afforded if we had remained as we were. (Hear, hear.) I cannot help coming to the conclusion, honorable gentlemen, that these resolutions contain the seeds of our destruction as colonies. There can be no political advantage in the proposed union, unless we assume the rights and responsibilities of an independent country. We are not yet prepared for that step. Our population is not numerous enough; we are too young and too weak to assume those rights and responsibilities. We have no commercial advantages to gain by the union. Why then force it upon us? Let it remain for more mature consideration, and the evils you have will be borne the more quietly; but if you force it upon the people prematurely, and the evils I fear spring from it, depend upon it that the public men who press it forward will be as seriously condemned as they are now highly lauded. The fact is, the people of the country do not understand this scheme. How can it be expected that they should understand it in all its bearings? Why, the honorable member from the Rideau Division said he heard the explanations of it and was here a couple of weeks before he understood it, and that he had sent 2000 circulars to his constituents that they might have a knowledge of it. How can he expect them to understand it from these printed documents, when he himself, with the advantage of hearing all the explanations upon it, was two weeks in gaining an understanding of it? Honorable gentlemen, I am in the abstract in favor of the union of these colonies—(hear, hear)—but I do not wish to force on this scheme in a way that is unfair and un-

just, that will lead to future difficulties of even a graver character than those we are now laboring under, and that will give cause for the advocacy of such a change in our position as few in this country would desire to see brought about. (Hear, hear.)

The House then divided upon the amendment, with the following result:—

CONTENTS.—Honorable Messieurs Aikins, Archambault, Armstrong, Bennett, Bureau, Chaffers, Currie, A. J. Duchesnay, Flint, Leonard, Leslie, Malhiot, Moore, Olivier, Proulx, Reesor, Seymour, Simpson, Vidal.—19.

NON-CONTENTS.—Honorable Messieurs Alexander, Allan, Armand, Sir N. F. Belleau, Blake, Boulton, Bossé, Bull, Campbell, Christie, Crawford, DeBeaujeu, Dickson, E. H. J. Duchesnay, Damouchel, Foster, Gingras, Guévremont, Hamilton (Inkerman), Hamilton (Kingston), Lacoste, McCrea, McDonald, McMaster, Macpherson, Matheson, Milla, Panet, Price, Read, Ross, Ryan, Shaw, Skead, Sir E. P. Taché, Wilson.—36.

So the amendment was negatived.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ said—I am anxious that honorable gentlemen should have a full opportunity of expressing themselves upon the measure which is now before the House, and as I am the mover of the resolutions, I think it is but just and fair that I should close the debate. (Hear, hear.) If no other honorable gentleman desires to speak upon them, I think that before the vote is taken I should have an opportunity of answering the arguments that have been advanced against the scheme, and of explaining certain expressions that have fallen from me. I believe the House will be disposed to give me that fair play which has always been given under circumstances similar to these—(hear, hear)—and I purpose, therefore—no other honorable gentleman desiring to address the House—to close the debate this evening.

HON. MR. CURRIE—I would ask if it is the intention of the Government to explain the resolutions more fully than has been done?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—The members of the Government will be happy to afford any information the honorable member may desire.

The House then adjourned till eight o'clock in the evening, and on reassembling,

HON. MR. RYAN said—The importance of the vote we are about to give on these resolutions is very great, as the future of the country is so largely dependent upon it, and representing as I do the division of Victoria, which is one of the most important in the country, containing a large representation of those sections or divisions of races which make up the population of Canada, I think it due to

my constituents to make a few observations upon the subject before us. (Hear.) If the constituency I represent is, perhaps, not quite the most numerous in the country, it possesses a large share of the wealth, business and manufacturing energy and commercial enterprise of the province. It also contains, in not very unequal proportions, people of the different nationalities, religions and languages which most largely prevail amongst us. You have the French element, with the Roman Catholic religion and French language; you have the English, Scotch and Irish Protestant element, and you have the Irish Roman Catholic element, which I may be said more especially to represent, and which is by no means an unimportant one. Go through Canada, and you will find that these, with a few European foreigners, such as Germans and Norwegians, make up nearly the whole population. My division is, in fact, an epitome of Canada. (Hear, hear.) It may not be too much to say that the opinion and feeling of Montreal will be a fair representation of what the opinion of the country generally is, and that if Montreal has come to a nearly unanimous conclusion, it is very likely the different sections of the country will have arrived at a very similar one on the subject of Confederation. I am happy to be able to state with confidence, that I have taken pains to ascertain the opinions of each of the different sections of my constituency to which I have alluded, and that I believe they are in consonance with the votes I have given in this chamber. (Hear, hear.) I have alluded to the energy of my constituents, to their great commercial enterprise. I believe that energy is one of their leading characteristics, and I may say this, that if that energy has led them, on rare occasions, a little further than their own interest and that of the country required, they, nevertheless, on such occasions acted on an honest and generous impulse, or were prompted by the feeling that some injustice had been done to them. I was greatly gratified with the remarks of the honorable and gallant Premier at the commencement of this debate, when alluding to events which long since took place in Montreal; he put the blame where it really should rest—on the Legislature of the day, which was pressing on the people a measure distasteful to them, and which was vainly remonstrated against by numerous portions of the country. The same impulsive character which led

them at that time into a course which is certainly much to be regretted, afterwards led them to countenance a movement of which I disapproved at the time, and which I opposed with all my might—the movement towards annexation. They favored that movement, because they thought they had been aggrieved and maltreated. But I may tell you now, that this feeling has completely vanished, and that their wish now is to place Canada on a footing in which, united with the Lower Provinces and in close connection with Great Britain, she may be thoroughly independent of her neighbors, and free from any need of looking again towards Washington. (Hear, hear.) In considering the project of Confederation, one of the principal subjects which has undergone discussion in this House has been the proposed Constitution of the Council, and the most prominent question connected with it has been the question of the elective *versus* the nominative principle. Although an elected member, I voted without the least hesitation against the elective principle, and I believe that in doing so I represented the views of my constituents as well as my own—I mean the great majority of my constituents, for there may be some exceptions with regard to this point, as there are no doubt with respect to the general question of Confederation. I based my vote on what is, I think, a true principle in politics, which is that if you wish a check to be established, such as I think this Council is intended to establish on the legislation of the other branch, you must not have the two Chambers returnable by the same constituents. If the constituents of both Houses are nearly the same, you lose the power of check, or at least you will not have it effectual, because you will have the same sentiments and feelings represented in this House as in the other. I am not singular in this opinion, but were I to cite the opinions of men who are of a conservative turn of mind, and who have always upheld the privileges of the aristocracy and the prerogative of the Crown, I should, perhaps, give you opinions which would carry less weight with the opponents of this measure than will that of a gentleman whose views I will cite, who has written a great deal, and very ably, and who belongs to the ranks of the advanced Liberal party in England—I mean Mr. JOHN STUART MILL. In his chapter on the Second Chamber (*Considerations on Representative Government*, page 242), he says:—

That there should be in every polity a centre of resistance to the predominant power in the Constitution—and in a democratic constitution, therefore, a nucleus of resistance to the democracy—I have already maintained, and I regard it as a fundamental maxim of government. If any people who possess a democratic representation are, from their historical antecedents, more willing to tolerate such a centre of resistance in the form of a Second Chamber or House of Lords than in any other shape, this constitutes a strong reason for having it in that shape.

Now, honorable gentlemen, I think a Second Chamber, constituted nearly in the same way as the Lower Chamber, would be wholly ineffectual to stop the current of legislation coming from that Chamber; the point, indeed, admits of very little question. (Hear, hear.) The objections which have been raised to nomination by the Crown or the Executive Government are of very little effect at this time of day. For myself I should have preferred to have the nomination of legislative councillors vested in the Crown independently of the recommendation of the Local Government, so as to have left the prerogative unfettered. There is no doubt that abuses formerly existed in Canada when the nominative system was in force—before responsible government was established and when the Colonial Office meddled a good deal with the affairs of the province; but now every honorable gentleman with any knowledge of historical events in Canada will say at once the case is altogether altered. So far from interfering in our internal matters, the Colonial Office now leaves us a great deal to ourselves and lets us do as we please. There never was a freer Constitution than ours. Under these altered circumstances, I should have preferred, I say, that in order to avoid all appearance of nominations for party purposes, the direct nomination of legislative councillors should have been left to the Crown or the Crown's representative in the Confederation. (Hear.) There was one remark made by the hon. member for Wellington in reference to Mr. CARDWELL's letter, which I think was made in error. He inferred from that despatch that Mr. CARDWELL was opposed to the nominative system. Now, the passage he alluded to was this:—

The second point which Her Majesty's Government desired should be reconsidered is the Constitution of the Legislative Council. They appreciate the considerations which have influenced the Conference in determining the mode in which this body, so important to the constitution of the Le-

gislature, should be composed. But it appears to them to require further consideration whether, if the members be appointed for life, and their number be fixed, there will be any sufficient means of restoring harmony between the Legislative Council and the popular Assembly, if it shall ever unfortunately happen that a decided difference of opinion shall arise between them.

Now the point of this (Mr. CARDWELL'S) objection clearly is to the number being fixed, not to the principle of nomination, nor to members being appointed for life. (Hear, hear.) Like many honorable gentlemen in this House, there are certain of the clauses in these resolutions which, I think, might have been improved. I, for instance, might have preferred the Confederate seat of government being established elsewhere than at Ottawa; and, with reference to this subject, I have been much struck with a remark, which I will cite, from a recent writer, who says that—"Any country compelled to forego the use of its natural chief city, and make some inferior and ill-placed town the seat of its government, labors under incalculable disadvantages." Everybody, however, has his own little bantling, and thinks it the handsomest in the world; and I doubt very much if, after all, we should have made the plan of Confederation much better, had every one of us been consulted and taken into the Conference, at Charlottetown or Quebec, to urge our own special views. (Hear, hear.) I rather infer, from the differences of opinion I have heard around me in these debates, that the compromise system would not have been so easily adopted by us as by the gentlemen who composed those conferences. I hope, however, that we shall adopt that system now, and get through the debate in the faith that they have done what is best for the interests of the country, and that the measure is so important, as a whole, as to render it unwise to place minor impediments in its way to interrupt its course. (Hear, hear.) I have marked several sections of the resolutions which I think are open to objection or susceptible of improvement, and I hope the honorable and gallant Knight at the head of the Government will give some explanations respecting the views which animated the Conference in reference to them. One of them is a matter in which Lower Canada is somewhat peculiarly interested—the system of marriage and divorce, which, I see, is to be left in the hands of the Federal Government. I hope nothing will be done by the General Government, in rela-

tion to this question, which will outrage the feelings of Lower Canada, or lead to the laxity, in dealing with the marriage tie, which prevails south of the line 45°. (Hear, hear.) Again, emigration is a subject which is left to the Local as well as the General Government to deal with. I think it should be under the care of the General Government entirely. Then, as to the question of education, I hope the Government will secure to Roman Catholics in Upper Canada the same rights which will be extended to Protestants in Lower Canada. To have the same privileges is only equal justice, which I trust and believe will be granted. Having been in communication with several of the Roman Catholic clergy, I can say that they desire to have every justice done to their Protestant fellow-subjects, but expect to have the same privileges granted to Roman Catholics in Upper Canada (who are the minority there,) as will be given to the Protestant minority in Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) I must also refer to the clause which gives to local governments the right of dividing the sections of the Confederation into constituencies and electoral divisions. This power may become very dangerous and lead to great practical injustice, and should, I think, be placed in the hands of the General Government. I come now to the question of railway extension, and this is a matter which seems to have been a serious stumbling-block to a great number of those who are really favorable to the measure of Confederation. Now, I do not think the Intercolonial Railway will be a profitable concern, all at once; but I think I can remove a few of the objections which have been raised to this part of the scheme. In the first place, I think a mistake prevails as to what will be the cost of carrying freight on this railway. I have here the annual *Trade and Navigation Returns of New Brunswick* for 1863, in which I find the following statement:—

If New Brunswick was connected with Montreal and Quebec by direct railway communication through British territory, our importations from the States would decrease immediately, and much of our flour and other supplies would come direct from Canada; and in the event of the Reciprocity Treaty and the bonding system of the United States, which allows British goods to pass through their territory free of duty under bond to Canada, being abolished, Saint John would probably become the Atlantic shipping port of Canada for the winter months.

People may suppose the rates of freight

would be so very extravagant that this could not come to pass; but in the same report, which has very opportunely come to hand, as it corroborates the remarks I made during the debate on the Address as to the fact that we should have some offset in the trade of the Lower Provinces, under Confederation, for what we should lose if the Reciprocity Treaty were to be annulled, I find the following statement:—

The cost of transportation of flour from Montreal to Portland, Maine, by rail, has been reduced to the low figure of 35 cents per barrel, and from Portland, Maine, to this port, it can be conveyed for 25 cents by steamer, or 15 cents by sailing vessel, making altogether 60 cents for conveying a barrel of flour, weighing 200 lbs., by rail and steam, a distance of 585 miles, and it could be delivered at this port (St. John, N. B.) within five or six days from the time of loading at Montreal. Of course these low rates of railway freight apply to large quantities only.

Well now, gentlemen, the distance from Montreal to St. John, by railway, is at a rough estimate about 600 miles.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Not so much—about 500 only.

HON. MR. RYAN—So much the better for my argument, but I will give my hon. friend the benefit of the 600 miles. Now, the further a barrel of flour is carried the less the freight per mile is, because you get rid of the cost of handling it at successive stages. If you can carry it from Montreal to Portland, say 300 miles, for 35 cents, you can certainly carry it 600 miles for less than twice that sum, or let us say for 60 cents, not more than what it now costs by the combined rail and steamboat route *via* Portland, while the flour conveyed all the way by rail will be the better for not being moved about from one means of conveyance to another. I have indeed reason to believe, from a very good railway authority, that it would pay a railway company well to carry flour from Montreal to St. John for from 60 to 70 cents per barrel, and that if it were necessary, the work could be done at a profit at 50 cents per barrel. (Hear, hear.) I want to shew by this, that the carrying of flour over the Intercolonial Railway will not be so difficult of accomplishment as people who have not gone into the calculation closely may be disposed to imagine. (Hear, hear.) I have here, too, a statement of the imports of flour into New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland. It is as follows:—

Imports of Flour.	Barrels.
New Brunswick.....	243,000
Nova Scotia.....	328,000
Newfoundland.....	226,000
	<hr/> 797,000 <hr/>

If we now look at our imports and exports for 1863, we shall find that we imported into Canada 4,210,942 bushels of wheat, while we exported only 3,030,407 bushels. Well, this may appear strange, considering that we are an agricultural and exporting country; but we come next to the article of flour, and find that while we imported only 229,793 barrels, we exported 1,095,691 barrels.

HON. MR. CURRIE—We imported wheat to grind it into flour.

HON. MR. RYAN—Exactly so. The excess of flour exported was 865,898 barrels, which, taken at $4\frac{1}{2}$ bushels to the barrel, would be equal to 3,896,541 bushels of wheat. Deducting from this the excess of our imports over our exports of wheat, viz., 1,180,535 bushels, will leave us 2,716,006 for export, which at the same calculation, viz., $4\frac{1}{2}$ bushels to the barrel, gives us 603,557 barrels of surplus flour, ground from wheat in Canada, with which to supply the demand of the three Maritime Provinces mentioned of 797,000 barrels. (Hear, hear.) Thus, if the Reciprocity Treaty be repealed, we can just about supply what they annually require. (Hear, hear.) Their importations are moreover very constant, for the return says:—

Our importations of wheat flour in 1863 amounted to 243,391 barrels, against 232,237 barrels in 1862; 210,676 barrels in 1861, 198,323 barrels in 1860; 295,356 barrels in 1859, 226,649 barrels in 1858; and 153,515 barrels in 1857.

That is as far as wheat or wheaten flour is concerned. They consume also a large quantity of pork, a large quantity of beef and other produce; but I do not wish to trespass longer upon the time of the House.

VOICES—"Go on."

HON. MR. RYAN—I will just read from the New Brunswick return. It says:—

Our importations into the Province in 1863, of all kinds of agricultural produce, amounted in value to \$2,060,702, the description of which was as follows:—Flour and meal of all kinds, bread, beans, peas and pot barley, \$1,333,786; grain of all kinds, bran, horse and pig feed, \$148,413; vegetables, including potatoes, \$76,769; meats

viz., salted, cured and fresh, including poultry, \$242,933; butter, cheese, lard and eggs, \$75,236; animals, including horses, oxen, cows, sheep and pigs, \$58,715; apples, pears, plums, cranberries, &c., \$60,257; tallow and soap grease, \$29,973; hops, \$5,225; hay, \$3,142; malt, \$4,719; shrubs, trees, &c., \$2,188; seeds, \$10,815; wool, \$8,531; amounting altogether in currency to £515,175. The value of the agricultural produce imported in 1862 was £476,581 currency; in 1861 it was £427,083 currency; and in 1860 it was £447,341 currency.

The Nova Scotia and Newfoundland returns also show that large quantities of agricultural produce of all kinds are imported into these colonies, as well as immense quantities of pork and other meats which we could easily and profitably supply. Now all these articles Canada will be able to supply, and this is another item in the return which is very noticeable. The Lower Provinces import large quantities of boots and shoes. The New-Brunswick return states that—

The value of boots and shoes imported in 1863 was \$59,851—duty, \$7,521; against \$17,957—duty, \$3,105, in 1862; \$101,967—duty, \$16,385, in 1861; and \$131,424—duty, \$20,832, in 1860.

These under Confederation would go duty free from Canada. There is a large manufacture of such articles, and with them, as with some other articles we make, we might supply the Lower Province markets. (Hear, hear.) If there is one feature in our connection with the Lower Provinces which we must not lose sight of, it is their possessing coal in large quantities; this is sure eventually to create manufacturing communities amongst them, to increase their population, and cause a larger home demand than at present, for the agricultural productions of Western Canada. (Hear, hear.) I may now recur to the Intercolonial Railway question, and express a hope that it will be gone about by the Government in the most economical manner possible. This much may be said, that whatever money is spent on it will be spent in the country, that is, in our new country, will be spent among ourselves, and will attract a great army of laborers; and I do hope and trust the Administration will so arrange the prosecution of the work, that these laborers shall be induced to settle on the lands traversed by the line, which, I am told, are very favorable to settlement, so that another market for our manufactures and productions may be formed; and that if the Reciprocity Treaty should be lost to us (an event which I deprecate as

much as anyone), we may have something to fall back upon—which we shall have, hon. gentlemen, if we look at our position boldly and energetically, and take advantage of circumstances as they arise (Hear, hear.) With respect to the statement that the road will not be valuable for purposes of defence, not being a military man, that is, nothing more than a militia officer, I do not pretend to offer a very valuable opinion: but it appears to me that, removed a certain distance from the frontier as it will be, an attack on the railway must be next to impossible in the winter time; besides, it will be our duty to guard our frontier in such a way that incursions cannot be made upon us with effect, and I hope we shall be able to do so. (Hear, hear.) It has been remarked that the English Government would not think of sending a military force from Halifax to Canada by railway, but I confess I differ from this view. In the war which is now going on in the United States, if it has been proved that railways can be easily broken up, it has also been proved that they can easily be relaid, and the value set upon them by military men is clearly exemplified by the struggles they make to gain or to retain possession of them. If a railway is partially broken up, they have appliances at hand quickly to repair it. It is a part of modern warfare to lay railways and lines of telegraph, and armies have corps attached to them whose special duty this is. (Hear, hear.) There is another thing, important in a military point of view, which has been lost sight of—which is, that although soldiers might walk over the snow, military munitions and the heavy articles used in war, such as cannon and mortars, cannot be put on snow-shoes. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) I think the railway would be of incalculable value for transporting such things as these if there were occasion for it, which I hope there never will be. It is, however, meet to be prepared for such an eventuality as war, for that is the best way to avoid it. (Hear, hear.) I may here refer to what some honorable gentlemen have remarked in this debate, that the circumstance of certain portions of the population of the Lower Provinces being occupied in maritime pursuits, diminishes to that extent their power of aiding Canada in case of war. In this opinion I am unable to concur; for if there be one arm more than another in which they can assist us, it is by the aid of their hardy seafaring population, who will swarm the seaports of the Confederacy and the

Empire, and act with great effect upon the commerce and sea-board towns of any foreign foe. It has been said, honorable gentlemen, that this measure is being hurried through the House, and complaint has been made that it has not been referred to the country for arbitrament. But, look at the consequences of so referring it to the country. Look at the consequences of delay. You have read the telegram to-day which gives the news of the assembling of the British Parliament, and I am glad to see a statement in Her Majesty's Speech, that She has approved of the measure which is now under our consideration. Well, gentlemen, the Parliament of Great Britain will not sit for an unlimited time. Its session, this year, may be shorter than usual, for the natural dissolution of this and the assembling of a new Parliament are drawing near, and contending parties generally make an effort, towards the close of a Parliament, to make a change in the Administration. Any one who reads the English papers and political documents will see that a change of Ministry is confidently expected by some people; and if a defeat of the present Ministry takes place, and Parliament is dissolved, their own affairs will occupy the minds of British statesmen, so that when again called together, for a short time in summer, it may be merely to legislate on local matters, and our Confederation project may thus be indefinitely delayed.

HON. MR. CURRIE—So much the better.

HON. MR. RYAN—I think any man with his eyes open will see that events are marching on upon this continent with great strides. Event follows event in such rapid succession that we can hardly tell whither the tide will flow next. Already we hear the great anticipated successes of the North. If the news be true that Charleston has been evacuated, it will be a severe blow to the cause of the South; and if the South be conquered, we know what have been the sentiments towards Canada expressed in the United States for the last three years. They will, perhaps, turn north for further conquests, and try to humble a power which has not in every way met their wishes. We should, at all events, be prepared to meet such a contingency, prepared to repel attack, prepared to defend our homes and the free Constitution under which we live. I will conclude by saying that if the citizens of Montreal have been accused in former times of energy in a wrong

direction, they are prepared now, and I speak it advisedly, to use that energy for the defence of the province. For the people of the nationality to which I belong, I will further say they have come to this country to find a home and they have found one, where they are not oppressed by any wrongs, where there is no invidious distinction between races and creeds. They appreciate the blessing and value of the institutions under which they live, they are ready to defend them, and they look on the union of the British North American Provinces as the surest means of preserving and perpetuating them. (Cheers.)

HON. MR. PRICE—Honorable gentlemen, being one of the newly elected members of this House, I would like to say a few words, by way of defining my position, before the vote is taken. Although I have said that I was in favor of Confederation as the only means by which we could make proper provision for our defence, yet, until I understood the details more clearly than what I could learn from the resolutions, I could not make up my mind to vote for it. Previous to the declaration at the election in my division, the press had circulated the views of the Conference, and I went over the details so far as I was in possession of them, and the verdict of the people at the hustings was unanimously in favor of the scheme. (Hear, hear.) I would like to enter into a discussion of the details, clause by clause, but it is impossible to do so at the present time. It is not surprising that almost every member of the House is opposed to one or more of the resolutions; it is impossible for us, even when we go into committee on almost any subject, to unanimously agree on all the clauses. Before going further I wish to thank my honorable friend the gallant Knight at the head of the Government, for his kind remarks with reference to my father and myself, at the opening of this debate. For the last twenty years I have been known and resided in the constituency which sent me here, and if I have been elected without much opposition, it was from friendship towards me on the part of my constituents. Although I represent people having different religious views, yet I believe only twenty-six Protestant votes were given for me. I have had a great deal of personal friendship and intercourse with the Roman Catholic clergy of Lower Canada, and must say I have always found them liberal and loyal in their views, and, as a body, almost

unanimous in supporting the scheme of Confederation, being convinced that it is the only *sortie* from our present political troubles, and of our continuing under the British Crown, knowing well the liberty that all subjects enjoy under it; and I feel certain that if ever the day comes to defend the British flag on this soil, while a shred is left on the staff they will be there to defend it. Being an elected member of this House, who by this scheme may be offered a seat for life, I beg to say that I care little for the chance; but I have been congratulated by my constituents, on all sides, upon the prospect before me, and if I vote for the measure as it stands I shall not, therefore, in any way displease them. Although I voted for rendering this House elective, in 1856, yet I did so, contrary to my own convictions, for the sole purpose of sustaining the Government, believing that this House should be a conservative body. I consider that this should be a special branch, where we should judge measures without reference to popular prejudices, if such a thing were possible. I think we are here to judge without that political partiality which actuates most of the members of the Lower House, some of whom got their seats by a majority of one. I am sure persons elected in that manner can hardly claim to represent the popular feeling of the country. For my part, I intend to vote for these resolutions, for it becomes a matter of choice with us either to support them and thus become one strong Confederacy, or else go by dribblets into the American Union. (Hear, hear.) I am fully convinced that we are tending rapidly towards annexation, and that the only thing that can save us is the formation of a strong Confederacy. And if that is not done immediately, I firmly believe that we shall let the golden opportunity slip, and will not again have the opportunity. Honorable gentlemen say that our debt will be rapidly increased under Confederation. Well, that is hard to say, but I think it quite likely it may increase slightly. But what would be our debt if we were annexed to the United States? What would our taxes be if we had a proportion of the enormous war debt of that country to pay, in addition to our own? For my part, believing as I do that this is the only hope of the country, and the present the only opportunity we shall have of carrying it through—and so far as I know it is the only one—I should feel myself unworthy the position I hold if I did not vote in favor of it. It is the only practicable scheme that has

ever come before the country for settling the difficulties that have afflicted the country. For the past ten years, during which I have had the honor of being a representative of the people, there has always been a running fight between the ins and outs—first one side and then the other, contending for office, and the result has been anything but satisfactory to the country. I think if honorable members would take an impartial view of this question, and consider that we cannot alter the details, if we desired to do so, without defeating the whole, they would not hesitate to vote for it. As I understand it, the details in reference to the formation of our own local governments will be brought before us, and we shall then have ample opportunity of considering and amending them if we think it necessary. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. REESOR—I do not wish to make any lengthened remarks; but there are one or two points to which I wish to call the attention of the House before the vote is taken. (Cries of "Question," "question!") If I am out of order, I will take my seat.

THE HON. THE SPEAKER—The honorable gentleman is perfectly in order.

HON. MR. REESOR—I wish to call the attention of the House to the opinion of the celebrated author quoted by my honorable friend from Victoria Division (Hon. Mr. RYAN). My honorable friend quoted some part of a work by Mr. JOHN STUART MILLS, a celebrated writer on Representative Government, but he did not go far enough. Mr. MILLS says:—

The consideration which tells most in my judgment in favor of two Chambers (and this I do regard as of some moment), is the evil effect produced upon the mind of any holder of power, whether an individual or an assembly, by the consciousness of having only themselves to consult.

This is perfectly true. But what does my honorable friend advocate? He advocates that the whole power shall be concentrated in the General Government; that they shall have the power to create this House, so that the whole power shall be legally centred in "one body." The writer he quoted goes on and condemns that principle in the following words:—

If the writings by which reputation has been gained are unconnected with politics, they are no evidence of the special qualities required, while, if political, they would enable successive ministries to deluge the House with party tools. That is the position to which my honorable

friend would drive us. He would give the ministry the power "to deluge this House with party tools." He then went on and proved too much with regard to the trade between the provinces. He said New Brunswick and Nova Scotia would take our manufactures, that already we had large manufactures of boots and shoes, and that the Lower Provinces would take these and other manufactures from us. And then he told us that they had coal in Nova Scotia, and that where there is coal, manufactures will spring up.

HON. MR. RYAN—Coal is not used in the manufacture of boots and shoes.

HON. MR. REESOR—But coal makes a manufacturing country, and there is no reason why Nova Scotia, as a manufacturing country, should not manufacture boots and shoes as cheaply as they can be manufactured at Montreal. I have lately learned from good authority that the very articles to which my honorable friend refers (boots and shoes) are now being largely manufactured in the city of St. John. Labor is quite as cheap in New Brunswick as in Canada, and there is no reason why they could not supply themselves with the articles named, and with many others, even cheaper than they can be supplied from Canada.

HON. MR. RYAN—As regards Mr. MILLS' opinions, the extract I read was this:—

That there should be in every polity a centre of resistance to the predominant power in the Constitution—and in a democratic Constitution, therefore, a nucleus of resistance to the democracy—I have already maintained; and I regard it as a fundamental maxim of government. If any people who possess a democratic representation are, from their historical antecedents, more willing to tolerate such a centre of resistance in the form of a Second Chamber or House of Lords, than in any other shape, this constitutes a strong reason for having it in that shape.

He admits that a check can be used, and properly used, by a House of Lords or a Legislative Council. Then he goes on to say that he does not think this the best check, and prescribes a plan of his own; but his statement on this point is too long to enter upon now.

HON. MR. CURRIE—I wish to ask the Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands a question with reference to the meaning of the 5th sub-section of the 29th clause, which commits to the General Parliament "the raising of money by all or any other modes or systems of taxation." Am I to understand that the General Government are to have the pow-

er of imposing local taxation upon the lands of the provinces?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—The general national power of taxation is to be in the General Government.

HON. MR. CURRIE—The 34th sub-section of the same clause commits to the General Government "the establishment of a general Court of Appeal for the Federated provinces." Is that to be in lieu of the Courts of Appeal we now have? Is it intended to do away with the present Court of Appeal and to establish a new one?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—I do not think my honorable friend has caught the meaning of what is intended. It does not say the general Court of Appeal shall be established, but that the power to establish it shall be in the General Government.

HON. MR. CURRIE—New Courts of Appeal?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—If a statute of the Parliament of the United Provinces shall be passed creating a Court of Appeal, it will state whether it is in lieu of, or in addition to, the present Courts of Appeal. I should suppose it would be in addition.

HON. MR. CURRIE—I think that point is one which we ought to understand before giving a final vote; and I do not think the Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands, with reference to it, has fulfilled his promise to give an explicit answer to any question which might be put, to elicit further information about the scheme. Then the 43rd clause gives the Nova Scotia Legislature power to make laws respecting export duties on coal. What is the meaning of that?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—I thought I had explained that the export duty there was almost synonymous with our royalty. It is levied in lieu of a royalty at the mine; and we therefore permit the Nova Scotia Government to exact it on coal coming to this country.

HON. MR. CURRIE—The honorable gentleman must see it cannot be a royalty, because the royalty must apply to all coal consumed in the Province of Nova Scotia, while the export duty only applies to coal exported from that province. The 9th sub-section of that clause imposes on the local governments, "the establishment, maintenance and management of penitentiaries, and of public and reformatory prisons." There is but one penitentiary in Canada, which is situated in Upper Canada. Does this clause impose on

the Local Legislature of Lower Canada the construction and maintenance of a new Penitentiary, leaving to Upper Canada the Penitentiary now in existence in that province?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—No doubt; but Lower Canada may arrange with Upper Canada for the temporary use of the Penitentiary, so long as she requires it, or for its permanent use, if that is thought better.

HON. MR. CURRIE—By the 6th subsection the local legislatures have the control of "Education; saving the rights and privileges which the Protestant or Catholic minority in both Canadas may possess as to their denominational schools at the time when the union goes into operation." I do not know whether the representations which have been made in some portions of the country are correct—that, under this section, the Roman Catholics would be entitled to no more schools than they have at the passing of the act? Will the Commissioner of Crown Lands please explain?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—By this section it is affirmed that the principle of action with reference to those schools which may be in existence at the time the Confederation takes effect, shall continue in operation. Should this Parliament and the other legislatures adopt the scheme, and if the Imperial Parliament adopts an act giving effect to it, there will be found in existence certain principles by which the minorities in Upper and Lower Canada will be respectively protected, and those principles will continue in operation.

HON. MR. CURRIE—But suppose no alteration is made in the Common School Law of Upper Canada—and, as I understand, none is promised—would the Roman Catholics be entitled to establish more separate schools?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—The present Act would continue to operate, and the honorable gentleman knows what are the rights of Roman Catholic schools under that Act.

HON. MR. CURRIE—That is the way in which I understand it. With reference to the 61st clause, I would ask is it proposed, at this session of the Legislature, to arrange the balance of the debt—not taken into the Confederation—between Upper and Lower Canada?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—It is proposed, before any Federation scheme goes into operation, that the debt shall be arranged between Upper and Lower Canada.

HON. MR. CURRIE—In the 64th section it is provided that, "in consideration of the transfer to the General Parliament of the

powers of taxation, an annual grant in aid of each province shall be made, equal to eighty cents per head of the population, as established by the census of 1861; the population of Newfoundland being estimated at 130,000."

Would the Commissioner of Crown Lands state why the population of Newfoundland is to be estimated at 130,000, while the population of the other provinces is taken according to the census of 1861—Newfoundland thus being allowed 8,000 of a population more than it would be entitled to under the census, and being allowed to take in on that basis \$200,000 more of debt, and also receiving more subsidy than it would otherwise be entitled to? If we are to assume that the population of Newfoundland increased 8,000 between 1861 and 1864 or 1865, why should not a similar increase be allowed to Canada? Assuming that the population of Canada increased at no more rapid rate, we would have an increase of 160,000, which would entitle us to go into the Confederation with a debt exceeding that with which we now go in of upwards of \$4,000,000, and which would give us \$130,000 a year more of subsidy. I cannot understand why the population of Newfoundland should be taken at 130,000, when all the other provinces—most of them, at all events, increasing in population much more rapidly than Newfoundland—go in with the population ascertained by the census of 1861.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—The reason is just this, that there happened to be no census taken in Newfoundland in 1861. The last census there was some years before—I think in 1857. The estimated increase, if I recollect rightly, was based on the increase which had taken place during the period between the previous census and that of 1857; and, taking that ratio of increase, it was found that the population, at the time of the union, would be close upon 130,000. We therefore put it at that figure.

HON. MR. CURRIE—The honorable gentleman is right in saying that the last census of Newfoundland was taken in 1857; but the increase should have been reckoned only for a period of four years, and I can scarcely believe that Newfoundland could be entitled to an increase of 8,000 in its population in four years, giving to that colony the benefit of four years' increase more than Canada. Our census was taken in 1861.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—Not at all; we all go in with the amounts of our respective populations estimated at the same time; 130,000 was the estimated population of New-

foundland at that date. We had no desire to give Newfoundland any advantage. Its population was estimated at 130,000 at the time at which the populations of the other provinces were taken.

HON. MR. CURRIE—Perhaps the Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands will inform us whether, in stating the revenues of the various provinces, the customs revenue raised on goods exported from one province to another was taken into account? Prince Edward Island, in 1861, paid customs duties amounting to £17,769 sterling; of that, only £11,096 was paid on goods imported from foreign countries, or countries other than those which, it is proposed, shall form part of this union; so that the people of that island paid only about 70 cents per head in duties on goods brought in from countries outside the proposed Confederation.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—What do you make the total customs revenue of Prince Edward Island for that year?

HON. MR. CURRIE—Seventeen thousand seven hundred and sixty-nine pounds sterling. Great Britain furnished the largest proportion of the imports; then Nova Scotia; then the United States; then New Brunswick. The whole duties, as I have said, paid on goods coming from other countries than the British Provinces, were £11,096, or about two-thirds of the entire customs revenue.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—I suppose the person who was probably the best informed about the state of the revenue in Prince Edward Island, was the Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. Mr. POPE; and our estimate of the revenue of that island was based on a printed return which Mr. POPE handed round among the members of the Conference, informing us what had been the revenue of Prince Edward Island in 1863, and for a series of years before 1863. In the same way Hon. Mr. TILLEY furnished the statement of revenue for New Brunswick, Dr. TUPPER for Nova Scotia, and Hon. Mr. GALT for Canada; and on these statements furnished by the Ministers of Finance for the various provinces the estimates were based. I observe that the Minister of Finance, Hon. Mr. GALT, in a speech delivered elsewhere, puts down the total revenue of Prince Edward Island at \$197,000, all of which is from customs and excise, save about \$32,000.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—My hon. friend from Niagara (Hon. Mr. CURRIE) in his own speech stated the revenue of Prince Edward Island at \$153,000.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ then rose to wind up the debate, with a general reply. He said:—Hon. gentlemen, I was very anxious that ample opportunity should be given to the members of this Honorable House to express their opinions on the matter which has been for the last two or three weeks under debate. And now as I see no member disposed to rise, with the view of offering any further remarks, I think the time has come when the debate may be closed, if such is the pleasure of the House. I commenced, hon. gentlemen, to take notes—pretty copious notes—with the view of answering the statements and arguments of hon. gentlemen who have spoken in opposition to the scheme. But, at the suggestion of some of my friends, I have taken my pen and crossed out all those notes—(hear, hear)—by way of compromise, if I may so express myself—(laughter)—and in order that I might not provoke further discussion. I hope that this sacrifice of mine—for it is a sacrifice—(laughter)—will be taken in good part, and that the few remarks I have now to make will not be of a nature to provoke any reply. In the first place, I must answer a question that was put to me, I think by my hon. friend from St. Clair Division (Hon. Mr. VIDAL). He said he did not understand exactly what I meant by the province being at the top of an inclined plane. It is true that in going over very rapidly the different topics on which I touched, I did not explain that figure very fully. But I stated that the province stood in a twofold danger—of being dragged violently into the American Union, and, in the next place, as we stood on an inclined plane, of slipping down gradually, and without our being aware of it, into the vortex below. It seems to me that the thing was plain enough. Still, as I am a Frenchman, and cannot express myself in English in the manner I would like, I think I should be allowed the privilege which is conceded to persons belonging to certain foreign nationalities. For instance, they say that an Englishman is allowed to speak once, an Irishman twice—

AN HON. MEMBER—Three times. (Laughter.)

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—Well, three times be it; that is still better. And a Dutchman as long as he finds it necessary, until he can make himself understood. Well, I want to have the privilege allowed to the Dutchman. (Laughter.) As to being drawn violently into the American Union, if this scheme of Confederation does not take place, it seems to me that that might be a very pro-

bable result of our position. Suppose war was declared late in autumn, at the close of navigation—with the little means we have here of defending ourselves, we would be placed for five months in a very disagreeable and trying position, having no opportunity of obtaining the powerful succour of the Mother Country. (Hear, hear.) That must be so easily understood, that I shall make no further remark upon it. But, my statement about the province being placed upon an inclined plane may require some little comment and explanation. I say that, if we do not cultivate with our sister provinces—the Maritime Provinces—a close commercial, political, and social intercourse—being all of us British subjects, all of us monarchists, owing allegiance to the same Crown—if we neglect the cultivation of that intercourse, we run a great danger. We are, in our present position, small, isolated bodies, and it may probably be with us, as in the physical world, where a large body attracts to itself the smaller bodies within the sphere of its influence. If we do not make those alliances with the Lower Provinces—if we do not open with them those communications, political, social, and commercial, which are essential for our own interest, we shall little by little lose some of those principles we now esteem so much; we shall lose little by little our attachment to the Mother Country, and the interesting reminiscences which, with many of us, now give intensity to that attachment; and we shall become—you may depend upon it, hon. gentlemen—more and more democratised, before we are aware of it. (Hear, hear.) And really, hon. gentlemen, if I were to form my opinion by some of the speeches which we have heard in this Honorable House since this debate was opened, I think there are some hon. gentlemen who, from the way in which they have expressed themselves, might be supposed to be—although I hope in reality they are not—already half way down the inclined plane. (Hear, hear and laughter.) Well, hon. gentlemen, I say that if we want to avoid that, we must have a Federal union with our fellow-subjects of the British Provinces, and that besides we must have easy means of access to the seaboard, so that, in case of danger, help can be immediately forwarded to Canada and to all parts of this Federal union, and that we may have a powerful army of Great Britain coming here as an auxiliary to the defence which I hope we shall be able to make ourselves. (Hear, hear.) An honorable gentleman has stated that I expressed myself to the effect

that, if this Confederation did not take place, Canada could not become prosperous. I never said anything of the kind. I said expressly the contrary. Perhaps I may not precisely apprehend the meaning of the word "prosperous." But I said this, that Canada had within itself all the means to become populous, to become wealthy, to become a great people. But on the other hand, I said that Canada and the other British American Provinces, without union, could not become a "powerful," as distinguished from a prosperous people. I said that we in Canada could not become a powerful people unless we had some maritime elements, unless we had the means, by having harbors and ports of our own open at all seasons, of communicating freely with all the nations of the world. (Hear, hear.) That is what I said. I never stated that Canada could not become prosperous, make money, and so forth. No; I think Canada can do that; but Canada, even though its population should reach forty millions—which it may in a century hence—can never be a powerful nation, unless its power is felt all over the world; and how can its power be so felt, unless it has its seaports open all the year round? (Hear, hear.) And I said—"Point out to me the nation in this world which is powerful, that has not some maritime elements." I say there is no one in the world. Every nation whose power has been felt over the globe, has been a nation that had some maritime outlet. But Canada, situated as it is, is in great want of free access to the sea; and, as long as we are shut up, during five months of the year, without being able to communicate with the rest of the world—for, notwithstanding our fine river, we cannot be said to have a real maritime element—we are in truth a dependent people. (Hear, hear.) I have some notes in French, made with the intention of answering honorable gentlemen who spoke in that language; but I think, having commenced, that I will go on in English. It has been asked by several honorable gentlemen how we were to make provision for the protection of the minorities in Upper and Lower Canada respectively. We have in Upper Canada a Catholic minority, in Lower Canada a Protestant minority. Well, those minorities are now in possession of certain rights; and, if we were not to legislate at all upon those rights, my interpretation of the scheme is, that they would still, under the local governments, enjoy the rights which they now possess. But it has been provided that, if necessary, addi-

tional protection shall be afforded; and in that case, I say, without hesitation, that what will be done for one portion of the country will also be done for the other portions—*justice égale distributive*. Hear, hear.) Honorable gentlemen have said that we have merely submitted the general scheme of the Government, and they have called upon us to give details—details about the School bill, details about the local governments, and the immense string of other details embraced in the amendment moved the other day by my hon. friend from Grandville (Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST), which I am sure was at least a fathom long, and a very long fathom too. (Laughter.) Now, suppose we had all these matters before us, could we really digest such a mass of information as hon. gentlemen have asked for? It seems to me it would be like introducing liquids into a vessel whose mouth is very small; if you throw in the liquid rapidly and in two great quantities, the vessel will be overflowed, and the fluid won't be got into it. I think we have enough before us at present, when we have the principal matter, without the accessories. For, what would be the use of the accessories if you reject the principle? (Hear, hear.) Depend upon it, as soon as these resolutions are concurred in, then the details will be given one after the other; and I trust they will be of such a nature as to meet with the approval of the majority of this Honorable House. (Hear, hear.) Some hon. gentlemen have told us that this was not a Federal union—that the project before you, hon. gentlemen, was in point of fact a project for a Legislative union. One hon. gentleman who took this view read the 29th section, in order to shew that the General Government, if it chose, could repeal any of the local acts of the different local legislatures—that the General Government, for instance, could do away with our religious and benevolent corporations, or deprive them of their property. I think the honorable gentleman must have been rather short-sighted when he read the 29th resolution, for he omitted a very important part of it; and, if he had not omitted that part, I do not think he would have said that this Federal scheme was really a scheme for a Legislative union. I have no doubt my honorable friend acted in good faith; but being rather short-sighted, he did not read the whole clause; otherwise he must have arrived at a different conclusion. The 29th section says: "The General Parliament shall have power to make laws for the peace, welfare and good

government of the Federated Provinces (saving the sovereignty of England), and especially laws respecting the following subjects." Then follows a list of all the subjects committed to the General Government. But the resolution does not finish there. There is something that comes after all that, and it is this: "And generally respecting all matters of a general character, not specially and exclusively reserved for the local governments and legislatures." Now I would ask honorable gentlemen if an act incorporating a religious body or benevolent society here in Lower Canada is a subject of a general character; is it not a subject purely local? (Hear, hear.) Take, for instance, the sisters of charity. Could the General Government, under this clause, interfere with the privileges of those ladies? I say they could not. I suppose the honorable gentleman who used the argument advanced it conscientiously and in good faith. But I think it is quite evident from a reading of the resolution that, if Confederation takes place, the General Government will have no power to interfere with such matters. (Hear, hear.) I must say positively, if I am competent to draw any conclusion at all from what I read, that the General Government will have no right to meddle at all with those religious and benevolent corporations, none in the world. (Hear, hear.) Remarks have also been made about the laws of divorce and marriage, and the honorable member for the division of DeLanaudière (Hon. Mr. OLIVIER) told us that the Conference had done well in transferring the power of divorce to the General Government. On his part, I think this was a wise view of the question, and I am glad to have the opportunity of now telling him so. He was, however, very uneasy about the word "marriage." Well, I will try to put him right and at his ease on that point; and I will give him the answer as I find it put down in writing, so that no possible misunderstanding may continue to exist. If the honorable gentleman will but take his pen, he will be able to note my answer:—"The word 'marriage' has been inserted to give the General Legislature the right to decide what form of marriage will be legal in all parts of the Confederation, without in any way interfering with the rules and prescriptions of the Church to which the contracting parties belong." Another honorable gentleman—I think the honorable member for DeLorimier (Hon. Mr. BUREAU)—asked me if the General Government would be responsible for the debts contracted by Canada

prior to the Federal union? I replied "Yes, the General Government would be liable for all the debts contracted before this date." "But," says he, "there are certain sums above the sixty-two and a half millions of dollars which will have to be settled as between Upper and Lower Canada. And what will become of the amount due to the seigniors? It may be that Lower Canada will repudiate that portion of the debt so allotted her." Well, I reply, Lower Canada cannot do that, if she were disposed to do so; but I do not believe that Lower Canada would be disposed to repudiate a debt which she has herself contracted—a debt of honor—a debt which is, as it were, sacred. But even if Lower Canada were disposed to do so, the General Government are liable for the amount of that debt; and as the General Government has to give to Lower Canada a subsidy of 80 cents per head, it would, of course, take very good care to subtract from the amount allotted to Lower Canada the interest which is to be paid to the seigniors. (Hear, hear.) So that on that score—I do not know if the hon. gentleman is himself a seignior or not, but he seems to take a great interest in the seigniors—the hon. member need not be uneasy at all.

HON. MR. BUREAU—What I stated was, that under the authority of a public act, special appropriations have been made for the redemption of the debt due to the seigniors, and that the putting aside of that act I consider an act of repudiation. Then, for the sake of argument I stated this, that you are shewing an example of repudiation. But I added that if you were going to pay to Lower Canada what you state, for her Local Government; in the event of her refusing to pay the seigniors, probably the General Government would retain sufficient from the 80 cents per head apportionment for that purpose. I do not wish to push the argument further; and I may state that it was only for the sake of argument that I advanced the proposition.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—No law has been repealed—no repudiation taken place. The seigniors, as it appears to me—I may not have understood the law, for I am no lawyer—will have additional security. That, it seems to me, is a plain fact. (Hear, hear.) Then the hon. member from DeLorimier found a great deal of fault with the manner—I must say the able manner in which the gallant Knight (Hon. Sir N. F. BELLEAU) explained the action of responsible government in this country. The honorable Knight shewed how

responsible government protected the French Catholics in Lower Canada under Confederation, saying that if ever an act of flagrant injustice was to be attempted in the Federal Government, the whole of the Lower Canadians would join as one man, and by uniting with the minority against the Government—because honorable gentlemen must know that there always will be minorities—by means of thus strengthening the minority any Administration could be ousted out of their places in twenty-four hours. My honorable friend stated this, and he stated it justly; he said so, well aware of what he was saying. But the honorable gentleman from DeLorimier comes forward and says: "Don't you recollect that at one time the Upper Canadians, with the minority from Lower Canada, united to impose upon Lower Canada their will?" I tell you, honorable gentlemen, that they never did harm to Lower Canada, and that they never could do harm to Lower Canada had they so chosen. And why? The French had the use of their own language conceded to them in order to bring them to support the Government, and much more would have been done to accomplish the same end. I am referring now to the Government of the day from 1844 to 1848. That Government would have given you, what was passed afterwards, an act to secure to the sufferers the payment of their losses, the Rebellion Losses Bill.—They would have given every shilling of those losses, and they would have given you more if you would have consented to become their followers. The honorable gentleman made out no case at all, and he could not have studied parliamentary history since 1841 correctly. Had he done so, he would have found that at that period what was called responsible government was not worked out. Sir CHARLES BAGOT, it is true, had lent himself to the views of his advisers, and responsible government had been going on perfectly under him; but then he died here, and honorable gentlemen must understand that Lord METCALF was opposed to responsible government.

HON. MR. BUREAU—Still we had responsible government.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—You had it in name only, but not in practice; otherwise Hon. Mr. BALDWIN and Hon. Mr. LAFONTAINE would never have left the Cabinet. They resigned their seats in Council because they held themselves responsible to Parliament, while Lord METCALF chose to appoint persons to office without consulting them, as his constitutional

advisers. Well, then, I assert that the case the honorable gentleman has cited to show that my honorable friend on the other side was wrong, is no case at all. It is not applicable in any respect to present circumstances, because, I repeat it again, we had not responsible government at that time.

HON. MR. BUREAU—We have not responsible government yet, then.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—How does the honorable gentleman make that out?

HON. MR. BUREAU—The honorable gentleman has stated that since the death of Lord BAGOT we have not had responsible government.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ—The honorable gentleman cannot surely have understood me. I think I said that under Lord METCALF there was responsible government in name but not in deed. And if the honorable gentleman will study our parliamentary history a little closer, he will admit that such was the case. The consequence was, as I have already stated, the resignation of Hon. Messrs. LAFONTAINE and BALDWIN. Still the Lower Canadian party was unbroken. It is true the new advisers of Lord METCALF coquetted much with that majority to obtain adhesion; but it was in vain. They remained firm to the last, until the general election of 1848 brought back the parties to Parliament in much about their natural strength. I have already stated that I have destroyed my notes, and I am ready to await the verdict of this honorable House. (Applause.)

HON. MR. VIDAL said—Honorable gentlemen, as I consider it my duty to vote for the motion now before the House, I think it desirable to clear myself from the imputation of inconsistency in having supported the amendments which have been proposed, and which the House has rejected. I may state that my views as to the desirableness of submitting the question to the people are unchanged; the plan has been voted down, but no argument has been adduced to demonstrate that it was wrong in principle, or likely to destroy the scheme. I have previously expressed my general approval of the Confederation, and that my desire was to secure its permanency by having its foundation broad and deep in the expressed approval of the people. Submission of the proposal to them has been refused, and the only question now for me to decide is whether I should accept the scheme as it is, or vote for its rejection altogether. Under these circumstances, I have no difficulty in

deciding that I must support the motion for its adoption. (Hear, hear.)

The question was then put on the main motion, which was carried on the following division:—

CONTENTS.—Honorable Messieurs Alexander, Allan, Armand, Sir N. F. Belleau, Bennett, Fergusson Blair, Blake, Boulton, Bossé, Bull, Burnham, Campbell, Christie, Crawford, De Beaujeu, Dickson, A. J. Duchesnay, E. H. J. Duchesnay, Dumouchel, Ferrier, Foster, Gingras, Guévremont, Hamilton (Inkerman), Hamilton (Kingston), Lacoste, Leonard, Lealie, McCrea, McDonald, McMaster, Macpherson, Matheson, Mills, Panet, Price, Read, Renaud, Ross, Ryan, Shaw, Skead, Sir E. P. Taché, Vidal, and Wilson—45.

NON-CONTENTS.—Honorable Messieurs Aikins, Archambault, Armstrong, Bureau, Chaffers, Currie, Flint, Letellier de St. Just, Malhiot, Moore, Olivier, Proulx, Reesor, Seymour, and Simpson.—15.

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. FERGUSSON BLAIR, that a select committee be appointed to draft an Address founded on the said resolution, and that the committee be composed of Honorable Messrs. CAMPBELL, FERGUSSON BLAIR, ROSS, CHRISTIE, Sir N. F. BELLEAU, and the MOVER.—Carried.

The House adjourned during pleasure; and on resuming,

HON. SIR E. P. TACHÉ reported the Address, and moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. FERGUSSON BLAIR, that it be agreed to.—Carried.

It was then ordered that the Address be engrossed, signed by the SPEAKER, and presented to His Excellency the Governor General by the whole House. It was also ordered that such members of the Executive Council as are members of this House, do wait on His Excellency the Governor General, to know what time His Excellency will please to appoint to be attended with the said Address.

The House then adjourned.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

MONDAY, *February 20, 1865.*

MR. JOLY said—MR. SPEAKER, when it is proposed to change the Constitution of the country, it becomes our duty to study with the greatest care, and from every distinct point of view, the new Constitution which it is proposed to substitute for the existing one; and in doing so we ought not to disdain the experience of past ages

History is the statesman's safest guide; it ought to be the basis of all his conceptions; indeed it would be treating its lessons with contempt, were we to attempt to dispose of the future without first knowing how Providence has disposed of the past. To make use of a maxim, common, but yet most truthful: "There is nothing new under the sun;" the history of the world is a constantly revolving scene; the same events pass and re-pass before our eyes under aspects varied enough, it is true, to deceive the superficial observer, but the man who thinks and investigates will have no difficulty in discovering that at all periods of the world's history, men have allowed themselves to be controlled by the same motives and passions, and will arrive at the inevitable conclusion that like causes produce like effects. The honorable ministers who have unfolded to us the scheme of Confederation have based all their arguments on the future; they have tried to prophecy, but for them the history of the past is a dead letter. Before attempting to predict the fate of our future Confederation, they should first have told us what had been the fate of past confederations. It does not suffice to paint a splendid picture of grandeur and prosperity; let it first be ascertained that the foundations on which the edifice is to be erected are sure and proved, and that established, we may then begin to build with safety. As has been said by one of the great professors of political science: "The wisdom of a statesman is the result of experience and not of theory." I am by no means astonished, however, at the repugnance evinced by the advocates of Confederation to make allusion to the past. The Minister of Agriculture alone has had the courage to open the volume of the world's history, and he hastily closed it with the significant remark, especially so falling from his lips:—

In all the constitutions in which the Federal principle has been adopted, it cannot be denied that the same fatal vice is to be discerned—the weakness of the central authority. This has been the fatal disease in all confederations of which I have heard, or whose histories I have read. They have died of consumption.

What the Government has not been willing to do, I now propose to do. Let us take counsel of those nations which have adopted federative constitutions, and may the recital of their unhappy experience be of use to us by placing us on our guard against the same

dangers. I propose to cast a brief glance on the history of each Confederation. I do not propose to lay before you my own views, and ask you to adopt them, but rather those of men of eminence, who have made the art of good government the study of their lives. I shall indeed make use, as nearly as I possibly can, of the very language which they have used. Lord BROUGHAM, who is listened to with profound respect in the Imperial Parliament, thus expresses his views in the third part of his work on *Political Philosophy*:—

Besides the other defects of the Federal union, its manifest tendency to create mutual estrangement, and even hostility, between the different parts of the same nation, is an insuperable objection to it.

And further on he adds:—

Whoever would see farther proofs of this position, may be referred to the ancient commonwealths of Greece. As a Florentine hated a Siennese worse than a German or a Spaniard, or even an infidel, in modern times, so of old did an Athenian hate a Spartan or a Theban worse than a Persian. Now, the Federal union, by keeping up a line of separation among its members, gives the freest scope to these pernicious prejudices—feelings which it is the highest duty of all governments to eradicate, because they lead directly to confusion and war.

Passing from the confederacies of Greece and Italy to those of the Seven United Provinces (now Holland and Belgium), we there find the same state of things. Let us hear what Lord MACAULAY says in the first volume of his *History of England*:—

The union of Utrecht, hastily established amid the throes of a revolution, with the view of providing for the exigencies of the moment, had never been considered with calmness, nor brought to perfection in a period of tranquillity. Each one of the Seven Provinces, which this union bound together in one cluster, retained nearly all the rights of sovereignty, and exacted from the Federal Government the most absolute respect of its rights. As the Federal authorities had no means of enforcing prompt obedience from the Provincial authorities, so these latter were equally powerless as regarded the Municipal authorities.

The advocates of Confederation take pleasure in citing the result of the Swiss (or Helvetic) Confederacy as an exception to the disastrous fate awaiting all confederations; but Switzerland possesses all the germs of this fatal malady, as witness the civil and religious war of the Sonderbund. Here, however, the symptoms are less violent than in other confederations, on account of its

exceptional position; France, Prussia and Austria are deeply interested in maintaining the existence of Switzerland as a neutral and independent state—it is indispensable to their safety. Were it not so, the last hour of the Helvetic Confederacy would have sounded long ago. If we pass from the confederations of the old world to those of the new, we shall find that the climate of America appears to be still more fatal to confederations than that of Europe. Let us begin with the Central American Confederacy or Republic of Guatemala. It was established in 1821, and was composed of five states: Guatemala, Honduras, San Salvador, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica. In 1829, that is to say, after an interval of eighteen years only, Honduras set the example by seceding from the Confederation, an example which was very soon followed by the four other states, and that Confederation has ceased to exist, after a brief existence, in the midst of revolutions and civil wars. The Confederation of Columbia was formed in 1819 of the twelve provinces freed by Bolivar from the dominion of Spain. After endless troubles and revolutions, they separated in 1831 (after an existence of 12 years) into three independent republics, though reunited under the name of Confederation of the United States of South America—New Grenada, Venezuela and Ecuador. I hold in my hand a volume of the *Annuaire des Deux Mondes*, containing a general history of the different states during the years 1853 and 1854. I will not occupy the time of the House by entering into the details of that history; I shall epitomize it by reading a few lines from the table of contents, in which we find mention made of the principal events in the most succinct form. I read from this table as follows:—“Venezuela—General condition of Venezuela—Insurrection of 1853—Insurrection of 1854.” One per annum, one would soon become used to insurrections and think but little of them in that happy country. “Compulsory Loans”—I suppose one may get used to these operations in course of time, however disagreeable they may be. At all events, if matters turn out well with the compulsory borrowers, as I have no doubt they do, they do not leave enough to their compulsory creditors to make it worth their while to renew the operation annually, and thus we see that compulsory loans are not effected every year in Venezuela with the same regularity in which the insurrections there are carried out. “New Grenada

—movements of parties;” I augur nothing good from this movement. “The Golgothas and Draconians”—probably the liberals and conservatives, who have had the singular taste to assume these villainous titles and who discuss the question of the day by musketry practice—“struggles of parties and threats of military revolution; movement of 17th April.” Still another movement—“uprising of the Provinces;”—here, at all events, we have an unmistakable movement, as to the nature of which there can be no doubt whatever. “Present state of the civil war.”—In New Grenada civil war figures in the quotations just as in Canada; we quote transactions in flour or lumber; it is their normal condition. I hear an honorable member exclaim “Oh, but they are savages!” They are not savages; but I am free to confess they behave like savages. This is but the ordinary effect of civil war; as witness what is passing amongst our neighbors in the United States. But let us proceed to another confederation. Bolivia and Lower Peru formed themselves into a Confederacy in 1836. This Confederacy was born and lived and died, the whole in three years, between 1836 and 1839, hardly allowing time to begin to write its history. Next we have the confederation of the United Provinces of Rio de la Plata or Argentine Republic, established in 1816, by the union of fourteen independent provinces. BOUILLET, after having referred to the promulgation of the new Constitution, continues in the following terms:—

This Constitution, however, does not prevent the united provinces of Rio de la Plata from being a prey to anarchy. The federalists and the anti-federalists are continually at war. Manufactures there are none; and the trade is very limited.

In that same table of contents of the *Annuaire des Deux Mondes*, I read * * * “Civil war and raising of the siege of Buenos Ayres—separate Constitution for Buenos Ayres * * *—Struggle between the parties, and financial distress—Disturbance (*echauffourée*) of the 18th July 1853.” I suppose this word means something half-way between a movement and an insurrection, “Revolution of the 25th September.” Events succeed each other rapidly. “Civil war—Intervention of Brazil.” But all this passed in 1853 and 1854. It is ancient history. Let us look at a few journals of last week or the week before. What do we find? Here is a specimen or two: “The President of San Salvador in his speech at the opening of the House defends

himself indignantly against the imputation of a wish to annex Central America to Mexico;" or take another article: "Hostilities have recommenced between the Empire of Brazil and the Republic of Uruguay," one of the States of the Argentine Confederation. "Paraguay, an ally of Uruguay, has also declared war against Brazil. The latter is assisted by the revolutionary party in Uruguay, under the orders of General Flores. A Brazilian fleet assisted by General Flores and the revolutionists of Uruguay, has burned Paysandu, the capital of Uruguay * * * so that Uruguay is torn at the same time by civil war and a foreign war." This is a lamentable state of affairs! How prudently ministers have acted in omitting all mention of these sad scenes, in asking us to vote for Confederation! They would have spoiled their brilliant picture by too great a depth of shadow. Passy, in his *Mémoire sur les formes de Gouvernement et les causes qui les déterminent*, (*Mémoires de l'Institut, Sciences morales et politiques*, 2e série, vol. 3,) expresses himself as follows, speaking of all these South American Confederations:

Seldom does a year pass, without fresh rebellions breaking out among them; very seldom do the heads of the governments reach the legal term of their functions. The presidencies are ephemeral dictatorships, the prize of generals who, exiles one day, are at the head of armies the next, while the states themselves sometimes confederate, again independent, are constantly changing their forms of government and their aspect.

PASSY assigns two main causes for these occurrences. The absence of homogeneity or common origin, and the want of knowledge. As to this want of knowledge, I must observe that there are few nations in the world, if any, the population of which is generally as enlightened as that of the United States of North America, and yet, at this very time, we see the dogs of civil war let loose among them and raging as fiercely as ever they did among the confederate governments of South America. As to the absence of homogeneity talked of by PASSY, if it exists to such an extent as to lead to these sad results among the confederations of South America, in which all the citizens are, without exception, Catholics, speaking the same language, and who all within a few years fought side by side against their common enemy, Spain, to achieve their liberty,—if they are deficient, I say, in homogeneity, what is the case with us? Protestants and Catholics, French, English

and Irish speaking two different languages. The strongest bond of union among the citizens of a state is a community of language and religion. We have neither in common. The confederations of South America have both, and yet, as PASSY says, they have not sufficient homogeneity to afford a hope that they can ever live in peace under a federal régime. Mexico was constituted a Confederation in 1824. In 1837 it was united, and the union subsisted till 1846, except three years of dictatorship. In 1846 the Federal principle again prevailed, but disappeared in 1853, since which period the history of Mexico is too generally known to need repetition in this place. It is written with the blood of its citizens. I shall merely mention the United States of North America. I do not pretend—I do not possess the ability—to trace out the real sources of the immense civil war by which they are now rent in pieces. Enough for me to say, that nobody is to consider slavery as the only cause of the civil strife. More than thirty years ago upon a question of tariff which went to protect the manufacturers of the North at the expense of the planters of the South, South Carolina sounded the signal of insurrection, as she since did in 1861; and had it not been for the firmness of General JACKSON, who overstepped his powers to save his country, the civil contest would have commenced at that time. It was sure to come on; it was only delayed for a while. These were all trials of the Confederate system.

MR. CORNELIER—All the confederations which you have mentioned were or are republican, and had the common fate of republican institutions. You have not said a word about monarchical confederations.

MR. JOLY—I have made no mention of monarchical confederations, because none have ever existed, and none can exist. The principle of a monarchy is that the power resides in one person; the principle of confederation is that it resides in all the members of the confederation. A confederation would, therefore, always be a republic, even if formed of several states subject to a monarchy; because the power would not be vested in one person, but in each of the several states, of which no one would acknowledge a head; it would be a republic consisting of a very small number of members. Before I take leave of all the confederations, the names of which I have mentioned, I intend to say one word, at least, in their favor. We understand that states

perfectly independent of one another, and not subject to any authority bearing equally on them all, may have agreed (notwithstanding the inconveniences of confederation) to become confederate for the purpose of strengthening themselves to resist a common enemy. So much they may have done. But we do not understand how provinces like ours, which have no existence independent of each other, but are all subject to the same authority, need have recourse to confederation for the purpose of cementing a union which already exists. Confederation, by marking more strongly the lines of demarcation between them, spoken of by Lord BROUGHAM, renders any more intimate connection between them for the future impossible. We are like bars of iron strongly welded together, which men should try to unite more strongly to each other by tearing them asunder to reunite them with shoemaker's paste. Some will answer, "True! the Federal principle has always and in every case proved a failure, but the cause lay in the weakness of the central power. We shall obviate that inconvenience, by establishing a central power strong enough to preserve our Confederation from that danger." But then it will be no longer a Confederation; it will be a legislative union—a union which the most zealous advocates of Confederation reject as incompatible with the various interests of the different provinces. If you succeed in establishing this central power, with strength enough to bear sway over the local powers, the latter will no longer have an exclusive existence; they will become the authorized delegates of the central power, their officers and every vestige of confederation will disappear from your Constitution. If you absolutely resolve to adopt the Federal principle, you cannot do it without adopting at the same time all its inconveniences. The weakness of the central power is not the fruit of the Federal system; it is its root, it is itself. This is the reason why states which are perfectly independent of each other, adopt the Federal principle solely as a means of defence against foreigners, because the central power in a confederation cannot be other than weak. We already possess, under our present Constitution, and without confederation, a central power stronger than any power which you can create, and to which we submit without complaint, because it is perfectly compatible with the existence of our local powers—I

mean the power of England. It is exercised by men who live too far from us to hearken to the bickerings of race or of party, or to be mixed up with them in any way. But if that central power was wielded by men taken from among ourselves, men who have taken part in our quarrels and animosities, and who would make use of it to give effect to the views of their party, it would become insupportable. As it now exists, we feel it only by the benefits it confers. Having thus shown the serious inconveniences innate in the Federal system, let us see whether there be anything exceptional in our position, operating in our favor, and allowing us to hope for immunity from those evils which have befallen all former confederations. What is our position? In what respects is it more favorable than that of other confederations? Let us begin with Lower Canada; its population is composed of about three-fourths French-Canadians, and of one-fourth English-Canadians. It is impossible, even for the blindest admirers of the scheme of Confederation, to shut out from their view this great difference of nationality, which is certainly fated to play an important part in the destinies of the future Confederation. When Lord DURHAM wrote his celebrated report in 1839, he said, when speaking of the English-Canadians of Lower Canada:—"The English population will never submit to the authority of a parliament in which the French have a majority, or even the semblance of a majority." A little further on, he added:—"In the significant language of one of their most eminent men, they assert that Lower Canada must become English, even if to effect that object it should be necessary that the province should cease to belong to England." Whatever errors Lord DURHAM may have fallen into in judging the French-Canadians, he certainly cannot be reproached with having shewn too great severity towards the English-Canadians. He merely depicted their sentiments, as they manifested themselves in his day. Since then, things have undergone a change. And last autumn, at Sherbrooke, the Honorable Minister of Finance presented to us a very different picture, when he said:—"For five and twenty years harmony has reigned in Lower Canada, and the English and French populations have entered into a compact to labor together to promote the common interests of the country." This picture is a true one at the present time, as was also

that drawn by Lord DURHAM in his day; things have changed! In the Parliament of the United Canadas, the English are in a majority; they have not to deal with a French majority. But, if circumstances have altered, men have not; place them in the same position in which they were previous to 1839, and again you will perceive in them the same sentiments as were depicted by Lord DURHAM. The seed lies hid in the soil, it does not shew itself on the surface; but a few drops of rain are all that is necessary to cause it to spring up. If such sentiments did not exist between the two nationalities, why this resolution, to be submitted to the House by the honorable member for Mis-sisquoi, which I am now about to read:—

Resolved, That assuming the Federal system of government to be a political necessity in a union of the British North American Provinces, any Confederation of those provinces which ignores the difference of race, language and religion of the inhabitants of the respective states or territories sought to be thus united, and is not framed with a view to secure to the inhabitants of such state or territory the management of their own local affairs, in accordance with their own peculiar views and sentiments, is unwise and inexpedient, and not conducive to good government or to the peace and tranquillity of those for whom it is framed;

Resolved, That with a view to secure to that portion of the inhabitants of Lower Canada speaking the English language, the free exercise and enjoyment of their own ideas, institutions and rights, in any proposed Confederation of the provinces, Canada should be divided into three civil divisions, to wit: Western, Central and Eastern Canada.

At the mere idea of a legislature in which the French element is to be in a majority in Lower Canada, the passions described by Lord DURHAM are evinced. It is true that the Ministry are doing their best to reassure both parties, and to each party, separately, they make promises at the expense of the other. French-Canadians! do not allow yourselves to be led away by those brilliant promises. An Italian poet describes the endeavors of a mother to induce her child to swallow a draught, which is intended to restore him to health; to tempt him, she covers the edge of the cup with honey; in like manner, the edge of the cup which is presented to you has been covered with honey, but instead of containing a health-restoring draught, that cup contains poison and death. I do not believe that the French-Canadians will abuse the power of their majority in Lower Canada by striving to oppress the English-Canadians; but there are too many points

on which they disagree to allow of their living long in peace together, in spite of their sincere wish to do so, under the system of local government which is proposed to us. The Honorable Prime Minister said in the Council:—

I believe the French-Canadians will do all in their power to render justice to their fellow-subjects of English origin; and it should not be forgotten that, if the former are in a majority in Lower Canada, the English will be in a majority in the General Government, and that no act of real injustice can take place without its being reversed by the Federal Parliament.

But who is to decide whether any act of the French-Canadians is really an act of injustice? The Federal Parliament, in which the English element will be all-powerful! In political matters, a disinterested opinion is but seldom come to; the sympathies of the majority in the Federal Parliament will be against us; I see in this the prospect of a position which may prove to be a most dangerous one for us; if the strife should commence, no one can tell when it will end.

DR. BEAUBIEN—I have confidence in the conscience of the Federal Parliament. We ought not to attribute evil intentions to men, but rather suppose that they will treat us as they desire to be treated themselves, with justice, and in a conscientious manner.

MR. JOLY—Despite the honorable member's sermon—I beg his pardon, I mean despite the honorable member's observation—I am of opinion that we ought not to leave interests so precious as those which are confided to us to the mercy of men with whom we are not always certain of living on good terms, without any other guarantee than their conscience. Confederation, by changing the state of things which established harmony between the English and French races in Lower Canada, will destroy that harmony, and the consequences may be only too easily foreseen. In Upper Canada there is much more homogeneity, and, by consequence, the danger of intestine trouble there is much less great; true it is, that the enormous power of the Orangemen and the law respecting separate schools may give rise to difficulties, but I fear more for the relations of Upper Canada with the other provinces, and especially the Atlantic Provinces. Upper Canada objects, in general terms, to the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. Its wish is to see the resources of the future Confederation applied to opening up the immense territory of the North-West, and to the enlargement

of its canals. The Atlantic Provinces desire the Intercolonial Railway; but they hold in dread the expenditure which would be entailed by the opening up of the North-West territory and the enlargement of the canals. Upper Canada already fears lest the Atlantic Provinces should unite with Lower Canada against her; the French-Canadians fear for their nationality, threatened by the English majority from the other provinces, and yet Confederation so far only exists as a scheme. If our relations with the other provinces are not at present very intimate, at least there is nothing hostile in them. We regard them with interest and friendship as members of one and the same family with ourselves. We all grow together under the shelter of the English flag, and in case of war with the United States, we are all ready to unite in our efforts, in good faith, for our common defence. But when the different provinces shall meet together in the Federal Parliament as on a field of battle, when they have there contracted the habit of contending with each other to cause their own interests, so various and so incompatible with each other, to prevail, and when, from repetition of this undying strife, jealousy and inevitable hatred shall have resulted, our sentiments towards the other provinces will be no longer the same; and should any great danger, in which our safety would depend upon our united condition, arise, it would then perhaps be found that our Federal union had been the signal for our disunion. In such a position the greatest danger would result from the neighborhood of the United States, a nation which for a long time has looked on our provinces with a covetous eye, and which has an immense army which the end of the war, probably not far distant, will leave without occupation. They will follow up our political struggles closely, will encourage the discontented, and will soon find an opportunity for interfering in our internal affairs, being called in by the weaker party; history is full of similar occurrences. The Attorney General for Lower Canada pretends that the opponents of Confederation desire annexation to the United States. I find it difficult to believe in his sincerity when he expresses that opinion; it is usually by such arguments as this that he replies to his opponents when he has no other answer to make them. One of the most justly respected men in Lower Canada, a man who enjoys universal esteem, Mr. CHERRIER, who had

long withdrawn from public life, determined, despite his repugnance to entering the lists, to raise his voice in order to warn his fellow-countrymen against the dangers of the Confederation project. The purity of his motives could not be questioned; being connected with no political party, he was perfectly disinterested in the course he took. It appears to me that the opinion of such a man deserved at least a respectful hearing. Instead of answering his argument, the honorable the Attorney General attempted to make him the laughing stock of this House. The Government stifles the voice of those who wish to enlighten the people; but it takes upon itself the task of enlightening them. Here is a work "in favor of Confederation," published in 1865, entitled: *L'Union des Provinces de l'Amérique Britannique du Nord, par l'Hon. Joseph Cauchon, membre de Parlement Canadien, et Rédacteur-en-chef du Journal de Québec*; and also author of a work published in 1858, "against Confederation." If the Government were generous, they would distribute the work of 1858 at the same time with that of 1865, in order to afford to every one the advantage of a choice, more particularly as the honorable author cannot be right in both. In bringing these two works into contrast, I do not wish to make a personal attack on the honorable member; the fact that he first wrote against Confederation and then in favor of it, is perfectly foreign to the debate. I should not have mentioned the matter, were it not that the Government make use of the work of 1865 (the second) in order to propagate in every direction their doctrines on Confederation; they are distributing thousands of copies of the work throughout Lower Canada, and in order to influence the English-speaking population, they are having it translated into English. It is, therefore, right to warn the people that they must distrust the arguments contained in that book; they are diametrically opposed to the opinions enunciated by the author in his work of 1858, in which he says, in express terms, that the consequences of Confederation would be the ruin of Lower Canada. Of course the author, in his work of 1865, attempts to explain his change of opinion; it is none the less true that he was wrong either in 1858 or else in 1865—which? It may be said in behalf of the book of 1865 that it is four times thicker than the other; this perhaps may seem a disadvantage to the

minds of some readers. The Government, knowing well how much the people fear direct taxes, tell them that Confederation involves them in no such risk. What new method are they going to invent then for raising money? It is perfectly clear that Confederation will largely increase our expenditure. Then, for instance, Canada, which has now but one Government to maintain (and it is as much as she can do to maintain it), will have three to maintain, or nearly so: the Government of Upper Canada, the Government of Lower Canada, and nine-twelfths of the Federal Government; it will be the same as regards the legislatures. Canada, with a population forming nine-twelfths of the Confederation, will have to build nine-twelfths of the Intercolonial Railway, in place of the five-twelfths she was to have been charged with, under the arrangements of 1863. With reference to the opening of the all but boundless territory of the North-West, and the construction of the fortifications which are spoken of only in whispers as yet, lest we should become alarmed, it is impossible to calculate the expenditure these works will involve. And, in face of this increased expenditure, our chief source of revenue is to be considerably diminished. I refer to the import customs duties. Here is the justification offered by the Minister of Finance for the reduction:—

It is evident since the Atlantic Provinces consume a far larger quantity of articles paying import duties than we do, that we shall be compelled, in order to assimilate all the customs tariffs, to diminish the import duties we pay in Canada. The Atlantic Provinces cannot adopt a customs tariff so high as ours.

I think I have shown that our expenditure must infallibly increase; and as our revenue will diminish, to what now tax will the Government have recourse in order to make up the deficit? We are told that Lower Canada will have a revenue of nearly a million and a half to meet her local expenditure; with what shall we meet our proportion of the Federal expenditure, which will be far larger? But I shall now deal with the advantages which we are told must certainly result from Confederation. They may be divided into three classes—political, military and commercial. The honorable member for Montmorency tells us that we are to have the advantage of a seat at the banquet of nations. The perspective is a highly flattering one, I admit, but we must be

permitted to take a common-sense view of it. The Honorable Minister of Finance, faithful to the doctrine that the greatness of a State is proportioned to the greatness of its debt, announces to us that our credit will be considerably increased, and that we shall be enabled to borrow much more extensively than we have hitherto done, a prospect at which he seems greatly to rejoice. This facility of borrowing is not always an unmixed good; but it must be remembered that our credit will depend entirely on the success of our Confederation. If it should not succeed, if any serious difficulty should arise within it—a thing which is possible—public opinion will be more prompt to take alarm, in that our Federal form of government does not afford strong guarantees for the maintenance of order and peace, and our credit will soon be worth less than the credit of a single province is worth to-day. The Honorable the President of the Council enumerated all our provinces, comparing one after another, as regards superficial extent, with the great states of Europe. He finished with the Hudson's Bay territory, stating that it is as large as European Russia; but will it ever be capable of supporting, like European Russia, a population of sixty millions, and feeding, with its surplus corn, a great part of Europe? The vastness of territory in which the honorable minister takes so much pride is precisely what inspires me with uneasiness; we shall have the outward form of a giant, with the strength of a child; we shall be unable to stand up. Hasty and premature growth is as fatal to states as it is to men; a state should extend its limits only in proportion as its strength increases. The Roman Empire did not attain in a day its colossal proportions; its growth, like that of the oak, was slow but sure. Let us not allow ourselves to be dazzled by the ambition of becoming all at once a great people; the United States are a great people, but where is the people, however small it may be, that now envies their greatness? Let us be content with our lot; few nations have a better one. The territorial formation of the future Federation will also be an insurmountable obstacle to the establishment of a strong government; it amounts to a deformity. I give the following passage in support of this proposition:—

What may the geographical advantages of the Union be? We speak more as regards the future than as regards the present. If the provinces it

is proposed to unite were grouped in a compact mass as are the majority of the states of the American Union, if their geographical position were such that they needed one another in order to prosper, in order to attain an outlet on the sea, we should say—here, at all events, is a motive for the sacrifices demanded of us. But no, they are scattered over the surface of the Gulf. The nearest to Canada, New Brunswick, is connected with us solely by a narrow strip of territory at most but a few leagues in width, and bordered throughout by the menacing frontier of the American Union. And even at this moment, pending the carrying out of the works of improvement we have just referred to, the shortest route from the provinces to Canada is by way of the United States. While the union of the Canadas was odious in its formula, it was at all events justifiable in a geographical point of view; Upper Canada required the use of the St. Lawrence in order to reach the sea, and the two provinces together form a compact body, a fact which is the strongest possible condemnation of the Constitutional Act of 1791, and on which they were separated.

If the readers of the work published by the Hon. Mr. CAUCHON, in 1865, in favor of Confederation, desire to know where I found that passage, I answer, in the work published by the Hon. Mr. CAUCHON, in 1858. It is probably the portion of the honorable gentleman's work of 1858, which he will find it most difficult to get over. He may, indeed, allege in explanation of his change of opinion on other points, that the political position is altered, that our relations with the provinces and our neighbors of the United States are no longer the same; but I apprehend he will hardly go the length of asserting that the geographical configuration of the country is changed. He will perhaps endeavor to show that the Intercolonial Railway, the construction of which forms part of the plan of Confederation, will obviate the defects of our geographical position; but I would remind him that in 1858, when he wrote his first work, the building of the Intercolonial Railway was proposed as it is proposed now; this will appear from the passage I have just quoted: "And at this moment, pending the carrying out of the improvements we have just referred to, the shortest way to come from the provinces to us is by way of the United States." Mr. SPEAKER, with the best possible desire to assist the honorable gentleman, I find it utterly impossible to extricate him from his unfortunate position, and I shall not make the attempt. The Hon. Attorney General promises us that Lower Canada will be the sun of the Confederation. Since we cannot find a comparison on this poor earth em-

blematic of our future greatness, let us borrow one from the heavens at the risk of losing ourselves in the clouds with the advocates of Confederation; I propose the adoption of the rainbow as our emblem. By the endless variety of its tints the rainbow will give an excellent idea of the diversity of races, religions, sentiments and interests of the different parts of the Confederation. By its slender and elongated form, the rainbow would afford a perfect representation of the geographical configuration of the Confederation. By its lack of consistence—an image without substance—the rainbow would represent aptly the solidity of our Confederation. An emblem we must have, for every great empire has one; let us adopt the rainbow. Mr. SPEAKER, the fact of our provinces being all at once erected into a Confederation will not give us a single additional man; battalions cannot be made to spring forth from the earth, armed from head to foot, by a stamp of the foot as in the mythological ages. The Hon. Attorney General for Lower Canada has developed a plan of strategy which I take the liberty of seriously recommending to the Commander-in-Chief. The honorable gentleman sums up in the following terms the advantages of the Confederation in a military point of view: "When we shall be united, the enemy will know that if he attacks any part of our provinces, the Island of Prince Edward or Canada, he will have to meet the combined forces of the Empire." There was no need of the Confederation to convince our neighbors of that; they are, as a general rule, sufficiently sharp-witted to discover, without being told it, that if they content themselves with attacking us at a single point at a time, of course they will have to meet all our strength. Would it not be well to enter into a contract, binding them to attack us at a single point only at one time—say Quebec? We might, in fact, give them the free use of the Grand Trunk Railway to bring their troops to Point Lévis. Of what benefit to the United States would be their vast armies, their great fleets, their abundant means of transport in every direction, if they were to attack us only at one point at a time, as the Hon. Attorney General seems to hope? In the war of 1812, they attacked us simultaneously at different points, though their troops were far less numerous in proportion to ours than they would now be in case of war, and though their means of transport were then far inferior to what they now are. Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Canada, would

be attacked simultaneously, and each province at different points. The provinces will help one another sufficiently if each of them can maintain the integrity of its own territory, so that the enemy may not be enabled to take the adjoining province in flank; in the same way that a soldier in line of battle assists his comrade at his side by simply keeping his own place in the ranks. We do not need Confederation to give us that unity which is indispensable in all military operations—unity of headship. A commander-in-chief will direct the defence of all our provinces; he will forward troops, and, if he can, vessels of war, to the points most seriously threatened, and will assist each province to defend the post which Providence has already assigned to each in our long line of battle. Moreover, in the event of war with the United States, if we were to trust to numbers we should be sadly disappointed. What we need above all is enthusiasm; our citizen soldiers must be convinced that they are risking their lives for something worth while; that they are happier in being under the flag of England than they could be under that of the United States, and that they must lose by an exchange. In the present position of the United States it is not difficult to make them understand that; the taxes alone with which the Americans are now crushed down, and of which the vast volume is growing from day to day, suffice to shew, at a first glance, how far our position is superior to theirs in a material point of view. But if, in order to meet the extravagant expenditure the Confederation must bring with it, the people find themselves taxed beyond their resources, the Government need not be surprised, if they should ever appeal to the courage of the people and call upon them to meet the enemy, to receive the answer the old man got from his donkey in LAFONTAINE's fable. When, at the approach of the enemy, the old man wished to mount and fly, the donkey refused to bear him, and commenced the following dialogue with his master:—

Me fera-t-on porter double bât, double charge ?
Non pas, dit le vieillard, qui prit d'abord le large.
Et que m'importe donc, dit l'âne, à qui je sois ?
Sauvez-vous, et me laissez paître.
Notre ennemi, c'est notre maître,
Je vous le dis en bon françois.*

* "On me double burthen do you think they will lay?"
"Not so," said the old man, ere he toddled away.
"Then, what odds," cried the donkey, "to whom I belong?"

You may take to your heels and leave me to feed.
The donkey's real enemy is his own master's greed,
And I trust you'll admit that the argument's strong."

LAFONTAINE, it will be seen, found means, two hundred years ago, of saying serious things in a laughing way. If the Government treat the people as a beast of burthen, to be pitilessly overlaid, the people will one day make them the same answer that the donkey made to his master, in LAFONTAINE's fable. Lord BACON, in his essays, expresses the same thought in more serious terms. But apart from purely material interests, which are nevertheless highly important, for happiness and poverty rarely go hand in hand, there are other interests of a higher order which rouse the courage of a people and sometimes render it capable of sustaining the most unequal struggles. Deprive the French Canadians of their nationality, and you deprive them of the enthusiasm which would have doubled their strength. I concur with the Government in their desire to form more intimate commercial relations between the different provinces; but when it is attempted to use the immense advantages which would result from these relations as an overwhelming argument in favor of Confederation, it is as well to form a proper appreciation of those advantages, and see whether we cannot secure them without Confederation. The Gulf Provinces possess timber, coal and fisheries; our own two great articles of export are timber and wheat. With regard to timber, the Gulf Provinces have no more need of ours than we of theirs. As to coal we import from England what we need for our present wants, in ballast, on board the numerous ships which come here for our timber, and we thus get it cheaper than we could import it from the Gulf Provinces. When this supply becomes insufficient to meet our growing wants, it will be necessary to look somewhere for a supply of coal. If the Lower Provinces can furnish it to us at cheaper rates than we can get it in the United States, we shall buy it from them. Upper Canada will probably get its coal from the Pennsylvania mines, which are in direct communication with Lake Erie, on the north shore of which the richest and most thickly settled portion of Upper Canada is situated. As regards fisheries, Canada has a stock of fish in its waters sufficient not only to supply all its own requirements, but to enable it to export largely from Gaspé to Europe. Now as to wheat. The Honorable President of the Council told us that in a single year the Atlantic Provinces paid \$4,440,000 to the United States for flour, and that a portion of that flour came from Upper Canada; and the honorable gentleman asks why should not we

ourselves sell our flour to the Lower Provinces? For the simple reason that, instead of having to pay four millions four hundred and forty-seven thousand dollars to the United States, they would have to pay us five millions of dollars, and they would therefore refuse to buy from us. There is no such thing as sentiment in matters of business; men buy in the cheapest market. The Gulf Provinces will buy their flour from the United States so long as they can obtain it at a lower price there than in Canada; and the fact that they do obtain it cheaper from the United States is clearly demonstrated by their buying from the Americans and not from us. But a single glance at the map will account for the difference in price. I do not believe that the Intercolonial Railway can be advantageously employed for the transport of flour from Rivière du Loup to Halifax; the cost of transport over five hundred miles of railway would be too great; the water route must therefore be adopted. Kingston and Halifax are in the same latitude, between the 44th and 45th parallel. From Kingston the St. Lawrence flows undeviatingly towards the north-east, and falls into the Gulf in the 50th degree of north latitude. From that point, in order to reach the Gut of Canso, you must not only make five degrees of southing, but also make nearly three degrees of longitude to the east, and then nearly three more towards the west before reaching Halifax. Moreover, the navigation is more or less dangerous throughout. When you compare this circuitous route with the far more direct one of the United States, it is quite easy to understand why the United States can sell even our wheat to the Gulf Provinces at lower prices than we ourselves are able to do. I have attempted to reduce the commercial advantages we are promised to their proper proportion. I will now endeavor to show that we can secure every one of these advantages without the Confederation. I shall cite, for that purpose, the very words of the Honorable Minister of Finance:—

If we look at the results of the free interchange of produce between Canada and the United States, we shall find that our trade with them increased, in ten years, from less than two millions to twenty millions of dollars. If free trade has produced such results in that case, what may we not expect when the artificial obstacles which hamper free trade between us and the provinces of the Gulf shall have disappeared?

But this fine result was not obtained by means of a Confederation with the United States. What hinders us from having free

trade with the Gulf Provinces? In support of this view, I shall quote the work of the honorable member for Montmorency, not that of 1858, but that of 1865, written in favor of Confederation, pages 32 and 33, where he shews in the most conclusive manner that we have no need of Confederation to improve our commercial relations with the Gulf Provinces. It is under this head of commercial advantages that the Intercolonial Railway fitly comes in. The Honorable President of the Council tells us that he is favorable to Confederation, because it will give us a seaport at all seasons of the year—a most powerful argument, he adds, in its favor. We stand in great need of a seaport in the winter season, more especially if the United States abolish the right of transit. Absolutely, without reference to that, we require it in order to perfect our system of defence. But is Confederation necessary in order that we may build the Intercolonial Railway? Certainly not. The hon. minister, in the same speech, gives an answer to the representatives from Upper Canada complaining that the Intercolonial Railway is to be built before any scheme is entertained for opening up the North-West Territory,—“The reason is that the necessary means of constructing the Intercolonial Railway are already secured to us by the guarantee of the Imperial Government, which will enable us to obtain money at a very advantageous rate of interest.” These means were secured to us a long time since, long before the question of Confederation was agitated. I see also in a report laid before the House in a return to an address moved for last year by the Honorable Minister of Agriculture, that as soon as it became known in England that Mr. FLEMING had been appointed to report upon a plan for the Intercolonial Railway, two offers were at once made for the building of it, uncalled for by us. One is contained in Mr. C. D. ARCHIBALD's letter of 27th August, 1863, and the other in that of Mr. C. J. BRYDGES of 4th March, 1864. Our credit is good enough to procure us the means of building the railway without having recourse to Confederation. To sum up all in few words: all the advantages are negative, that is to say, Confederation will do no harm to our interests, military or commercial, but neither do they require it. As to the inconveniences of which it may be productive, I leave them to the judgment of the House, who will decide whether they are positive. I am asked: “If you will have nothing to do with Confederation, what will you have?”

I answer, we would remain as we are. That, I am told, is impossible, in our present position with respect to Upper Canada. The Hon. Premier, in introducing the scheme of Confederation to the Legislature, said,—“At the time these measures were resolved upon, the country was bordering on civil strife, and he would ask if it was not the duty of both sides to do all they could to prevent the unfortunate results which would have followed.” All the ministers following him, used expressions of the same tenor, nothing caring for the incalculable wrong which they were doing to the country, they whose duty it was to watch for the preservation of its good name, and the safety of its interests. How will the world be astonished, who look upon Canada as one of the most favored countries on earth, in which the people enjoy more liberty and more perfect tranquillity than is to be found in any other—how will they be astonished to hear that we are “a country bordering on civil strife?” How will such tidings affect our credit? The world will not understand the motives of our ministers in painting the condition of our country in such gloomy colors. It will not be aware that they must have Confederation to keep their places, and that this threat of war is uttered for the nonce as an unanswerable argument to force us to accept it. What a discrepancy there is between this declaration of the Ministry that we are “bordering on civil strife,” and the opening of the Speech from the Throne, which expresses “thankfulness to a beneficent Providence for the general contentment of the people of this province,” or the address voted by the Legislature in answer to the Speech from the Throne, which is the faithful echo of this grateful sentiment! What would the members of the Ministry have said, if a member had risen to move an amendment to the Address in the words made use of by the Hon. Premier, “That the country is bordering on civil strife, and that therefore the House cannot admit that there is general contentment among the people?” It is on reasons widely differing from these that the Speech from the Throne takes ground in recommending the adoption of the scheme of Confederation. But are we really bordering on civil strife? Of course it is representation based on population which is the exciting cause. Do the people of Upper Canada demand representation based on population as a condition *sine qua non* of the continuance of our peaceful relations with them? Has this desire to obtain representation based on population taken

such deep root in the bosom of Upper Canada, that it is ready to plunge us and itself into the horrors of civil war in order to achieve it? Or is not representation by population rather one of those political clap-traps which ambitious men, who can catch them no other way, set to catch the heedless multitude? We, Lower Canadians, who at this distance cannot judge of the sentiments of Upper Canadians by our own observation, must depend for the formation of our opinions respecting them on the Upper Canada newspapers, and on the speeches of their members in this House. They are the only sources of information which we possess. Well, in 1862, we saw the Upper Canada leaders, except the President of the Council, who was wise enough to keep aloof, who are at the same time connected with the principal newspapers there, either as proprietors, editors or co-editors, accept office under the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Government, the fundamental principle of which was equal representation of the two sections, a principle which entitled it to the cordial support of Lower Canada. These gentlemen we saw reflected, notwithstanding their abandonment of their principles, and we found them voting against representation by population. From this I conclude that Upper Canada is much more indifferent, and its leaders much less sincere touching this question of the representation, than they would have us believe. Were it otherwise, Upper Canada would have taken the opportunity, afforded by the election, of punishing the men who had betrayed her. But who are those two men who now pitch their voices in harmony (formerly so discordant) to predict civil war, if we do not vote for Confederation? They are the Attorney General for Lower Canada, and the President of the Council (Hon. Messrs. CARTIER and BROWN!)—the one demanding representation by population, the other refusing it: both took their stand as the champions of their sections, and became their chieftains respectively. When they found out that that game was unprofitable to both, as the President of the Council seemed to be excluded for ever from the ministerial benches, and the Attorney General could not maintain himself in his position on them, the Attorney General gave way: he agreed to representation by population, trying to disguise it under the name of Confederation; and to reward him for this complaisance, the President of the Council saved him—him and his colleagues—and condescended to take a seat among them. They hold over us a threat of civil war to

force us to ratify their bargain. There is only one man in Canada who could have done what the Attorney General for Lower Canada has done, and that man is himself. Thanks to his energy, to his intimate acquaintance with the strong and the weak points of his fellow-countrymen, the Attorney General for Lower Canada has succeeded in attaining an elevation which no one can dispute with him—that of chief of the French Canadian nationality. To attain this eminence, he has crushed the weak, cajoled the strong, deceived the credulous, bought up the venal, and exalted the ambitious; by turns he has called in the accents of religion and stimulated the clamour of interest—he has gained his end. When Lower Canada heard of his alliance with the President of the Council, there arose from all quarters one universal cry of indignation. He managed to convert the cry of anger into a shout of admiration. When his scheme of Confederation became public, a feeling of uneasiness pervaded all minds; that instinct forewarned them of the danger which impended. He has hushed that feeling to a sleep of profound security. I shall compare him to a man who has gained the unbounded confidence of the public, who takes advantage of it to set up a Savings Bank, in which the rich man deposits his wealth, and the day laborer the small amount which he has squeaked out of his wages, against a day of need—both without a voucher. When that man has gathered all into his strong box, he finds an opportunity to purchase, at the cost of all he holds in trust, the article on which he has long set his ambitious eye; and he buys it, unhesitatingly, without a thought of the wretches who are doomed to ruin by his conduct. The deposit committed to the keeping of the Attorney General is the fortune of the French-Canadians—their nationality. That fortune had not been made in a day; it was the accumulation of the toil and the savings of a whole people in a whole century. To prolong the ephemeral existence of his administration for a few months, the Attorney General has sacrificed, without a scruple, this precious trust, which the unbounded confidence of his fellow-countrymen had confided to his keeping.

HON. MR. CARTIER—And what have I received in payment for that?

MR. JOLY—A salary of five thousand dollars per annum, and the honor of the position.

HON. MR. CARTIER—That is not enough for me.

MR. JOLY—I am well aware of it; that

is why the honorable member is desirous of extending the circle of his operations. But he will not long enjoy the fruits of his treason; by crushing the power of the French-Canadians he has crushed his own, for upon them his existence depends. Does he believe in the sincerity of the friendship of the Liberals of Upper Canada? They fought with him for too long a time to allow of the existence of any sympathy between them and him, and now he has lost even their respect. They consented to ally themselves with him in order to obtain their object—representation by population; but when they no longer stand in need of him, they will throw him aside like a worn-out tool. I look upon this threat of civil war as resembling a farce played by two comrades; they shout out to us, "Take care, we are going to fight; we shall do some mischief if you don't hold us." Do not put yourselves out of the way to stop them; you need not be alarmed, they will not fight. It is also said to us, "See how many changes of Ministry there have been since 1862; can such a state of affairs continue any longer?" I am free to admit that all those changes must have been very unpleasant for the different ministers who have succumbed under them, but has the country suffered much by them? The condition of the finances of a nation is the touchstone of its prosperity. In 1862, the Minister of Finance, before resigning, declared a deficit of five millions one hundred and fifty-two thousand dollars (page 20 of his speech); for the year ending the 30th June last, there was a surplus of seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars. If all these changes of ministries had not taken place, it is impossible to say how large the deficit would have become by this time, as for several years previous to 1862 it had gone on steadily increasing. These two reasons advanced by ministers are merely intended as a veil to conceal the true motive for this complete revolution in our Constitution; that true motive is simply a desire on their parts to remain in power. Without wishing to enter into all the details of the measure proposed to the House, which have been so ably handled by the honorable member for Hochelaga, more especially those relating to the Legislative Council, there are some which I cannot pass over in silence. The following are the paragraphs of the resolutions of the Quebec Conference which regulate the organization of the Lower House of the Federal Legislature, principally in respect of the number of representatives:—

17. The basis of representation in the House of Commons shall be population, as determined by the official census every ten years, and the number of members at first shall be 194, distributed as follows:

Upper Canada	82
Lower Canada	65
Nova Scotia	19
New Brunswick	15
Newfoundland	8
Prince Edward Island	5

18. Until the official census of 1871 has been made up, there shall be no change in the number of representatives from the several sections.

19. Immediately after the completion of the census of 1871, and immediately after every decennial census thereafter, the representation from each section in the House of Commons shall be readjusted on the basis of population.

20. For the purpose of such readjustments, Lower Canada shall always be assigned sixty-five members, and each of the other sections shall at each readjustment receive, for the ten years then next succeeding, the number of members to which it will be entitled on the same ratio of representation to population as Lower Canada will enjoy according to the census last taken by having sixty-five members.

21. No reduction shall be made in the number of members returned by any section, unless its population shall have decreased, relatively to the population of the whole Union, to the extent of five per centum.

22. In computing at each decennial period the number of members to which each section is entitled, no fractional parts shall be considered, unless when exceeding one-half the number entitling to a member, in which case a member shall be given for each such fractional part.

I object to the 21st clause, because it contains provisions which are unjust to Lower Canada. The full scope of that clause is not generally understood; that proportion of five per cent. appears to be a very small affair, and yet, under certain circumstances, it might produce considerable results, which are not taken into consideration in the explanations given on that subject in the work written by the Honorable Mr. CAUCHON, which the Government has caused to be distributed (pages 72 to 87). It is difficult to foretell what the exact numerical increase of the several provinces will be from the present time to the next census in 1871. The Honorable Mr. CAUCHON assumes, as the basis of his calculations, a rate of thirty per cent. Let us suppose the case to prove that in all the provinces (with the exception of Lower Canada) the population increases by thirty per cent. between 1861 and 1871, and that that of Lower Canada increases by thirty-four per cent. It may, perhaps, be objected to this that it is improbable. My reply is, that when we are discussing a scheme

of such importance as that which is now under our consideration, we should provide for all possible contingencies; but this one is far from being impossible if the predictions of the Minister of Finance and the Attorney General, who promise to Lower Canada so brilliant a future under the Federal system, are fulfilled. If Lower Canada becomes the heart of the commercial life of the Confederation; if the mines of copper, lead, silver, and gold which we have lately discovered should produce the same results that they produce everywhere else, that of attracting a great influx of population, I cannot be accused of any very great exaggeration in supposing that the population of Lower Canada may, between the years 1861 and 1871, increase by four per cent. more than the population of the other provinces. In the case which I have supposed the increase would be as follows:—

Upper Canada	418,827
Lower Canada	377,625
Nova Scotia	99,257
New Brunswick	75,614
Newfoundland	39,000
Prince Edward Island	24,227

Total increase

1,034,550
According to this calculation, Lower Canada would have, in 1871, a population of 1,488,289 souls, which would have to be divided by 65, that being the invariable number of representatives assigned to Lower Canada, in order to ascertain what will be the number of constituents for each representative in the Federal Parliament; the result will be found to be 22,896. Upper Canada would have a population of 1,814,918 souls, which, divided by 22,896, would give her seventy-nine representatives instead of eighty-two. Nova Scotia would have a population of 430,114 souls, which would give her nineteen representatives as at present (eighteen and a fraction over the half). New Brunswick would have a population of 327,661 souls, which would give her fourteen representatives instead of fifteen. Newfoundland would have a population of 169,000 souls, which would give her seven representatives instead of eight. Prince Edward Island would have a population of 104,984 souls, which would give her five members as at present (four and a fraction over the half). It will be seen that if the five other provinces were represented on the same scale as Lower Canada, they would, in 1871, lose among them five members; but as the total population of each will not have decreased by five per cent., relatively to the total population of the Confederated Provinces,

there will be no reduction in the number of their representatives, in accordance with the provisions of this 21st clause. It is the interest of Lower Canada, more than of any other province, to watch with a jealous eye over the mechanism adopted for the organization of the Federal Legislature. In case of a vital question arising, we should have to counteract the votes of these five members (who ought, in justice, to be deducted from the representation of the other provinces) by those of five of our members, whose votes would thus be lost to us, as would also be the weight which their five united counties, with a total population of 114,480 (or 22,896 for each county), would throw into the scale. Other combinations of circumstances might arise which might prove even more disadvantageous to us. This subject naturally leads me to address myself to my French Canadian colleagues; I fear that my remarks may not be well received by all, but I hope that honorable members will be good enough to excuse my frankness in consideration of the great importance of the question. I have no right to maintain that all those who are favorably disposed towards Confederation are not acting in good faith; it is not my wish to reproach them for acting according to their convictions, but in so acting they should not forget the duties which their charge imposes on them. It is a well known fact that when the scheme of Confederation was laid before the public, all the newspapers, and most of the members who support the Administration, declared themselves in favor of the scheme, but, in nearly every instance, with an express reservation of the right to introduce certain amendments which they considered indispensable. But the Honorable Attorney General for Upper Canada declared, some days ago, that the Government would accept no amendment, and that the resolutions must be adopted exactly in the shape in which they were brought down. Are honorable members going to submit to this decree? Is it not their intention at least to make an effort to have those amendments, which they looked upon as indispensable, adopted? Their position in relation to the Government confers upon them an influence which they can never exert more usefully than at present; it is their duty to exert that influence; they are responsible for the results of this measure, which cannot be adopted without their concurrence. Their principal argument in support of Confederation is that we have now an excellent opportunity of obtaining favorable

conditions—an opportunity which will probably never occur again, and one of which it is their duty to avail themselves. But have the honorable members made those conditions? Have they taken as great precautions to preserve intact the interests of nearly a million French Canadians entrusted to their care, as they would have taken in making an agreement for the sale of a farm, or even the purchase of a horse? Have they made any conditions at all? If they have made no conditions, do they at least know what the fate is that is reserved for us? Do they know the nature of the form of Government which will be imposed on Lower Canada? Can they say whether we shall have Responsible Government? No! for the Ministry refuses to speak; it will only speak when the measure of Confederation shall have been adopted, and when it is too late to raise any objections. Responsible government would not be a very efficacious remedy for the evils which I foresee, but it would, at all events, be a means of defence for us, and we ought not to reject it. It is true that, according to the 41st article of the resolutions, "The local governments and legislature of each province shall be constructed in such manner as the existing legislature of each such province shall provide." But the English element is at present in the majority. We are told that the English are naturally favorable to responsible government. That is true when it relates to themselves; for how many years did Canada remain without responsible government? The painful events of 1837 and 1838 were the result of that anomaly in the parliamentary system. Upper Canada will not need, as we shall, a local responsible government; it will not have, as we shall have, to defend a nationality which will be in a minority in the Federal Parliament, but which, at least, ought to enjoy in Lower Canada those powers which parliamentary authority everywhere accords to the majority. Upper Canada only desires to make of her local legislature a municipal council on a large scale; she will fight out her party quarrels in the wider arena of the Federal Parliament. The English of Lower Canada, who will gain nothing by having a responsible local government, because that government is the government of the majority, will unite their votes with those of Upper Canada to impose upon us the same system of government as in the other section. The local parliaments, in the event of that system being adopted, having no part in the government, will soon become perfectly useless, and

they will soon be dispensed with, just as in a machine we do away with useless and expensive wheelwork. Nothing will then be left to us but the legislative union which the honorable members have not ventured to propose, because they are compelled to admit it would be an act of crying injustice to Lower Canada. But we are told to rely on article 42, which gives to the local legislatures the right of amending or changing their Constitutions from time to time, and it is said that when Lower Canada is separated from Upper Canada, she may alter her Constitution if she pleases, and adapt it to her own views. It must not be forgotten, however, that the Lieutenant-Governor, who will enjoy the right of reserving the bills of the Local Parliament for the sanction of the Governor General, will be appointed by the Governor General in Council, that is to say, by the Federal Government, and, as a matter of course, it must be expected that he will act in conformity with the views of the Federal Government. Any bill reserved by him will require to be sanctioned by the Federal Government, which may refuse such sanction if they think proper, as they undoubtedly will as regards any bill the object of which might be to give responsible government to Lower Canada, whilst all the other provinces would only have governments which were not responsible. And the militia,—it will be exclusively under the control of the Federal Government. Have the honorable the French-Canadian members, to whom I more particularly address myself at this moment, reflected on the danger to us that is contained in this provision? It is with reluctance that I once more allude to the difficulties which may arise between the different sections of the Confederacy, but it would be wrong to shut our eyes to the future for fear that it may appear too threatening. Did we not, a few days ago, hear one of the honorable members, who most warmly supports the Government, complain in this House that Upper Canada was going to have four military schools, whilst Lower Canada would only have two? Why should we vest in the Federal Government the right of giving instruction in the military art and of arming the other provinces at the expense of Lower Canada? Why, while there is yet time, should we neglect to take those salutary precautions on which our existence as French-Canadians depend? Our Local Government ought to have the same active part in the organization, instruction and equipment of our militia which

belongs to all local governments which form part of other confederacies. But I was forgetting that this is to be a model Confederation, which is to unite within itself all the evils of the Federative system without including one of its advantages. I read in the work in favor of Confederation, to which I have referred on more than one occasion, page 25, as follows: "With them we offer protection to your religion, to your institutions, and to your civil laws," &c., &c. They offer to protect the French-Canadians; but when, under the present Constitution, they can protect themselves, why should they abdicate the right of so doing? Now they are strongly entrenched in their citadel, and they are advised to raze the walls in order to secure their safety. The French Canadians, at the present day, are in a better position than they were at the time of the union. They are at the same time both judges and suitors. They are asked to adopt a new form of government; it is not imposed upon them; and, to induce them to do so, the hon. Minister of Agriculture tells them that this new form of government was recommended successively by Chief Justice SEWELL, Judge ROBINSON, and Lord DURHAM. The names alone of these three men ought to suffice to open our eyes; their avowed object always was to obliterate French-Canadian nationality, to blend the races into one only, and that the English; and to attain that end they recommended, as the Minister of Agriculture has told us, the system of government now submitted for our approval. In the last passage, a few lines of which I have just cited, we find at page 25 a phrase upon which I have reflected seriously; it is as follows, and is placed by the author in the mouths of the English-Canadians of Lower Canada, "Remember that we, too, are inhabitants of Lower Canada, and that we, too, aspire to other and nobler destinies." I asked of myself, with all seriousness, what then are the aspirations of the French-Canadians? I have always imagined, indeed I still imagine, that they all centre in one point, the maintenance of their nationality as a shield destined for the protection of the institutions they hold most dear. For a whole century this has ever been the aim of the French-Canadians; in the long years of adversity they have never for a moment lost sight of it; surmounting all obstacles, they have advanced step by step towards its attainment, and what progress have they not made? What is their position to-day? They number nearly a million, they have no longer,

if they are true to themselves, to fear the fate of Louisiana, which had not as many inhabitants, when it was sold by NAPOLEON to the United States, as Canada had in 1761. A people numbering a million does not vanish easily, especially when they are the owners of the soil. Their number is rapidly increasing. New townships are being opened in every direction, and being peopled with industrious settlers. In the Eastern Townships, which it was thought were destined to be peopled entirely by English settlers, these latter are slowly giving way to the French-Canadians. There is a friendly rivalry between the two races, a struggle of labor and energy; contact with our fellow-countrymen of English origin has at last opened our eyes; we have at last comprehended that in order to succeed, not only labor is needed, but well-directed and skilled labor, and we profit by their example and by the experience they have acquired in the old countries of Europe. Agriculture with us is now becoming an honorable pursuit; the man of education is no longer ashamed to devote himself to it. Our farmers feel the necessity and desire of attaining perfection in the art. We possess magnificent model farms, in which we can learn the science of agriculture. We are entering a new era of prosperity. The French-Canadians hold a distinguished position in the commerce of the country; they have founded banks and savings banks; on the St. Lawrence between Quebec and Montreal, they own one of the finest lines of steamboats in America; there is not a parish on the great river which has not its steamboat; the communications with the great towns are easy; we have railways, and we now measure by hours the duration of a journey which formerly we measured by days; we have foundries and manufactories, and our shipbuilders have obtained a European renown. We have a literature peculiarly our own; we have authors, of whom we are justly proud; to them we entrust our language and our history; they are the pillars of our nationality. Nothing denotes our existence as a people so much as our literature; education has penetrated everywhere; we have several excellent colleges, and an university in which all the sciences may be studied under excellent professors. Our young men learn in the military schools how to defend their country. We possess all the elements of a nationality. But a few months ago, we were steadily advancing towards prosperity, satisfied with the present and confident in the future of the French-Canadian people. Suddenly discouragement, which had never over-

come us in our adversity, takes possession of us; our aspirations are now only empty dreams; the labors of a century must be wasted; we must give up our nationality, adopt a new one, greater and nobler, we are told, than our own, but then it will no longer be our own. And why? Because it is our inevitable fate, against which it is of no use to struggle. But have we not already struggled against destiny when we were more feeble than we are now, and have we not triumphed? Let us not give to the world the sad spectacle of a people voluntarily resigning its nationality. Nor do we intend to do so. Let the people have time given them to understand the question; let their opinion on the subject be obtained at the polls. It is but their right, unless our form of government is a delusion and a snare. If the measure is a good one, what danger is there in discussing it? If the new Constitution it is proposed to give us is to last for centuries, why should we not at least endeavor to make it as perfect as possible? Why press its adoption before it is understood? In conclusion, I object to the proposed Confederation, first, as a Canadian, without reference to origin, and secondly, as a French-Canadian. From either point of view, I look upon the measure as a fatal error; and, as a French-Canadian, I once more appeal to my fellow-countrymen, reminding them of the precious inheritance confided to their keeping—an inheritance sanctified by the blood of their fathers, and which it is their duty to hand down to their children as unimpaired as they received it. (Cheers.)

The debate was then adjourned.

TUESDAY, February 21, 1865.

HON. SOLICITOR GENERAL LANGEVIN

—It is not without some degree of hesitation that I rise to address the House on this occasion; for I see before me the representatives of two millions and a half of people, who are called together to settle the most weighty matters which concern them, and more particularly to take into consideration a question involving the destiny, not only of the two Canadas, but also of all the Provinces of British North America. I must confess that I experience a strong feeling of hesitation and great diffidence of my own powers, when I consider the importance of the measure submitted to us for discussion, and the consequences which may result from

our decision, both to ourselves and our posterity. The measure is so vast in its bearings, the interests affected by it are so considerable, that no one can be surprised at my diffidence and hesitation. This question of Confederation is bound up with the common interests of empires and the general policy of nations, for it is no unimportant matter for the great nations who bear sway among mankind, to know into what hands the Provinces of British North America may fall. We need only look back into the pages of history to learn how greatly nations are moved by the creation of a new people; and on the present occasion, the thousand voices of the press proclaim the interest which the question of Confederation excites both in America and in Europe itself, and how closely the governments observe our proceedings; and this interest which they feel and proclaim is legitimate and natural, for the measure is destined to make us rank among the nations of the earth. More than all, this question particularly concerns England and the United States, and in an equal degree with ourselves. England is interested in seeing these provinces well governed, prosperous, free, contented and happy. She is interested in their having a good government, and that it should be so administered as to be no burthen to her as the Mother Country; that, on the contrary, they should become powerful and in a position to assist her in certain eventualities. On the other hand, the United States must feel a degree of satisfaction in seeing the Provinces of British North America become a powerful nation. They will see it without a feeling allied to jealousy. They must wish us to be strong enough to maintain our neutrality, our good understanding with them, and those friendly relations which should ever subsist between neighboring nations. But if this question is interesting to England and the United States, it is still more so to ourselves—to us, whose destiny is at stake, to us whose position is a lofty one as compared with the ordinary lot of nations; for the faculty is not granted to all nations to choose their own lot in the full leisure of a time of peace, without the taint of a single drop of blood shed—to fix upon a Constitution which will set them at once on the high road of progress, and enable them to take such ground for their career as may seem good in their own eyes. In 1840, when the union of the two Canadas was under consideration, we occupied no such position, for that union was imposed upon us

in our own despite, and we were never consulted on the subject. It will be remembered that for a certain time our very language was proscribed, and our position rendered as unfortunate as it could be made. True, we had an equal number of representatives in this House, but as a people we were manifestly held to be inferior. I grant that the attempt to fix the yoke permanently on our necks proved a failure, but this was no fault of those who imposed the union on us. We have won the position which we now occupy by our own energy and perseverance, assisted by some of the representatives of Upper Canada. At this day things are greatly changed. We are in the midst of a great revolution, but a revolution of which peace is the guiding spirit; we are free to deliberate whether we will change our position, and to dictate the terms on which the change is to be made. We are invited to shape out our future destiny, and we should not be true to ourselves, or to our constituents, if we refused this day to avail ourselves of the resolutions adopted at the Conference of Quebec. The hon. member for Hochelaga (Hon. Mr. DORJON), whom I regret not to see in his place—

HON. MR. HOLTON—He will be here in a moment.

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—The hon. member for Hochelaga told us the other day that the plan of a Confederation was adopted and moved by the present Administration for the mere purpose of stifling the cry of representation by population. Well, and if it really were so, where does the hon. member find the harm in it? Is it not most important that we should stop that cry for representation based on population, in our present condition? Representation by population would have left us, Lower Canadians, in an inferior position relatively to that of Upper Canada—would have conferred on the latter the privilege of legislating for us, not only in general, but in local matters. The hon. member for Hochelaga ought to have been the last to reproach the present Government with having, by this measure of Confederation, stopped the cry for representation based on population. In 1854, the hon. member admitted, as he himself acknowledges, that representation based on population was just in principle, and the consequence of that admission was fatal. The consequence was that the hon. member was compelled to keep in the same track until the formation of the BROWN-DORJON Administration in

1858—an Administration which had no very long existence. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. HOLT—Unfortunately. (Laughter.)

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—That Administration had no very long existence, and I rejoice that I did my part in upsetting it, for it is probable that, if it had stood, representation based on population would have been forced upon us, and we should not be now in our present position—in a position to make our own terms as freely as Upper Canada, and take part, on a footing of equality, in negotiating a treaty with the Lower Provinces. This is why I rejoice that I contributed to overthrow that government. The hon. member for Hochelaga told us the other evening that in 1856 he spoke as follows:—

In 1856, when Parliament was sitting at Toronto, I first suggested that one means of surmounting our difficulties would be the substitution of a Confederation of the two Canadas in place of a Legislative union. By that arrangement local questions would be debated in the local legislatures, and the Central Government would have the control of commercial and other questions of general interest. I said that considering the differences of race, religion and laws now existing between the two sections of the country, it would be the best means of surmounting them. That is to say, I would leave to a central government questions regarding commerce, banking, the currency, public works of a general character, &c., and to the local legislatures all local questions. At the same time I said that if these views were not accepted, I should certainly be in favor of representation based on population, with conditions and guarantees which would secure the interests of Lower Canada, and preserve to Lower Canada the institutions which are so dear to her.

Well, we see that in 1856, the hon. member for Hochelaga was desirous of forming a new Constitution for the express purpose of stifling the cry for representation based on population. In 1858 he formed, together with the present Hon. President of the Council (Hon. Mr. BROWN), the BROWN-DORION Government; and again, he stipulated that the question of representation based on population should be taken into consideration, and that the Government should consider the means of settling the difficulties which it involved. In 1859 he signed a document, which also bore the signatures of Hon. Mr. DRUMMOND, Hon. Mr. DESSAULLES, and Hon. Mr. MCGEE, in which he said with his colleagues, that a change in

the Constitution of the country was necessary:—

If Lower Canada insists on maintaining the union intact; if she will neither consent to a dissolution of the union, nor consider the project of a Federation, it is difficult to conceive on what reasonable grounds the demand for representation according to population can be resisted. The plea for such resistance has hitherto been that danger might arise to some of her peculiar and most cherished institutions; but that ground will be no longer tenable if she rejects a proposition, the effect of which would be to leave to her own people the sole and absolute custody of those institutions, and to surround them by the most stringent of all possible safeguards, the provisions of the fundamental law of the land, unalterable save by the action of the people affected by them. The logical alternative now presented to the people of Lower Canada would, therefore, seem to be dissolution or federation on the one hand, and representation according to population on the other.

Here, again, he intended to stifle the cry of representation based on population, and intended to do it by founding a new Confederation. In 1861 it was just the same; he declared that he was desirous of settling that question of the representation; that it was not expedient that it should remain an open question; that it was a difficulty to be got rid of one way or another. In 1862, also, he went into the Government with the same object in view. But how did he set about carrying it out? He made it a close question, and adopted, with his colleagues, the plan of the double majority. The hon. member doubtless had forgotten that in 1859, when he penned the manifesto which I have just quoted, he had condemned the double majority. Here is, in fact, what he said in that document:—

In each section there would still be minority and majority parties, and unless the principle of the double majority could be enacted as a fundamental law, we should be exposed to an endless round of the same complaints that we now hear, of one section ruling the other contrary to its well known public opinion, and to see reproduced in our politics the same passions, the same intrigues, the same corruption and insincerity. The enactment of the double majority is not advocated in any quarter. The impossibility of clearly defining the cases to which it should apply, and of distinguishing them from those to which it should not, is felt by all; but were it even possible, it would only lead to new phases of difficulty, by compelling majorities professing opinions and principles diametrically opposed to each other, to unite, and thereby effectually to extinguish the influence

of one or the other minority, or of both. It is difficult to conceive one single legislature composed of two majorities and two minorities; these two majorities without any identity of principle, acting nevertheless together by common consent, so as to never trespass the one on the other, and so that each section of the province would always be governed by a majority of its representatives. On many questions this course could not be carried out without alternately forcing the majority of the representatives of each section of the province to abstain from voting, or to declare themselves in favor of measures which their judgment and their conscience would disavow. The complications of such a system amounting to nothing short of an application of the Federal principle to a single legislature, would render it impracticable.

Then the honorable member had changed his opinion on this subject! I do not say this as a reproach; but it proves that he always acted with the same object in view—that is to say, to stifle the cry for representation based on population. How, then, does it happen that he finds fault with the present Ministry for bringing forward a measure to put an end to these difficulties, and to prevent our being placed in a position of inferiority? But the object of the Confederation is not merely to do away with existing difficulties. It has become a necessity, because we have become sufficiently great,—because we have become strong, rich, and powerful enough,—because our products are numerous enough and considerable enough,—because our population has become large enough to allow of our aspiring to another position, and of our seeking to obtain an outlet through some seaport for our products. At the present day we stand in a position of vassalage to the United States, with respect to the exportation of our products to Europe; we are at their mercy. If we should have any difficulty with our neighbors to-morrow, they would close the Portland route to us, and we should find ourselves, during nearly seven months in the year, cut off from all communication with the seaboard, save by means of the usual long and difficult land journey. This is not a tenable position, nor one worthy of a people such as that which inhabits the Provinces of British North America. It is a position which must be emerged from, for such is the interest of Canada, of the Lower Provinces, and of the Western States. The honorable member for Hochelaga told us that he was in favor of a plan which would settle existing difficulties, and would place Lower Canada in a suitable position; but he never told us what that plan was. The only thing he ever proposed was his plan of 1859 for

the Confederation of the two Canadas; but that plan would only have settled one difficulty, and would have allowed others of the greatest importance to arise—and among others, that respecting our communication with the seaboard. That plan, for instance, would not have allowed us to construct the Intercolonial Railway; for it is almost impossible that so great an enterprise should succeed unless it is in the hands of a great central power, and if it is necessary to consult five or six governments before commencing it. But the question of the Confederation of the two Canadas is not the only one which is presented as a means of escaping from our difficulties; there are different plans which I shall enumerate. Some propose, for instance, that we should remain in the position in which we now are; others wish for annexation to the United States; some would, perhaps, be in favor of complete independence; others would favor a Confederation of the two Canadas; and, lastly, the Confederation of all the British North American Provinces is proposed. Well, let us cursorily examine these various propositions. It may be that there are some members who are desirous that we should remain as we are. The honorable members for Hochelaga and Lotbinière (Hon. Mr. DORION and Mr. JOLY) consider our position an excellent one, and so, in their speeches, they have told us. They consider that we are extremely prosperous, and that we have nothing to wish for. For my part, I consider that in our present position we are under a great disadvantage; it is that if we remain isolated and alone, we cannot communicate with the metropolis, except through the United States; if we remain alone we can aspire to no position, we can give rein to no ambition as a people. Again, we have at the present time as many systems of judicature as we have provinces; with Confederation, on the contrary, this defect will be removed, and there will be but two systems: one for Lower Canada, because our laws are different from those of the other provinces, because we are a separate people, and because we do not choose to have the laws of the other populations—and the other for the remainder of the Confederation. All the other provinces having the same laws, or their system of law being derived from one and the same source, may have one and the same system of judicature; and, in fact, a resolution of the Conference allows them to resolve that they will have one code and one

judicial system ; but an exception is made in favor of Lower Canada and our laws. There are also as many different tariffs as there are different provinces, as many commercial and customs regulations as provinces. It is true that there are now many free goods, but it is also correct to say that there as many customs systems as there are provinces. And with respect to great colonial works, is it not true that it is impossible at the present day to undertake them, because the interests involved are too considerable, and because it is necessary to consult three or four legislatures ? By this it will be understood that it is almost impossible to reconcile so many different interests, except by uniting in one and the same legislature the representatives of those interests and of the people affected by them, and this object we cannot attain by remaining by ourselves. Currency and the interest of money are also regulated by different systems in the several provinces. There is one currency here, another in Newfoundland, another in Prince Edward Island, and so on. The shilling and pound of this province are different from the shilling and pound of Newfoundland and those of the other Maritime Provinces. But, with Confederation, all these matters would be placed under the control of one central legislature ; the currency would become uniform throughout, and capital might be everywhere invested without obstacle. So also it will be with respect to the rights of authors, patents for mechanical inventions, &c. When speaking of the Intercolonial Railway, I made no mention of the Pacific Railway, because I consider that we ought to devote our attention to accomplishing the works of which we at present stand in need. At a later period, when our resources and our population shall have sufficiently increased, we may direct our attention to the Pacific Railway. And should it become necessary, we can, with Confederation, hope to build it in less than ten years, whereas by remaining by ourselves as we are, we could not hope to have it for perhaps one hundred years. I think that I have now held up in a salient point of view the disadvantages of the *status quo*. The necessary consequence of what I have just demonstrated is that we cannot remain in the position in which we now are, whether we will or not. The question of representation based on population must be met ; that question must be settled. To say that we will grant it is to wish to place us in a position of inferiority, and I, for my part, will

never consent to place my section of the province in that position. Then there is another alternative that is proposed—annexation to the United States. I do not believe there is a single member in the House or out of the House who would consent to the annexation of Canada to the United States. But it is a question which must be examined when discussing that of Confederation, because it is one of the alternatives offered to us, and out of which we have to make a selection. What then would be our position in case we were annexed to the United States ? It is true that we should become an independent State in the American Confederation, but with the advantages accruing from such a state of affairs, we should likewise have the disadvantages. We should have to contribute towards the liquidation of the enormous debt which the United States have contracted in consequence of the war which is desolating one of the finest portions of the land ; we should have to pay the interest, and subsequently the principal itself, for I do not suppose that the Americans have the slightest intention of repudiating their debt. The debt would have to be paid, and to effect that, heavy imposts would have to be paid for a great number of years to provide the interest and sinking fund. Those who talk of the debt which is going to result from the Confederation should remember that it will be but a mere trifle compared with that for which we should become responsible under annexation. For one dollar that we shall have to pay under Confederation, we should have to pay six under annexation. It is said that the debt will be enormous, but it will only be as one dollar to four dollars in England, and six dollars in the United States. That is the financial aspect of annexation. But what would be the fate of the French-Canadians in the case of annexation to the United States ? Let us profit by the example of the French race in the United States, and enquire what has been the fate of the French in Louisiana ? What has become of them ? What has become of their language, their customs, their manners and their institutions ? After the war, hardly a trace will remain to show that the French race has passed that way. So far as religion is concerned, we might not find ourselves so badly off ; but we live in peace at the present day and are perfectly comfortable ; Catholics and Protestants have the same rights and religious liberty, and they live as peacefully together.

as if there was but one religion in the land.

MR. DUFRESNE (Iberville)—We are well off, let us remain so.

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—Yes, but we cannot remain in the position in which we are. The hon. member for Hochelaga has said so for ten years past, and undertook to change it. He said the position was no longer tenable in 1854, and if it was not tenable then, it is still less so in 1865. I now come to the other alternative proposed to us—that of independence. Men may be found, both in the House and out of the House, who would be disposed to say that we had better have independence than Confederation. For my part, I believe that the independence of the British North American Provinces would be the greatest misfortune which could happen to them; it would be to leave us at the mercy of our neighbors, and to throw us into their arms. Independence would make us masters of our position, but at the same time we should be deprived of the protection of England, and without that it is by no means difficult to foresee what would become of us. The hon. member for Hochelaga may think it to our advantage to be weak, but in that opinion I do not coincide; I consider that it is better to be in a position to meet the enemy in case of his attacking us. Let it be well understood that without the protection of England we can do nothing. And besides the outlay which would be entailed by our providing for our defence, there would also be enormous expenditure in order to keep up in a suitable manner our relations with foreign powers. With independence, and without the support and assistance of England, we should have to maintain an army and a very expensive government, we should have to keep up diplomatic relations with other countries, and provide means to defray a host of other expenses which we should not have to do under Confederation. Independence is, therefore, out of the question for the present. Lastly, we have the fourth alternative—the Confederation of the two Canadas, proposed by the honorable member for Hochelaga. In his manifesto of 1861 he told us in what position we should then be. The following passage is from the manifesto in question:—

It would have been easy at any time to satisfy Upper Canada by giving her four or five members more than Lower Canada, preserving at the same time equality in the Legislative Council. To avoid the danger which this increase of members

might entail, it is proposed to give Upper Canada seventeen members more than Lower Canada, and there are added besides forty-seven members more for the Maritime Provinces; in all sixty-four members are added to the British element, besides the twenty-eight additional members which are given to the Legislative Council; and this is the way in which it is pretended that the rights of Lower Canada are to be protected.

The hon. member for Hochelaga according to his own plan would have preferred—

HON. MR. DORION—It is not a plan, it is an argument.

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—Then it is a very bad argument—an argument by no means advantageous to Lower Canada. The hon. member says in that manifesto that it would be quite an easy matter to secure the silence of Upper Canada, by granting it four or five more members than Lower Canada. But the hon. member very well knows that if we were to grant representation based on population, it would not be four or five members we should have to give to Upper Canada, but the seventeen members which it is now proposed to give Upper Canada by the plan of Confederation. The increase would not be based on an imaginary number. But even with four or five members more in the present union, Upper Canada could impose its decision on all questions which might come before the House. The hon. member for Hochelaga has told us that under the proposed system Upper Canada will have seventeen members more than Lower Canada, and that the English element will be increased by the addition of all the members from the Lower Provinces, and that they will enter into a league against us Lower Canadians. I must say, I do not think the hon. member pays a very high compliment to his ex-colleague the Hon. Mr. HOLTON, when he says that because the members will be English, they will be against us French-Canadians. So great was his confidence in the hon. member for Chateauguay, that he took him into his Government, and would take him again to-day if he had the opportunity; and yet the hon. member for Hochelaga speaks of the English as though they were our natural enemies. For my part, I do not think they are; moreover, the question before us is not the formation of a Local Government only. We are considering the establishment of a Confederacy—with a Central Parliament and local parliaments. The Central or Federal Parliament will have the control of all measures

of a general character, as provided by the Quebec Conference; but all matters of local interest, all that relates to the affairs and rights of the different sections of the Confederacy, will be reserved for the control of the local parliaments. The position in which Confederation will place us is very different from that which we should have occupied under the system proposed by the honorable member, inasmuch as the seventeen members, which Upper Canada will have more than Lower Canada, will have nothing to do with our local affairs, our religious questions or particular institutions, and the hon. member for Hochelaga, by his scheme, would have entrusted all that to the good-will of the Upper Canadian majority; but for my part, I would rather entrust the management of these matters to my own people than to them. As regards the seventeen additional members which Upper Canada will have in the Federal Parliament, I am not alarmed at their presence any more than at that of the members from the Lower Provinces, because in Parliament there will be no questions of race, nationality, religion or locality, as this Legislature will only be charged with the settlement of the great general questions which will interest alike the whole Confederacy and not one locality only. Our position then is excellent, and all those who frankly give expression to their opinions must admit that the representatives of Lower Canada at the Quebec Conference have carefully guarded her interests. I may say that the basis of action adopted by the delegates, in preparing the resolutions, was to do justice to all—justice to all races, to all religions, to all nationalities, and to all interests. For this reason the Confederation will be accepted by all, in the Lower Provinces as well as here. Under Confederation there will no longer be domination of one race over another, and if one section should be desirous of committing an act of injustice against another section, all the others would unite together to prevent it. But, supposing that an unjust measure was passed in the House of Commons of the Federal Legislature, it would be stopped in the Legislative Council; for there we shall be represented equally with the other sections, and that is a guarantee that our interests will be amply protected. In the Legislative Council we shall have 24 members like Upper Canada and the Lower Provinces. I assert, then, that

there is a vast difference between the arguments of the hon. member for Hochelaga and the measure of the Government; our interests will be protected by the Legislative Council, and the measures of general interest will come under the jurisdiction of the Federal Parliament. When the matter under consideration is a great public enterprise, such as a railway, a canal or a telegraph line, our religious and national interests will not be endangered. It will be the duty of the Central Government to see that the country prospers, but it will not be its duty to attack our religion, our institutions or our nationality, which, moreover, as I have just proved, will be amply protected. While on this point, I will draw the attention of the honorable member for Hochelaga to the fact, that in 1859 he expressed himself as follows:—

Whatever may be the number of provinces or of subdivisions which it may hereafter be deemed necessary to adopt, the separating line between Upper and Lower Canada must be maintained. In defining the powers of the local and federal governments, those only must be delegated to the latter which would be absolutely necessary for the purposes of Confederation, and, as a necessary consequence, reserve to the subdivisions powers as ample and as varied as possible. The customs, the mail service, the laws respecting the currency, patents and copy-rights, the public lands, and such of the public works as possess an interest common to all parts of the country, ought to be the principal, if not the only objects which would be placed under the control of the Federal Government, whilst all that would relate to improvements purely local—to education, the administration of justice, the militia, the laws of property, and of internal police—would be under the control of the local governments, whose powers, in a word, would extend to all matters not specially delegated to the General Government.

Thus we see that the honorable member was willing to give up the control of the public lands to the Federal Government. He considered that it would be better to leave the control of colonization and the public lands to the Federal Government, in which, nevertheless, he was prepared to give a preponderance to Upper Canada. By the plan of Confederation brought down by the present Government, the control of these matters is given up to the local legislatures, and I earnestly hope that the honorable member will not endeavor to take them away and transfer them to the control of the Federal Government. If his plan or his argument had ever been put into operation, he

would have abandoned the control of our public lands to the British element, of which he now pretends to stand in mortal fear. I repeat the declaration that it is impossible for us to continue in our present position; that annexation to the United States would be the greatest disaster that could befall us; and that it is impossible, that it would be disastrous to think of the independence of the country; that the project for the Confederation of the two Canadas as proposed by the honorable member for Hochelaga is not desirable, and would not offer any guarantee for the institutions of Lower Canada, but that the Confederation of all the Provinces of British North America would be preferable, and is our only remedy. The Confederation would have the effect of giving us more strength than we now possess; we should form but one nation, one country, for all general matters affecting our interests as a people. But when I speak of a great and powerful nation, far be it from me to wish that we should form an independent nation, and that we should abandon the protection of the British flag; on the contrary, I earnestly hope that we shall long remain under the protection of that flag. What I would say is, that with Confederation we shall be in a better position for self-defence, and to aid the Mother Country under certain exigencies, than we are at the present time. Having Confederation, the Central Government will be in a position to have its orders carried out over its whole territory; and when the question of defence comes up, it will not be obliged to consult four or five different legislatures, but it will be able to organize our defences immediately and without obstruction. Besides, we shall have acquired a standing which we have not hitherto attained in our relations with other countries with which we have dealings. It is of no small importance for the inhabitants of a country to have a standing in foreign countries, and not to be treated as men of inferior position. When Canadians go to London or elsewhere out of their own country, they have no recognized position, because we are only a simple colony. But under the Confederation we shall be protected by England, and besides we shall have a position in foreign lands, the position which every man enjoys who belongs to a great nation. On this very point a public writer wrote some few years ago in a London newspaper an article from which I will

ask permission to read an extract to the House. The matter under consideration was the cession of the right of fishery on the Banks of Newfoundland by England to France. He says:—

Now, see the effect of this want of association and representation here. The basis of a treaty is agreed upon between Great Britain and France, by which Great Britain agreed to give to France the exclusive right of fishing upon a great portion of the coast of Newfoundland, a thing unjustified by any former treaty. Newfoundland no sooner heard of it than she remonstrated, and denied the right of Great Britain to sign away to a foreign nation the property of the people of Newfoundland; and, in fact, set at defiance the action of the Imperial Government. Now, this is not only derogatory to us as a nation, but it illustrates the danger which may arise to the colonies from the Imperial Government not being properly informed on such subjects. For, from a careful perusal of all the treaties on the subject in question, we cannot but believe that Newfoundland was right.

It is evident that, if the Confederation had existed at that period, England would not have acted without consulting us; but in those days they used to say, "They are Canadians, mere colonists, &c.;" and as we were then separated, of course we had to submit; our rights were not protected as they will be when we are united. Under Confederation, England will consult us in all matters which affect our interests, and we shall be able to make ourselves effectually heard in London. In proof of this I cite from the same writer:—

Here is another question which especially affects Canada. In the course of last year, the subsidy of £176,340 per annum, paid to the Cunard vessels plying between Liverpool and the United States, was renewed for a period of six years by the Imperial Government. Another postal subsidy of £78,000 was just being granted by the Imperial Government to a new line of steamers between Galway and the United States, in this case also without consulting the interests of British North America. This is a great injustice, particularly to Canada, for that province has expended large sums in the opening of water communication in the valley of the River St. Lawrence, canals which have become valueless from having to compete with the United States routes, encouraged by a subsidy from the Imperial Government of nearly £300,000 per annum, while Canada on the other hand receives no aid whatever from the Imperial Government, but is compelled to subsidize a line of its own (to attract a feeble share of the trade) to the extent of £50,000 per annum."

If all the Provinces of British North America had then been united under one

single government, we should have been informed that the Imperial Government intended to make that treaty, and our rights would have been respected; but as we were but a simple colony, and as there were many interests brought to bear, we could do nothing to protect ourselves. I do not desire to weary the House with quotations, but I trust I shall be allowed to cite another author, who in addition to showing how limited are the objects of ambition presented to the inhabitants of a colony, demonstrates that, though British subjects, we are almost on the footing of foreigners in England:—

Here again the contiguity of the colonies to the United States suggests disagreeable comparisons. In that great republic, the scope for individual exertion is immense; and although the rewards of success in the higher walks of life are not generally so great as under most monarchical governments, some of the "prizes open to all," in that country, are of a very high order. Many a British North American has seen individuals upon the United States side of our boundary, whom he knew from personal acquaintance to be inferior to him in natural abilities, education, wealth, and social standing, raised in a short time to the presidency of that republic, a position which would entitle him to rank with the proudest monarchs of Europe. At the same time that British American could not reasonably aspire even to become the governor of his native province; and if he were to go to England, all the influence which he could command would probably not procure him a presentation to his Sovereign.

Does not that show that the position of a Canadian, or of any other inhabitant of the colonies, in England is a position of inferiority? We desire to remove that inferiority by adopting the plan of Confederation now submitted to the House. The honorable member for Hochelaga stated that Confederation had not been asked for by the people, but that it was adopted as the last resource of a falling party. He referred, of course, when he expressed that opinion, to the vote of censure he had proposed last year against the TACHÉ-MACDONALD Ministry. After all his efforts against that ministry, the honorable gentleman could do no more than reproach them with an act committed, or supposed to have been committed, five years before by another government; and by that means he had succeeded in overthrowing the ministry. The result of the vote, brought about by the honorable member, was very different from what he expected; it resulted in the Coalition, and the project of Confederation now before the House. The honorable

gentleman says that the people have not asked for it, but when the Government announced to the House that the basis upon which the new ministry had been formed was the Confederation of the provinces, the opposition did not declare that the measure was a bad one. On the contrary, the great majority of the members from Upper and from Lower Canada pronounced themselves in favor of the plan, and promised their support to the Government. The honorable gentleman also asks, who empowered the delegates to meet and prepare a plan of Confederation, and submit it to this House? I answer, that the power was derived from the expressed sentiments of the House when it consented to the formation of the Government on that basis. The Government felt that they had a perfect right not only to assist at the Quebec Conference, but to bring it about. And even though there had been no other reason but the difficulties which had arisen in Canada some years before; even though there had been no other reason than the care of the interests of the country, we should have been justified thereby in assisting at the Charlottetown Conference, and in calling the Quebec Conference, at which the measure was adopted by the thirty-three delegates. The honorable gentleman let fall the accusation that we consented that Canada should have but one vote in the Conference. In making a charge against the Government, as leader of the Opposition, the honorable gentleman ought to have sought to base it on more correct information.

HON. MR. DORION—I understood it to be so, from what the President of the Council stated.

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—Canada had more than one vote; and the President of the Council never stated the contrary.

HON. MR. DORION—How many were there? Two?

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—Yes, two; one for Upper and one for Lower Canada. We could have had more, but that was not the question. We did not go to the Conference to discuss simple matters of form, nor did we go there to force our views upon others; we desired to come to an understanding with the Lower Provinces. It was not our object to frame a feeble and unjust Constitution, destined, from the very fact, to last but a day. Hence it would not have been right, and we did not desire to take advantage of our position, but we treated

with the provinces on a footing of equality, not wishing to force our views upon them, but anxious to come to an understanding, and to extend justice to all.

HON. MR. DORION—The statement I made is not denied, that the votes were given by provinces.

HON. SOLICITOR GEN. LANGEVIN—It is true; the Lower Provinces had each one vote, as had Upper and Lower Canada, and it is for us a matter for congratulation. I may be permitted to remind the House, in connection with this matter, of the saying of the first NAPOLEON to one of his ambassadors, whom he sent to a prince who was feeble, poor, and without an army—that prince was the Pope: "Treat with him as if he had an army of two hundred thousand men at his back!" Now, that is what we did; we treated Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and the other provinces as we desired to be treated ourselves, that is to say, with justice and consideration, and the result shews that we were right. The honorable gentleman ought to have confined himself to publishing, in his own way, the secrets of the Conference, and refrain from divulging those of the committee appointed last year with respect to constitutional difficulties. I understood that everything was to have remained secret in that committee, except the report made to the House.

HON. MR. DORION—Does the hon. gentleman accuse me of divulging the secrets of that committee?

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—The hon. gentleman stated that the Hon. Attorney General (Hon. J. A. MACDONALD) had constantly acted and voted in that committee against the Confederation project, and that now he presents one himself; and I maintain that he ought not to have said that, for the action of the members of the committee was to have remained secret. If the deliberations of the committee were to have remained secret, the hon. gentleman must see that he is in a difficult position. The object of that secrecy is evident; it was the same object we had in view in preserving secrecy in the proceedings of the Quebec Conference; to give increased freedom of opinion to each member, and not, as has been said, to deprive the people of information to which they were entitled. We knew that if our proceedings were presented day by day to the people, through the press, we should not have enjoyed that liberty of action and

of discussion which we required. It is easy to understand, that during the deliberations, a member might one day pronounce against a resolution or some important point, and that the arguments of another member in a contrary sense might make him change his opinion; but that this might be, it was necessary to be free from all outside influence, and therefore it was that the Conference sat with closed doors.

HON. MR. DORION—Will the hon. member allow me to say a few words? He has stated that I divulged the secrets of the committee on sectional difficulties. I assert that I never attended the sittings of that committee, that I merely went there on the first day to state that I would not take part in its proceedings, and that I then withdrew and did not again attend. I was opposed to the proceedings of that committee, and I did not attend it; but I learned that the Hon. Attorney General voted, on the last day the committee sat, against Confederation; and that was all I stated. So that if the secrets of the committee have been revealed, it has not been done by me.

HON. MR. CAUCHON.—The hon. member for Hochelaga has quite forgotten what passed in the committee. He was present, with the hon. member for Chateaugay (Hon. Mr. HOLTON), at the commencement of the proceedings of the committee, when it was stated and agreed that everything that passed in the committee was to be kept secret. I admit that the hon. gentleman refused to take part in the proceedings of the committee, but at the same time he knew perfectly well that they were to be secret, and he was bound to respect that secrecy. He was aware that the representatives of the press had been excluded.

HON. MR. DORION.—The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken, for I was not present.

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN.—The hon. member for Hochelega must understand that not being myself a member of that committee, and knowing that he was a member of it, and that it had been stated in the House that the proceedings were to be secret, I was perfectly justified in blaming him for having spoken.

HON. MR. DORION.—I never knew that the proceedings of the committee were to be secret.

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN.—I knew it, and I feel that I was perfectly justi-

fied in saying what I said ; but after the explanations which the hon. gentleman has just given, I cannot accuse him of having done it otherwise than inadvertently. The honorable member for Hochelaga stated that the memorial submitted by the Government at the time of its formation spoke of a Confederation other than the one which it now proposes. It will be well to refer to the document in question in order to ascertain its contents. The memorial consists of two parts, of which the following is the first :—

The Government are prepared to state that immediately after the prorogation, they will address themselves, in the most earnest manner, to the negotiation for a Confederation of all the British North American Provinces.

That failing a successful issue to such negotiations, they are prepared to pledge themselves to legislation, during the next session of Parliament, for the purpose of remedying existing difficulties by introducing the Federal principle for Canada alone, coupled with such provisions as will permit the Maritime Provinces and the North-Western territory to be hereafter incorporated into the Canadian system.

In other words, the Government promises, in the first part of the memorial in question, to direct its attention to a Confederation of all the British North American Provinces ; and, in the event of its not succeeding in carrying out that object, to turn its attention to a Confederation of the two Canadas. And now here are the contents of the second part :—

The Government are prepared to pledge themselves to bring in a measure, next session, for the purpose of removing existing difficulties, by introducing the Federal principle into Canada, coupled with such provision as will permit the Maritime Provinces and the North-West territory to be incorporated into the same system of government.

And the Government will seek, by sending representatives to the Lower Provinces and to England, to secure the assent of those interests which are beyond the control of our own legislation, to such a measure as may enable all British North America to be united under a General Legislature based upon the Federal principle.

Well, where is the contradiction between these promises and the present action of the Government ? We begin with a plan of Confederation for the two Canadas, and subsequently, finding that the Maritime Provinces are ready to enter upon the consideration of a more extensive union, we have made arrangements to bring them at once into the Confederation. There is no contra-

diction in that, but it is the same measure and the same plan ; the only difference is, that, instead of admitting them into the union some six or nine months hence, we have admitted them at once. When we approached the question, we found the Maritime Provinces in process of deliberating upon a union amongst themselves ; but the Charlottetown delegates perceived that the Confederation which we proposed to them would be much more advantageous to all the provinces than that upon which they were engaged, and they at once consented to accept our proposition. Accordingly they came to Quebec, and the result of their visit was the plan which has been submitted to this House. The hon. member for Hochelaga has, therefore, no right to reproach us with having altered the plan promised to the House, since it is word for word that which we promised. This measure, as I observed a short time ago, cannot last, unless it protects the interests of all. Now, we have different interests in Lower Canada, in which reside two populations differing in origin, differing in religion, and speaking different languages. On the other hand, Upper Canada has a homogeneous population, but one professing different religions, and so it is with respect to the several Maritime Provinces. In these latter provinces, also, we have more than one hundred thousand fellow countrymen of French origin. Well, Mr. SPEAKER, we have taken care to protect these different interests, and to preserve the rights of this population, by uniting them in the Confederation to a people numbering a million souls of the same origin as themselves. But we are told : " You wish to form a new nationality." Let us come to an understanding on this word, Mr. SPEAKER. What we desire and wish, is to defend the general interests of a great country and of a powerful nation, by means of a central power. On the other hand, we do not wish to do away with our different customs, manners and laws ; on the contrary, those are precisely what we are desirous of protecting in the most complete manner by means of Confederation. Under the new system there will be no more reason than at present to lose our character as French or English, under the pretext that we should all have the same general interests ; and our interests in relation to race, religion and nationality will remain as they

are at the present time. But they will be better protected under the proposed system, and that again is one of the strongest reasons in favor of Confederation. Not only indeed did we assure ourselves of that protection, but the provinces who were parties to the Confederation desired it also. All local interests will be submitted and left to the decision of the local legislatures. There will be other exceptions with respect to Lower Canada, and, in fact, all the exceptions in the scheme of Confederation are in favor of Lower Canada. These restrictions in favor of Lower Canada were obtained by the delegates from that province; but they seek no thanks for their conduct, as they consider that in so doing they only performed a duty—a duty incumbent on all true patriots and good citizens. All that they now come to this House and ask for, is its sanction to the measure which ensures these privileges to the populations which they represent. I may add that, under Confederation, all questions relating to the colonization of our wild lands, and the disposition and sale of those same lands, our civil laws and all measures of a local nature—in fact everything which concerns and affects those interests which are most dear to us as a people, will be reserved for the action of our local legislature; all our charitable and other institutions will be protected by the same authority. There is also the question of education. Upon this question, as upon all others, the Lower Canadian delegates have seen to the preservation of certain privileges, and that question has been left to our Local Legislature, so that the Federal Legislature shall not be able to interfere with it. It has been said that with respect to agriculture the power of legislation would be exercised concurrently by the Federal Legislature and the local legislatures. But the House is perfectly well aware for what reason that concurrent power was allowed. Every one, indeed, is aware that certain general interests may arise respecting which the intervention of the Central Legislature may be necessary; but, Mr. SPEAKER, all interests relating to local agriculture, everything connected with our land will be left under the control of our Lower Canadian Legislature, and this is a point upon which we invariably insisted, and which was never denied us in the Conference. It is thus clear that under Confederation as proposed, the inhabitants of distant parts of the Confederacy, having the privilege of laying their claims before their respective

local legislatures, will not be put to the great trouble of betaking themselves to the central seat of government, when, for instance, they wish to obtain authority to build a bridge or open a road. I now come, Mr. SPEAKER, to the subject of the details of the measure, and I shall reply to the observation of the honorable member for Hochelaga on that subject. That honorable gentleman objects to the appointment of the legislative councillors by the Central Government, and adds that those councillors will be appointed by a Tory government, and will necessarily be selected from among the tories. In making that assertion the honorable member did not act with that frankness which we are entitled to expect from him. (Hear, hear.) He hardly alluded, if he did so at all, to the clause in the resolutions by which the opposition, in the different parts of the Confederation, are protected. In that clause it is provided that the Central Parliament, in making the appointments in question, shall be careful to watch over the interests of the Opposition, as well as over those of the Ministerial party. Now, Mr. SPEAKER, when a government binds itself in this way, is it reasonable and fair to believe or to suppose that it will break its word which has been so solemnly pledged? For my part, I am convinced that the members of the present Government, should they form part of the Central Government, would fulfil what has been promised, and would watch over the rights of the Opposition as over those of the other party. The honorable member for Hochelaga also pretended that the Maritime Provinces had forced upon us the clause which provides that the legislative councillors in the General Parliament shall be appointed by the Crown. Yet, the honorable member right well knows that the elective principle in our existing Legislative Council was merely an experiment, and that in Lower Canada we have become tired of the system, not because the councillors who have been elected by the people are unworthy of the position which they occupy, or because their selection was an unfortunate selection, but because the very nature of the system prevents a large number of men of talent, of men qualified in every respect and worthy to sit in the Legislative Council, from presenting themselves for the suffrages of the electors, in consequence of the trouble, the fatigue and enormous expense resulting from these electoral contests in enormous divisions. We know that the system has wearied Lower Canada,

and that that province will approve of our having inserted the clause in question in the resolutions. The vote which took place last night in another place, shews that I am not mistaken in what I assert on this subject. One of the greatest objections which the honorable member for Hochelaga raises to the appointment of the legislative councillors by the Crown, is that their number will be fixed, and that, by consequence, it will prove an obstacle to the decisions and legislation of the Commons House of the Federal Parliament. In a word, the honorable member declares that the Legislative Council, so constituted, will be, to use an English expression, a nuisance. The honorable member should glance back at the past to consider how many councillors appointed for life there were in the Legislative Council at the time of the concession of the elective principle, and how many of those said councillors remain at the present day. He would have ascertained that in eight years the number had diminished by one-half. Of the forty-two or forty-three members which there were then, there now remain but twenty-one or twenty-two. (Hear, hear.) The honorable member for Hochelaga should also have admitted that in those eight years there had been such considerable changes among the elected councillors, that there was no danger of the Legislative Council not being at least accessible to the people. This diminution gives an average of three members a-year, and if we take the proportion between this diminution and that which would necessarily prevail among a larger number of councillors, we shall find that there will be at least five vacancies in each year. The honorable member must then perceive that, if it should happen that the Legislative Council should be so opposed to the views of the Lower House as systematically to reject the measures of the popular branch of the Legislature, at the end of a year or perhaps less, such changes would be effected by death or otherwise, that we should immediately have such an infusion of new blood, that any attempt of this kind could not be repeated for a long time. Besides, the Legislative Council will not constitute a separate class like the House of Lords in England. The councillors will come from among the people, with whom they will have interests in common, and it is absurd to suppose that they will be induced to oppose systematically and constantly the measures which the Lower House may enact in favor of the people and at their instance. The honorable member for Hochelaga, when on this subject,

reproached the Attorney General for Upper Canada with having stated in his opening speech, that if he had to preside over the selection of the legislative councillors, he would see that the best qualified men were appointed. Now, Mr. SPEAKER, I see nothing in that declaration which is not in the most perfect accordance with the interests of the country, and it is important that the best men from each section of the Confederacy should be called to sit in this important branch of our General Legislature. The honorable member has taken occasion to find fault with the clause of the resolutions which provides that the lieutenant-governors shall be appointed by the Central Government, and sees in it great danger, especially to Lower Canada. Mr. SPEAKER, I should very much like to know what protection the population of the different provinces derive from the fact that the governors of the British North American Provinces are sent out to us from England. Under the existing system, our governor is responsible neither to the people nor to the House; he depends entirely upon the English Government, to which he is responsible. Under the system proposed the lieutenant-governors will be appointed by the Central Government, to which they will necessarily be responsible for their actions. And in that Government we shall have more than one vote; we shall be represented in it by our ministers, who will be there to cause every encroachment or arbitrary act which the lieutenant-governor may allow himself to commit, to be condemned. If the Central Government should refuse to do us this justice, and should persist in not recalling any lieutenant-governor who should have so failed in his duty to the population which he governed, we should have our sixty-five representatives to protest and to vote at need against a government which should dare to act in such a way. In that respect we should have much better guarantees than at present; and in very truth this is a new privilege that we have obtained, as the people will have a voice in these appointments, from the fact that we shall have our responsible ministers in the Central Government, who will be sustained and supported by the members from our section. In allusion to the appointment of the lieutenant-governors, the honorable member for Hochelaga thought proper to make a violent attack upon the Conservative party. He asserted that that party continually sought to diminish the liberties and the privileges of the people, whilst the Liberal party labored to extend and ensure those same

liberties. Well, Mr. SPEAKER, I believe the people know their interests as well as the honorable member for Hochelaga, and that they will not heap reproaches upon us for having given them a Constitution, the object of which is to protect their local and general rights in a much more effectual manner than they are protected under the present system. While thus attacking the Conservative party, the honorable member for Hochelaga did not neglect also to make a slight insinuation against the delegates to the Conference. In fact, he says:—

The Speaker of the Legislative Council will also be appointed by the Crown. This is another retrograde step, and a bit of patronage more for the Government. We have all heard talk of a speech delivered lately in the Island of Prince Edward or in New Brunswick—I forget which—in which the speaker enumerated the advantages which had been flashed in the eyes of the delegates, while they were here, in the shape of appointments which were to be looked for, as those of judges in the Court of Appeals, of Speaker of the Legislative Council, of local governorships, as one of the causes of the unanimity which prevailed among the members of the Conference.

The honorable member must have a very mean opinion of human nature, to suppose that public men, having such great interests entrusted to them, and their own and their country's honor to guard and to keep pure and unsullied in the eyes of the world, would agree to betray and deliver up their country for the love of a poor appointment, even if it were the post of lieutenant-governor or of chief justice. I am willing to believe that that insinuation was a slip of the tongue, and that he is already sorry that it ever escaped from his lips. Another point on which the honorable member for Hochelaga enlarged, is the militia question and the defence of the country. On this head, the honorable member declares that he cannot understand how the union of the provinces is to increase our strength. The experience of the honorable member for Hochelaga and the teachings of history ought, however, to have taught him that a disunited people, scattered over a vast extent of territory, must be an easier conquest than one which is united under a single strong and respected government. This brings me to speak of another observation made by the honorable member, who declared that our best policy, in order to avoid all difficulty with our neighbors, and escape the evils of a war, would be to remain quiet and sit with our arms across. The House will permit me to quote the very expressions of the honorable member on this subject:—

It would be a piece of folly for us to raise a standing army, by way of keeping off an invasion of our frontier. Our best plan is to remain quiet, and to give no pretext to our neighbors for making war on us. Let a healthy state of public opinion be our shield; let not the press violently assail the northern authorities; then if war comes without any fault of ours, it will be our duty to do our best to assist the Mother Country in the struggle which would ensue.

I think, as the honorable member does, that we ought not to give any just cause of dissatisfaction to our neighbors, and still less attack their frontier; and the present Government have given proof, on all occasions, that they are disposed to respect the rights and opinions of the American people. But, on the other hand, the honorable member is the first to inform us that the best means of defending ourselves is, not to be ready and accustomed to the use of arms, but to remain unarmed, with our arms across like men of peace—in plain terms, to give ourselves up, bound hand and foot. Now, I will ask him a plain question. If he were apprehensive of an attack from a neighbor of his, would he go to him and say, "Here I am, do what you please with me," or would he not rather be prepared to meet an attack? I rather think that the honorable member would not be long in making up his mind as to which course he would take. Now, that which is wise and politic in an individual is equally wise and politic in the case of a nation. We are not desirous of assuming a threatening attitude towards our neighbors. On the contrary, our wish is to live with them in peace and quietness. We are anxious not to do the least act which can be construed into a threat; but we should be lamentably blind if, with the enormous military armament of our neighbors before our eyes, we looked at this formidable military display with our arms across, and a careless disregard of its greatness in our hearts. Such an attitude would neither be patriotic nor worthy of a nation of free men. The most certain way to avoid an attack and subjugation by our neighbors, to have our independence and our privileges respected, is to shew them that we are prepared to defend them at any cost. The honorable member for Hochelaga has declared that he is prepared to make some sacrifices to defend the country, but he has not told us how much he is ready to do in that behalf. Perhaps he will let us know at a future time, if we are called upon to spend money for the purpose. However that may be, I must animadvert on the remarks which he has made with regard to the volunteers.

Speaking of the expense which the Government were incurring for the defence of the frontier, he said that 30,000 militiamen would cost thirty millions of dollars! The honorable member has a singular way of calculating. The fact is, if we were under the necessity of raising an army of 30,000 men, we should not pay them at the rate of a dollar, nor even three-quarters of a dollar, a head. The honorable member for Hochelaga knows as well as I do that the militia force now on foot and doing duty at the frontier, or in garrison in the interior, was called out in circumstances altogether exceptional, and that the Government were quite unable to control, to the extent they would perhaps have desired, the rate of pay which was to be allowed. The honorable member must likewise be aware that those brave militiamen gave the greatest proof of their love of country, and in many cases made very great sacrifices to the detriment of their own interest and that of their families. Many of them were employes in commercial houses, some in counting-houses, others in workshops, which gave them much higher remuneration than they are now receiving from the Government, and I consider it very bad taste indeed that any should grudge them their paltry pay, under the pretence that it will be a heavy item on the budget. (Hear, hear.) They did not hesitate, when the country claimed their services, to risk their health and to give up the comforts and delights of home, and I am well assured that the people will not grudge them the miserable half crown which they receive in exchange, and will approve of what the Government has done under the circumstances. The honorable member for Hochelaga reproaches the Government with another misdeed. The truth is that he finds something wrong, some short-coming, in every action of the present Administration. Accordingly, alluding to the right of veto permitted to the General Government, the honorable member expresses himself in this manner: "Thus, if a measure were passed by a majority of a local legislature, and if, nevertheless, the majority of the section of the General Government representing that particular province were opposed to it, would not that section use all their influence in the General Government to throw out that measure?" Before answering the honorable member, Mr. SPEAKER, I think it will be well to refer to the two clauses which relate to that matter. In these clauses we find?—

1. Any bill of the General Parliament may be

reserved in the usual manner for Her Majesty's assent, and any bill of the local legislatures may, in like manner, be reserved for the consideration of the Governor General.

2. Any bill passed by the General Parliament shall be subject to disallowance by Her Majesty within two years, as in the case of bills passed by the legislatures of the said provinces hitherto; and, in like manner, any bill passed by a local legislature shall be subject to disallowance by the Governor General within one year after the passing thereof.

Well, I ask the House, what is wrong in those two clauses? At present, what is our position when a bill has passed the two Houses of our Legislature? It is this: the bill is submitted for the sanction of the Governor General, and in nearly all cases is sanctioned without being referred to the Imperial Government. But if, for instance, the bill relates to a divorce, or to any question which concerns the Imperial Government, or if again it is a measure affecting our relations with our neighbors or any other nation, it is then reserved for Her Majesty's sanction. When a measure is thus reserved, does the honorable member for Hochelaga suppose that the members of the English Government meet to take it into consideration? Not at all; there is in the Colonial Office a second or a third class clerk whose particular business it is, and who makes his report to the minister. This report decides either the sanction or the disallowance of the measure in question. If the measure is highly interesting to the country and is disallowed, we cannot blame any one and must submit, as the English ministry are not responsible to us. Under the Confederation this danger and inconvenience will no longer exist. In a case wherein the Local Government of Lower Canada should pass a law which the Lieutenant-Governor might think fit to reserve for the sanction of the Central Government, if the latter refused their sanction, although it was demanded by the people of the section, and there were no reason for this refusal, we should have our sixty-five members in the Central Parliament to protest against it, and who would unite and make combinations to turn out the ministry who should act in that manner. And you are not to say that those sixty-five members would be powerless against the rest of the House. United in a compact phalanx, they would, without doubt, find support among the members of the other provinces, who would have every reason not to allow our rights and privileges to be infringed, lest they should one day experience the same treatment themselves in

regard to their own. On the other hand, Mr. SPEAKER, the disallowance of a measure sanctioned by the local governments is limited as to time, and must be declared within twelve months, whereas, under the present system, it can be done within two years. This is a restriction which has been granted in favor of Lower Canada and of all the other provinces of the Confederation; it is a restriction favorable to the people, but the honorable member will refuse, no doubt, to acknowledge that this concession to the people is our work. Moreover, why should we be afraid of this veto? In our Local Legislature we assuredly have no intention to be unjust towards a portion of the population, but propose to act towards them, as in times past, as towards equals; we intend, in short, to be as just to that part of the population as we were when they were a feeble element in it. This has not prevented the honorable member for Hochelaga from telling the English members from Lower Canada that they must be on their guard and take care of themselves. Well, Mr. SPEAKER, I shall not offer such an insult to the race to which I belong. The French-Canadians have always acted honorably towards the other races who live among them, and they will certainly not take advantage now, any more than they have done in times past, of the majority they may have in the Local Legislature to molest or persecute the minority. This is the reason why we have no fear nor misgiving relative to the right of veto. Moreover, we are not to suppose that the intention of the two clauses which I have already quoted, is that every bill passed in the local legislatures will be reserved for the sanction of the Central Government. That reservation will take place only in respect of such measures as are now reserved for Her Majesty's sanction. So that the honorable member for Hochelaga is widely mistaken when he reproaches the present Government for having agreed to those two clauses. Another question on which the hon. member has also called us to account, relates to the export duties on timber and coals. In clause 29, which relates to the powers of the Federal Parliament, the third section reads as follows:

The imposition or regulation of duties of customs on imports or exports, except on exports of timber, logs, masts, spars, deals, and sawn lumber from New Brunswick, and of coal and other minerals from Nova Scotia.

The fact that this power has been conferred on the Government does not imply that it will be exercised. The power was granted

simply because it might be necessary in certain cases mentioned. Now this is the reason for the second part of the clause which I have just read to the House, and which I cannot better explain than by citing some expressions of a speech by the Hon. the Minister of Finance on the subject. Nevertheless, as there are several honorable members in the House who do not understand English, I think it will perhaps be better to explain them in French. Here then was the thought of the Convention: as in New Brunswick the Government had found that it was a great disadvantage to collect the duties on timber according to the system formerly adopted, and they had substituted an export duty which superseded all other dues on that product, it was no more than right that this source of revenue should remain in New Brunswick, to which province it was an object of absolute necessity to defray its local expenses. In Canada we retain, under the new Constitution, our own method of collecting similar duties. As to New Brunswick, the duty on the article in question is their principal revenue, as coal is almost the sole revenue of Nova Scotia; and if they had been deprived of them, they would have peremptorily refused to join the Confederation. (Hear, hear.) Their demand was perfectly just, and could not therefore be refused. Moreover, we have no right to complain, for they leave us all our mines and our lands, and we shall now, as heretofore, collect the proceeds for our own use and profit. The honorable member for Hochelaga says that it will be impossible to administer the affairs of the local legislatures without having recourse to direct taxation; but a man of his experience ought not to have made that assertion. Instead of attempting to trade on popular prejudice, he ought to have admitted at once that the right granted by the new Constitution of levying direct taxes, is the same that already exists in the present Constitution; it is the same right that all our municipalities possess. It does not follow that the right will be exercised. But the honorable member knows well that the people are not in favor of direct taxation, and that they would be unwilling to adopt it as a system, in place of indirect taxes; hence his attempt to use it as a bug-bear in order to alarm the people of Lower Canada. We must bear in mind that the proceeds of the local revenue of Lower Canada will be employed in defraying local expenses. The Hon. Minister of Finance has stated that in Lower Canada the local revenue will be \$557,000, besides the 80 cents per

Speaking of the expense which the Government were incurring for the defence of the frontier, he said that 30,000 militiamen would cost thirty millions of dollars! The honorable member has a singular way of calculating. The fact is, if we were under the necessity of raising an army of 30,000 men, we should not pay them at the rate of a dollar, nor even three-quarters of a dollar, a head. The honorable member for Hochelaga knows as well as I do that the militia force now on foot and doing duty at the frontier, or in garrison in the interior, was called out in circumstances altogether exceptional, and that the Government were quite unable to control, to the extent they would perhaps have desired, the rate of pay which was to be allowed. The honorable member must likewise be aware that those brave militiamen gave the greatest proof of their love of country, and in many cases made very great sacrifices to the detriment of their own interest and that of their families. Many of them were employes in commercial houses, some in counting-houses, others in workshops, which gave them much higher remuneration than they are now receiving from the Government, and I consider it very bad taste indeed that any should grudge them their paltry pay, under the pretence that it will be a heavy item on the budget. (Hear, hear.) They did not hesitate, when the country claimed their services, to risk their health and to give up the comforts and delights of home, and I am well assured that the people will not grudge them the miserable half crown which they receive in exchange, and will approve of what the Government has done under the circumstances. The honorable member for Hochelaga reproaches the Government with another misdeed. The truth is that he finds something wrong, some short-coming, in every action of the present Administration. Accordingly, alluding to the right of veto permitted to the General Government, the honorable member expresses himself in this manner: "Thus, if a measure were passed by a majority of a local legislature, and if, nevertheless, the majority of the section of the General Government representing that particular province were opposed to it, would not that section use all their influence in the General Government to throw out that measure?" Before answering the honorable member, Mr. SPEAKER, I think it will be well to refer to the two clauses which relate to that matter. In these clauses we find:—

1. Any bill of the General Parliament may be

reserved in the usual manner for Her Majesty's assent, and any bill of the local legislatures may, in like manner, be reserved for the consideration of the Governor General.

2. Any bill passed by the General Parliament shall be subject to disallowance by Her Majesty within two years, as in the case of bills passed by the legislatures of the said provinces hitherto; and, in like manner, any bill passed by a local legislature shall be subject to disallowance by the Governor General within one year after the passing thereof.

Well, I ask the House, what is wrong in those two clauses? At present, what is our position when a bill has passed the two Houses of our Legislature? It is this: the bill is submitted for the sanction of the Governor General, and in nearly all cases is sanctioned without being referred to the Imperial Government. But if, for instance, the bill relates to a divorce, or to any question which concerns the Imperial Government, or if again it is a measure affecting our relations with our neighbors or any other nation, it is then reserved for Her Majesty's sanction. When a measure is thus reserved, does the honorable member for Hochelaga suppose that the members of the English Government meet to take it into consideration? Not at all; there is in the Colonial Office a second or a third class clerk whose particular business it is, and who makes his report to the minister. This report decides either the sanction or the disallowance of the measure in question. If the measure is highly interesting to the country and is disallowed, we cannot blame any one and must submit, as the English ministry are not responsible to us. Under the Confederation this danger and inconvenience will no longer exist. In a case wherein the Local Government of Lower Canada should pass a law which the Lieutenant-Governor might think fit to reserve for the sanction of the Central Government, if the latter refused their sanction, although it was demanded by the people of the section, and there were no reason for this refusal, we should have our sixty-five members in the Central Parliament to protest against it, and who would unite and make combinations to turn out the ministry who should act in that manner. And you are not to say that those sixty-five members would be powerless against the rest of the House. United in a compact phalanx, they would, without doubt, find support among the members of the other provinces, who would have every reason not to allow our rights and privileges to be infringed, lest they should one day experience the same treatment themselves in

regard to their own. On the other hand, Mr. SPEAKER, the disallowance of a measure sanctioned by the local governments is limited as to time, and must be declared within twelve months, whereas, under the present system, it can be done within two years. This is a restriction which has been granted in favor of Lower Canada and of all the other provinces of the Confederation; it is a restriction favorable to the people, but the honorable member will refuse, no doubt, to acknowledge that this concession to the people is our work. Moreover, why should we be afraid of this veto? In our Local Legislature we assuredly have no intention to be unjust towards a portion of the population, but propose to act towards them, as in times past, as towards equals; we intend, in short, to be as just to that part of the population as we were when they were a feeble element in it. This has not prevented the honorable member for Hochelaga from telling the English members from Lower Canada that they must be on their guard and take care of themselves. Well, Mr. SPEAKER, I shall not offer such an insult to the race to which I belong. The French-Canadians have always acted honorably towards the other races who live among them, and they will certainly not take advantage now, any more than they have done in times past, of the majority they may have in the Local Legislature to molest or persecute the minority. This is the reason why we have no fear nor misgiving relative to the right of veto. Moreover, we are not to suppose that the intention of the two clauses which I have already quoted, is that every bill passed in the local legislatures will be reserved for the sanction of the Central Government. That reservation will take place only in respect of such measures as are now reserved for Her Majesty's sanction. So that the honorable member for Hochelaga is widely mistaken when he reproaches the present Government for having agreed to those two clauses. Another question on which the hon. member has also called us to account, relates to the export duties on timber and coals. In clause 29, which relates to the powers of the Federal Parliament, the third section reads as follows:

The imposition or regulation of duties of customs on imports or exports, except on exports of timber, logs, masts, spars, deals, and sawn lumber from New Brunswick, and of coal and other minerals from Nova Scotia.

The fact that this power has been conferred on the Government does not imply that it will be exercised. The power was granted

simply because it might be necessary in certain cases mentioned. Now this is the reason for the second part of the clause which I have just read to the House, and which I cannot better explain than by citing some expressions of a speech by the Hon. the Minister of Finance on the subject. Nevertheless, as there are several honorable members in the House who do not understand English, I think it will perhaps be better to explain them in French. Here then was the thought of the Convention: as in New Brunswick the Government had found that it was a great disadvantage to collect the duties on timber according to the system formerly adopted, and they had substituted an export duty which superseded all other dues on that product, it was no more than right that this source of revenue should remain in New Brunswick, to which province it was an object of absolute necessity to defray its local expenses. In Canada we retain, under the new Constitution, our own method of collecting similar duties. As to New Brunswick, the duty on the article in question is their principal revenue, as coal is almost the sole revenue of Nova Scotia; and if they had been deprived of them, they would have peremptorily refused to join the Confederation. (Hear, hear.) Their demand was perfectly just, and could not therefore be refused. Moreover, we have no right to complain, for they leave us all our mines and our lands, and we shall now, as heretofore, collect the proceeds for our own use and profit. The honorable member for Hochelaga says that it will be impossible to administer the affairs of the local legislatures without having recourse to direct taxation; but a man of his experience ought not to have made that assertion. Instead of attempting to trade on popular prejudice, he ought to have admitted at once that the right granted by the new Constitution of levying direct taxes, is the same that already exists in the present Constitution; it is the same right that all our municipalities possess. It does not follow that the right will be exercised. But the honorable member knows well that the people are not in favor of direct taxation, and that they would be unwilling to adopt it as a system, in place of indirect taxes; hence his attempt to use it as a bug-bear in order to alarm the people of Lower Canada. We must bear in mind that the proceeds of the local revenue of Lower Canada will be employed in defraying local expenses. The Hon. Minister of Finance has stated that in Lower Canada the local revenue will be \$557,000, besides the 80 cents per

head of the population to be paid each year, in half-yearly payments in advance, by the Federal Government. This subsidy will, therefore, amount to \$888,000, making a total of \$1,446,000 for the local requirements of Lower Canada. I am aware that the honorable member has cast a doubt upon the accuracy of the figures set down by the Hon. Minister of Finance, and attempted to show that the local revenue would not be as large; but the figures I shall give are taken from the Public Accounts, and I think it will be admitted that they must be considered to be correct. At all events, here are the figures I have gathered from an examination of the official documents:—

Expenses other than those of the legislature and of the local debt of Lower Canada.....	\$ 997,000
Cost of legislation.....	150,000
Interest on local debt.....	90,000
Total.....	\$1,237,000

Now the revenue of Lower Canada will be as follows, taking the present figures and without adding the probable increase:—

Slide dues.....	\$ 49,040
Casual.....	4,000
Quebec Fire Loan.....	294
Fines, &c.....	341
Tax on judicial proceedings.....	91,731
Cullers' fees, measuring timber....	79,960
Interest on Municipal Loan Fund..	114,889
Court houses, Lower Canada.....	25,892
Jury and building fund, L. C.....	29,710
L. C. municipal fund.....	38,752
Common school lands.....	128,340
Tavern licenses applied to L. C. municipal fund.....	3,962
Crown lands.....	206,512
Total revenue.....	771,823
80c per head of population.....	888,888
	1,660,712
Less:—Interest on municipal loan fund, and proceeds of school lands.....	243,129
Leaving a net revenue of....	\$1,417,582

Now it is evident that these figures agree with the calculations of the Honorable Finance Minister, less a difference of \$20,000 to \$25,000. Lower Canada will have a revenue of nearly \$1,500,000, and the excess of its revenue over expenditure, according to the calculations of the Honorable the Finance Minister, will be \$209,000.

HON. MR. DORION—Why do you deduct the revenue from the Municipal Loan Fund?

Is it because Lower Canada is to be charged with the payment of the Municipal Loan Fund debt?

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—I strike out the item of revenue from the common school lands, because in the course of time the lands will become exhausted, and the revenue cannot be considered as permanent. Besides, the amount must be added to the Common School Fund, and cannot really be considered as an ordinary source of revenue. It is the same as regards the Municipal Loan Fund, which cannot be considered as permanent revenue, and I wish to count only the ordinary items of revenue. But, on the other hand, it must be seen that many of the items of revenue will increase in course of time, so that the surplus of revenue over expenditure in Lower Canada will always be considerable.

HON. MR. DORION—The honorable member did not understand my question. I asked him whether Lower Canada will be compelled to pay the municipal debt, and he has not answered.

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—I understood the honorable gentleman perfectly well, but I make it a rule never to allow myself to be turned aside by interruptions, and I shall not depart from that rule now. (Hear, hear.) The figures I have given are highly important, for they demonstrate that Lower Canada will have a real revenue under the new Constitution—a revenue which is not calculated upon the probable increase and prosperity of the country, but upon the present revenue—of nearly \$1,500,000, to meet local expenses. And yet, in the face of these figures, which are based upon the most evident facts, honorable members talk of direct taxes. They simply want to frighten the country. But the people will see that there is no danger of direct taxation with the surplus revenue we shall have. Direct taxation must be resorted to if Lower Canada should give way to extravagance and spend more than her means, but not otherwise. Lower Canada will have a revenue sufficient to meet all its expenses, unless it follow the example of a person with an income of £400, who should expend £1,000. The total expenses of Lower Canada for all purposes, less the cost of legislation and the payment of interest on the local debt, will be \$997,000, calculating the expenditure upon the present basis. But it is evident that Lower Canada will reduce its expenditure, such for instance as the expenditure connected with the Crown Lands department, and that economy will be prac-

tised in order, at a future period, to meet the expenses of local works, without rendering it necessary to defer other necessary items of expenditure. The expenses of the local legislation of Lower Canada may be set down at \$150,000, and that is a reasonable estimate if we remember that all questions of general interest are to be discussed and regulated by the Federal Parliament, and that the local legislatures will only have to deal with questions of local interest. It is clear that the sessions will be far shorter than they are at present, and far less expensive. Every one will admit that under the present system long discussions do not take place in the House on private bills and measures of local interest, which are discussed in committees, but that such discussions occur on questions of a general interest, such as railways, taxation, the tariff, Confederation, and that these are the discussions which prolong the session. I say, moreover, that the interest on the portion of the public debt to be assigned to us will be about \$90,000, and that our total yearly expenditure will reach \$1,237,000, leaving us a surplus revenue of \$209,000. I trust Lower Canada will have the prudence to set apart a large portion of the \$209,000, in order to carry out hereafter local works and improvements without being compelled to touch its yearly revenue.

MR. DUFRESNE (Iberville)—The surplus can be put out at interest! (Laughter.)

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—The honorable member for Hochelaga feigns great uneasiness as to the position of Lower Canada in the Confederation, as well as to the matter of direct taxes. He spoke at great length as to the prosperous financial position of Lower Canada when she entered the union in 1841; but we must remember that before the union the revenue of Lower Canada was but \$530,000, and that, nevertheless, she was compelled to provide for all local expenses and many items of general expense which, under the Confederation, will fall within the domain of the Federal Government, such, for instance, as the payment of the salaries of the judges, etc. Under the Confederation Lower Canada will have a surplus of over \$200,000 on its local expenditure, even though the present expenditure should not be reduced. The honorable member for Hochelaga also said that the share of the debt apportioned to Lower Canada, apart from the general debt, would be \$4,500,000. He must have made serious errors in his calculations in order to arrive at such a result. The debt of the two Canadas at the present moment, deducting the Sinking

Fund, is \$67,263,000; comparing the calculation of the honorable member with that put forth by him in his address to his electors in 1863, I find he has arrived at a perfectly different result, and he has no right to accuse others of being in error. Thus, in his address he states that apart from the then debt, \$16,000,000 would be required for the Intercolonial Railway, and yet he now asserts that it would take twenty millions.

HON. MR. DORION—It was the President of the Council who said it.

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—The honorable member should not trust to the calculations of the President of the Council, since he himself has stated that nothing good can come from this side of the House. But the fact is the honorable member was anxious not to frighten the people at that time, and therefore it was that he spoke of sixteen millions, whereas now he speaks of twenty. With regard to the amount of the public debt, the Hon. Minister of Finance has given us figures taken from the most reliable sources, and I prefer adopting his figures to following those of the honorable member for Hochelaga. The Hon. Minister of Finance told us that the total debt of the two Canadas, without counting the Sinking Fund, was \$67,263,000, and that the Federal Government would undertake \$62,500,000. There will therefore remain about \$4,763,000 to be divided between Upper and Lower Canada, and if Lower Canada takes for its share \$4,500,000 as the honorable member stated, there will only remain about \$263,000 for Upper Canada! I do not see how the honorable gentleman has managed to arrive at such a result, for it is clearly erroneous.

HON. MR. DORION—Let the Honorable Solicitor General apply to the Honorable Minister of Finance, and he will get the explanation.

HON. SOLICITOR GENERAL LANGEVIN—It is evident that the honorable member for Hochelaga, in his calculation of the apportionment of the residue of the debt between Upper and Lower Canada, has put a 4 in place of a 1 or 2, in the same way that he put 20 in place of 16 in the matter of the Intercolonial Railway. In his anxiety to find fault he sees double, and instead of seeing five millions to be divided, he sees nine. The debt devolving upon Lower Canada will not be \$4,500,000. Lower Canada will have only its just share of the five millions to be divided.

HON. MR. DORION—The honorable member has forgotten the explanations of the Honorable Minister of Finance, who stated

that the debt incurred for the redemption of the seigniorial tenure, which amounts to three millions, was not included in the general debt.

HON. SOLICITOR GENERAL LANGEVIN—The Minister of Finance stated the whole debt, in his speech at Sherbrooke, at \$67,263,994. The amount of the debt is \$75,578,000; but it is necessary to deduct the Sinking Fund and cash in bank, \$7,132,068, reducing it to \$68,445,932; the Minister of Finance also deducted the Common School Fund, which amounts to \$1,181,958, and he arrived at the result I have just given, that is to say, that the real debt of Canada is \$67,263,994. I do not give all the items of the public debt, for I do not think it devolves upon me to prove that the calculations of the Finance Minister are not correct; that is the task of those who accuse him of error; and the Public Accounts are there to shew that the Finance Minister has stated nothing but the truth. The honorable member for Hochelaga has manifested excessive anxiety respecting the financial position of the Confederation; but in this case also we have the same guarantees as for that of the local governments. He asserted, for instance, that Newfoundland was too poor to contribute to the revenue of the Confederation, and that, in place of receiving anything from that province, we shall be compelled to send down money to prevent the people of the island from perishing by cold. The honorable gentleman is, nevertheless, well aware that Newfoundland has a large revenue, a revenue of \$480,000, and that its expenses are less than its income. Newfoundland will receive its share from the Federal chest, but it will also contribute to the general revenue. While I am considering this portion of the honorable gentleman's speech, I must admit that it is the strongest argument in behalf of Confederation, from the standpoint of the Lower Provinces, that could be brought forward; and, for my part, I desire to see thousands of copies of his speech sent to those provinces, for his object clearly is to shew that the measure would be entirely to their advantage. He has attempted to shew that they will have a larger revenue than they have at present; but he omitted to state that Lower Canada would have \$200,000 over and above her expenses. He knows perfectly well that the total revenue of the provinces forms a sum of \$14,223,320, for 1864, and that the total expenditure amounted only to \$13,350,832, so that there is a surplus of \$872,488, apart from the revenue from increase of im-

ports in 1864. The financial position is therefore highly favorable for the formation of a Confederation. The honorable member for Hochelaga stated that New Brunswick would have a surplus of \$34,000 over its expenditure, and he complains, upon that ground, of the subsidy of \$63,000 it is proposed to pay that province during ten years. But every one is aware that the subsidy is to be paid because that province gives up all its revenues to the Federal Government, except that derived from its export duty on timber; that was the reason its delegates insisted on the payment of the subsidy during ten years, and they were right. The honorable member also stated that Prince Edward Island was to receive \$48,000 more than its expenses. But how comes it then that Prince Edward Island has hitherto exhibited reluctance? It must be that that province takes a different view from the honorable member. The truth, however, is that Prince Edward Island, like the other provinces, was treated with justice and equity by the Quebec Conference, that its local requirements were considered, and that a sufficient revenue to provide for them was awarded to it. The honorable member for Hochelaga, who spoke in English, took that opportunity to make a violent appeal to the members from Upper Canada, and told them that there would be enormous imposts, and that two-thirds of the revenue and of the taxes would be paid by them. He did well to speak in English, for I am certain that he would not make the same assertion in French in the presence of the members from Lower Canada; he would make no appeal of that nature, and I regret it, for that would give us the best of reasons for entering into the Confederation; but I must acknowledge that that statement of the honorable member is not exactly correct, for the basis of the Confederation is justice to all. The honorable member for Hochelaga also said, in order to produce an effect upon the members from Upper Canada, that the extension of the Confederation westward was a farce, "an absurd affair," because the western provinces do not even think of it, and because we have no communication with that territory.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—We must go round Cape Horn! (Laughter.)

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—Since the question of Confederation has been raised, papers have arrived from Victoria (Vancouver's Island) and from British Columbia, and they all agree in saying that it is to their

advantage to unite themselves with the provinces for all general business, reserving to themselves the management of their local affairs. I quote as follows from one of the journals in question :—

Whatever may be the result of the present attempts to form a Confederation of the North American Colonies, we may be certain of one thing, and that is, that but few years will pass away before the accomplishment of a plan of this nature. Half a dozen provinces lying adjacent to each other, and subject to one and the same power, having different tariffs, exhibit a state of affairs which, from its very nature, cannot continue long. However, setting aside this anomaly, we find North American Colonies for which a more vast political career must be provided. The people have too long labored under the weight of disabilities which, by wounding their pride, have placed them in a humiliating position before the eyes of the whole world. With all the advantages of responsible government granted to him by the Imperial authorities, after years of strife and trials, the colonist hardly possesses one half the national privileges enjoyed by an Englishman. He is deprived of his share of patronage even in cases in which he is entitled to it and is eminently worthy of it. The position of Colonial Governor is seldom or never granted to him, and in many parts of Her Majesty's dominions he is forbidden to practise his profession in the courts of justice. We therefore hail this initiative taken by the Canadian Government as the commencement of the regeneration of the colonists, who have hitherto remained in pupillage. With a confederation of colonies extending from one ocean to the other, what limits shall we assign to our greatness, our material progress and our political aspirations? Instead of seeing the talent of our statesmen fettered, harassed and restrained within the narrow limits of local politics, we shall find its scope extended to a whole continent, while a more vast and natural field will be thrown open to the active and enterprising spirit of the North American Provinces. Want of space prevents our entering upon this question at greater length to-day; but we hope that the movement will succeed, and will allow us at no distant day to emerge from the isolated and feeble position in which we now are, to become a part of the great British North American Confederation.

That is the language of one of the newspapers of those colonies. What has the hon. member to say to it? I hope I shall be forgiven for reading some more extracts from these journals, which we do not read here as much as we ought to do, although they are of a nature to give us information respecting that part of British North America. Another paper says :—

There is then but one course left for the Eng-

lish colonies, and more especially the North American and Australian colonies. Before ten years have passed over our heads, the population of the colonies comprised between Vancouver's Island and Newfoundland will be hardly less than six millions of souls, occupying a territory as large as that of the United States before the civil war, and in extent greater than three-fourths of the continent of Europe. With telegraphic communication and railways from one ocean to the other, with a Federal union, in which will be combined and concentrated all the talent of the colonies, and the object of which will be to represent the various interests of those colonies, what country has before it a more splendid future than this immense Confederation, with its innumerable and inexhaustible resources?

I shall not occupy any further time in quoting from these journals, but I wished to demonstrate that the plan of Confederation is not only a plan of political men in their extremity, as was said by the hon. member for Hochelaga, but that the provinces give in their adherence to it, because they perceive that it will be advantageous to them. As to the facilities for communication, I shall quote an excellent authority—Professor HIND—to show that they are not so limited as the hon. member declares them to be. The following is from an essay by Professor HIND on the subject of the North-West Territory :—

The Canadian emigrant party assembled at Fort Garry, in June, 1862, travelling thither by Detroit, La Crosse, St. Paul, and Fort Abercrombie, by rail, stage and steamer. At Fort Garry they separated into two parties; the first division contained about one hundred emigrants, the second division, sixty-five persons. The first party took the northern route, by Carlton to Edmonton; the second, the southern trail. At Edmonton they all changed their carts for horses and oxen, and went thence in a straight line to the Leather Pass (lat. 54°), through which they took 130 oxen, and about 70 horses. They suddenly found themselves on the head waters of the Fraser river, and so gentle was the ascent that the only means they had of knowing that they had passed the dividing ridge of the Rocky Mountains was by unexpectedly observing the waters of the rivers flowing to the westward. When in the mountains they killed a few oxen for provisions; others were sold to the Indians at Tête Jaune Cache, on the Fraser river, and others were rafted down the Fraser to the forks of the Quesnelle. At Tête Jaune Cache a portion of the party separated from the rest, and, with fourteen horses, went across the country by an old well-worn trail, to Thompson's river, and thus succeeded in taking their horses from Fort Garry through the Rocky Mountains—through a supposed impassable part of British Columbia—to the wintering station on Thomp-

son's river for the pack animals of the British Columbia gold-seekers. With this party of more than 150 people were a woman and three little children. The little children were well cared for, for the emigrants took a cow with them, and these infant travellers were supplied with milk all the way on their long journey to the Leather Pass in the Rocky Mountains. I look upon the successful journey of the Canadian emigrants in 1862, across the continent, as an event in the history of Central British America of unexampled importance. It cannot fail to open the eyes of all thinking men to the singular natural features of the country which formed the scene of this remarkable journey. Probably there is no other continuous stretch of country in the world, exceeding 1,000 miles in length, and wholly in a state of nature, which it would be possible for 100 people, including a woman and three children, to traverse during a single short season, and successfully, and indeed easily overcome such apparently formidable obstacles as the Rocky Mountains have been supposed to present.

On a review of what is now known of Central British America, the following facts cannot fail to arrest the attention and occupy the thoughts of those who think it worth while to consider its future, and its possible relation to ourselves during the next and succeeding generations.

We find in the great basin of Lake Winnipeg an area of cultivable land equal to three times the area of this province, and equal to the available land for agricultural settlement in the province of Canada. It is watered by great lakes, as large as Lake Ontario; and by a vast river, which in summer is navigable to within sight of the Rocky Mountains. It contains inexhaustible supplies of iron, lignite, coal, salt, and much gold. It has a seaport within 350 miles, *viz* the Nelson River, of Hudson Bay, which is accessible for three months in the year for steamers.

This great basin contains the only area left on the American continent where a new nation can spring into existence.

This is a complete refutation of the statement made by the hon. member for Hochelaga, that communication with those colonies is impossible. In a part of the lecture from which I have just quoted, Professor HIND says that, between Lake Superior and the Lake of the Woods, the distance is only about 200 miles, and when once that is got over, an immense valley more than a thousand miles in length is attained—a magnificent valley, which may form part of the Confederacy and provide an outlet for our population. The hon. member for Hochelaga also told us, that if we accepted Confederation we should subsequently be drawn into a legislative union; but he well knows that by the Constitution which is submitted to this House, the question of a Federal union only is mooted. If at a subsequent

period our descendants should choose to have a legislative union, that will be their affair and not ours; if they do choose to have it, it will be because they will then be strong enough to have nothing to fear. Further, without entering into all the details relating to the position, as to religion, of Lower Canada in the Confederation, I must call attention to the fact that the total population of all the provinces, in 1861, was 3,300,000 souls, and of these the total number of Catholics amounted to 1,494,000. Thus they will be numerous enough to protect their religious and other interests; and those interests will be in a position of safety in the local legislatures. We do not seek to be allowed privileges which others have not; we only wish that our rights may be respected as we respect those of others. French-Canadians are not, have never been, and will not become persecutors either in political or religious matters under the Confederation. I appeal to men belonging to other religions to say whether we have ever proved unjust or persecutors to them. That part of the population of Lower Canada which is of foreign origin will have nothing to fear under the Local Government, any more than we shall have anything to fear under the Federal Government. But in consideration of what has been said by the honorable members for Hochelaga and Lotbinière, and of the mistrust which they have endeavored to create in the minds of the French-Canadian and Catholic population of Lower Canada, I think the House will allow me to read an extract from a letter written by His Grace the Archbishop of Halifax, who is likely to understand the interests of the Catholic population quite as well as the two honorable members in question. This is the reply which he makes to those who pretended that we had reason to fear invasion of the country by the Fenians:—

If there be fifty thousand men already prepared to invade this country, as you admit, instead of laboring to keep us in our present disjointed and defenceless position, you should rather call on all to unite where a single man cannot be dispensed with, and gird on our armor for the rencontre. If responsible government, which the great and good men of this country won for us, be a precious heirloom on the lilliputian scale on which we now find it, instead of bartering it away for nothing by Confederation, as you say, we shall rather, in my opinion, add to its lustre and value, and ennoble and enrich it, and make it boundlessly grander and more secure for ourselves and those who are to come after us. We obtained

responsible government from the Mother Country, in whose legislative halls we had not a single member to represent us. We are now, on the contrary, asking to transfer the rich and prized deposit to a place which will be a part only of our common country, where our voice must be heard, and where we will have a fuller and fairer representation than the city of London or Liverpool, or Bristol, can boast of in their English House of Commons; and this is the great difference between obtaining from England what we had not, and transferring what we now have, in order to make it more valuable and more available for our own purposes, and by far more secure. Confederation, therefore, instead of depriving us of the privileges of self-government, is the only practical and reliable guarantee for its continuance. We are too small to be warranted in the hope of being able to hold it always on the strength of our own resources; and England, if not too weak, is certainly too prudent and too cautious to risk her last shilling and her last man in a country where, instead of a population of four millions, she will have scarcely one-tenth of that number to help her against the united power of a whole continent. To deny, therefore, the obvious advantages of Confederation, you must first prove that union is not strength—that England under the heptarchy, and France under the feudal chief and barons, were greater and stronger and happier than they now are as the two greatest nations of the world.

Here, again, is what he says in answer to those who will have nothing to do with defence, under the pretext that we have nothing to fear from our neighbors:—

No nation ever had the power of conquest that did not use it, or abuse it, at the very first favorable opportunity.

All that is said of the magnanimity and forbearance of mighty nations, can be explained on the principle of sheer expediency, as the world knows. The whole face of Europe has been changed, and the dynasties of many hundred years have been swept away within our own time, on the principle of might alone—the oldest, the strongest, and, as some would have it, the most sacred of all titles. The thirteen states of America, with all their professions of self-denial, have been all the time, by money-power, and by war, and by negotiation extending their frontier, until they more than quadrupled their territory within sixty years; and believe it who may, are they now, of their own accord, to come to a full stop? No; as long as they have the power they must go onward, for it is the very nature of power to grip whatever is within its reach. It is not their hostile feelings, therefore, but it is their power, and only their power I dread.

In reply to those who declare that the best defence we can have is no defence at all, he says:—

To be fully prepared is the only practical

argument that can have weight with a powerful enemy, and make him pause beforehand and count the cost. And as the sort of preparation I speak of is utterly hopeless without the union of the provinces, so at a moment when public opinion is being formed on this vital point, as one deeply concerned, I feel it a duty to declare myself unequivocally in favour of Confederation as cheaply and as honorably obtained as possible, but Confederation at all hazards and at all reasonable sacrifices.

After the most mature consideration, and all the arguments I have heard on both sides for the last month, these are my inmost convictions on the necessity and the merits of a measure which alone, under Providence, can secure to us social order and peace, and rational liberty and all the blessings we now enjoy under the mildest government and the hallowed institutions of the freest and happiest country in the world.

I will now draw your attention to a short letter from the Roman Catholic Bishop of Newfoundland, which has not yet been read in the House, but which has just been published in the newspapers:—

ST. JOHNS, Jan. 5th, 1865.

MY DEAR SIR,—In reply to your communication of this date, I beg to state that I took no notes of the observations I made at the last examination of the youth of St. Bonaventure's College. I distinctly remember, however, that among other arguments I used to impress on parents and scholars the necessity of education, one was, that according to the tendency of the age, a union of all the British North American Provinces would take place, if not immediately, by the force of circumstances in a few years; and that such a union would have an extraordinary influence on the rising generation in Newfoundland. People were in the habit of saying that education of a high class was useless in this country, as the field was too limited. I repudiated that idea altogether. Newfoundlanders were not confined to this island, the British Empire and the States were open to them. Wherever the English language was spoken, there was an opening for an educated Newfoundlander. But independently of that, the Confederation of the Provinces would open up a home-market for education and talent—a market increasing every year, and of which at present we can form no conception. The bar, for example, would be open to all; the Central Legislature would open up a great field for political ability; the highest offices of the law and the government would be open to Newfoundlanders as well as to Canadians or Nova Scotians; and I hope that they would be found perfectly qualified by education to take their places, side by side, with their fellow-confederates, and compete for the prizes the Confederation would hold out to them, on terms of perfect equality. I sincerely believe that they could do so, as, from my experience, I considered that the youth of this country have as fine talents,

and as great an adaptability for learning, as I have seen in any part of the world; and that I never saw, in any part of Europe, boys acquitting themselves better (and in many cases not so well) than they did at the preparatory examinations and the present exhibition. This, so far as I recollect, was the substance of the remarks I made on the *fact*, immediate or prospective, of the Provincial Confederation.

Thus, whilst some honorable members seek to alarm Lower Canada by asserting that our religion and our nationality are in danger, here we have an Archbishop and a Bishop declaring themselves strongly in favor of Confederation, and who do not see in it any danger for their flocks. And it is well known, even here, that the whole of the estimable and most respected body of the clergy, from those of the highest rank down to the very humblest of their followers, are in favor of Confederation. But the honorable member for Hochelaga, for the purpose of frightening Lower Canada, has told us that we should very soon have a legislative union, and that in that case the fifty French-Canadian members from Lower Canada would coalesce with the minority of the Federal Parliament, with the view of obstructing the working of the Government. Well, what better proof could we have that we have nothing to fear, and that we shall not be exposed to danger under Confederation? History is before us to prove that there will always be an opposition, and that if an attempt is made to oppress any one section of the Confederation, its representatives would unite in a body with the minority, and having thereby constituted a majority, would prevent any injustice on the part of the Federal Government. I beg to thank the hon. member for having, against his will, furnished me with so strong an argument in favor of Confederation. The hon. member then appealed to the national passions and the prejudices of race. He told us that the Protestant minority in Lower Canada would have to seek protection against the majority of that section. I repeat it, he made that assertion in English, and would not repeat it in French. But what treatment did the minority receive in Lower Canada when she had a separate Parliament? Did not the French-Canadian majority always exercise liberality towards our fellow-countrymen whose origin and religion was different from ours? Thank God, our race is not a persecuting race; it has ever been liberal and tolerant. The hon.

member for Lotbinière (Mr. JOLY) has also appealed to the religious and national prejudices of the English minority of Lower Canada, but he ought to remember that there is no more danger for the English race in Lower Canada than for any other, and that he was the very last member of the House who ought to appeal to religious or national prejudices.

MR. JOLY—Mr. SPEAKER, I beg leave to correct the honorable member.

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—The hon. gentleman can speak presently.

MR. JOLY—But any member may correct another when he has been made to say the very reverse of what he did say.

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—Mr. SPEAKER, I call the hon. gentleman to order. I have not found fault with his having spoken for three hours. I did not interrupt him whilst he spoke, and consequently I do not choose to be interrupted myself. I do not wish to put words into his mouth which he has not uttered, but I wish to have it understood that he made an appeal to the English of Lower Canada, calling upon them to reflect on the fate of their race and their religion, when he read an extract from the report of Lord DURHAM, the hon. gentleman took very good care to read it in English only—

MR. JOLY—I protest against the language of the hon. member, and I claim the right to explain.

MR. J. B. E. DORION—It is not so; the hon. member for Lotbinière did not appeal to religious prejudices.

MR. JOLY—I desire to know, Mr. SPEAKER, whether the hon. member is to be allowed to assert that I said what I did not say?

MR. SPEAKER—The hon. member for Lotbinière is entitled to explain his language, or to correct the Solicitor General after he has finished speaking.

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—I have the floor, and I claim to be heard without further interruption.

MR. J. B. E. DORION—Go on; but state correctly what a member may have said.

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—The hon. gentleman is not pleased that an attack should be made on one of his friends, and yet he was by no means displeased at the language used by the hon. member for Lotbinière last night when speaking of my colleague the Hon. Attorney General. At all events I will not be interrupted.

MR. J. B. E. DORION—This is the sort of justice to be expected from the other side of the House.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—You may speak when you like; you can speak when your turn comes, but we shall not listen to you.

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—I assert then that the hon. member for Lotbinière has appealed to the passions, seeking to have it believed on the one hand that French Canadian nationality and the Catholic religion would be endangered by Confederation, and on the other hand that English nationality and the Protestant religion would be exposed to danger in Lower Canada under the local government. He cited in the English language the report of Lord DURHAM, to induce the belief that the English of Lower Canada would never consent to submit to a legislature, the majority of which would be French-Canadian; but for my part I am not of that opinion, and I think that they will submit to it, because they are sure that they will be treated with justice. It ill became that hon. gentleman to make this statement, when he is himself elected for a county exclusively Catholic, which has not hesitated to entrust him with its interests. He ought not to have made this appeal, as he himself is a living proof of the religious tolerance and liberality of our compatriots. Neither did it become the hon. member for Hochelaga to speak as he did to the same effect, when we have seen a large and important electoral division—the division of Laurentides—reject a venerable gentleman who presented himself for re-election to the Legislative Council, a man who had been in political life for more than twenty-five years, to elect in his place an English Protestant, Mr. PRICE, although there were not 1,500 Protestants in the whole division, out of a population of 50,000 souls. The election of the member for the county of Megantic (Mr. IRVINE) is yet another evidence of the liberality of our fellow-countrymen, the majority of the residents in that county being French-Canadians and Catholics.

MR. J. B. E. DORION—It was not they who sent him here.

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—On the contrary, but for their votes he would not have been returned to Parliament for that county. I may further say, Mr. SPEAKER, that the presence here of the hon. member for Shefford (Hon. Mr. HUNTINGTON), that

of the member for Chateauguy (Hon. Mr. HOLTON), and the presence of several other members afford abundant proof of the liberality of our fellow-countrymen, because those honorable members, although English and Protestant, represent counties the great majority of the population in each of which is French-Canadian and Catholic. The English have always been dealt with more liberally than the hon. member for Hochelaga himself would, perhaps, treat us were he in power. We did not require the aid of the hon. members for Hochelaga and Lotbinière for the protection of the minorities in the Conference. We were the first to demand that justice should be extended to the Catholics of Upper Canada and the Protestants of Lower Canada, because we desired to establish a solid work, and not to build on the sand an edifice which would crumble to dust the next day. The English of Lower Canada will not be excited by the appeals of the hon. members, because they know that whatever they can justly claim will be conceded to them without difficulty and with all good will. Mr. SPEAKER, although it is with great regret that I have to ask the continued attention of the House, at this late period of the evening, yet such is the great importance of the question before us, that I venture to hope that the House will pardon me for presenting at such length my views on this matter. I may be permitted, I hope, to refute another assertion made by the honorable member for Hochelaga. That honorable member, who has found something to censure in every article of the scheme of Confederation, conceived that he produced an argument that would be irresistible by asserting that the distribution of the debt was unfair and burdensome to Lower Canada. To give a greater force to this argument, he stated that Lower Canada entered into the union with a debt of \$400,000, and that she would leave it with a burden of \$30,000,000, after having only expended in the interval the sum of \$12,000,000 for public works within her limits. This argument is most specious. Supposing that our debt was \$400,000, and that to-day it is \$30,000,000, the honorable member must at all events admit that the circumstances also have very much changed. At the time of the union our population was only 630,000, and to-day it is 1,250,000. The honorable member, too, must not forget that at the time of the union our territory only produced 21,000,000

bushels of grain, whilst to-day it produces more than 50,000,000 bushels. At the time of the union we had only 1,298 schools, and to-day we have 3,600. At the time of the union these schools were attended only by 39,000 children, whilst to-day they are attended by more than 200,000. At the union the exportations from the ports of Quebec and Montreal amounted to \$9,000,000; to-day they exceed \$18,000,000. At the union the number of vessels built annually in our shipyards was 48 only; now we have 88, and the tonnage is quadrupled. At the time of the union our importations amounted to \$10,000,000, and to-day they reach \$45,000,000. At the time of the union our exportations and importations amounted to \$16,000,000; to-day they reach the enormous sum of \$87,000,000. And it is with such figures as these before us that we are to be told that we are leaving the union with a debt of \$30,000,000! At the time of the union the revenue arising from the tax on bank-notes, which affords a fair indication of the extent of business done, amounted to \$2,200; to-day it amounts to \$15,800. At the time of the union the number of merchantmen arriving in Quebec every year was 1,000; now it is 1,660, and the number of vessels arriving at all the ports in Lower Canada is 2,463. At the time of the union the tonnage of these vessels was 295,000 tons, and now in the port of Quebec it is 807,000 tons, and for the whole of Lower Canada 1,041,000 tons. At the time of the union 25,000 sailors arrived here annually; now we have 35,000. In 1839 the revenue of Lower Canada was \$588,000; when we enter the Confederacy, although we are not called upon to pay any of the expenditure for general purposes, our revenue will be \$1,446,000, that is to say that we shall have, under the Confederation, a revenue three times as large as it was at the time of the union; and instead of having, as we then had, an excess of expenditure amounting to about \$80,000, the total expenditure of Lower Canada, under the Confederation, will be about \$1,200,000, leaving a surplus of more than \$200,000! If then our debt has increased, we have made most rapid progress, and we have received the full value for our money. Nor must it be forgotten that at the time of the union of Upper and Lower Canada the country had not a single railway, and now it is traversed from end to

end by one of the finest railways on this continent; and ere long, let us hope in the interest of our commerce and our safety, that this iron band will connect the extreme west with the Atlantic ocean. (Hear, hear.) We entered the union when the Welland canal had hardly been begun; we leave it with one of the most magnificent canal systems the world has ever seen. And then the telegraph lines. At the time of the union the only telegraph we had was that one with balls, which so many of us remember, and which used to connect the citadel with the Island of Orleans, and thence communicated with Grosse Isle by a telegraph of the same kind; now an immense network of telegraph wires places us in daily and immediate communication with the most remote districts in the different provinces. We leave the union with a debt greater than that with which we entered it, but we leave it with a most perfect system of lighthouses, wharves, piers, slides, in fact with a large number of other public works, which have mainly contributed to the settlement and the prosperity of the country, and which have more than doubled its resources since the union. The Grand Trunk Railway alone, for the sixteen millions which it has cost us, has contributed to increase the value of our lands by millions and millions of dollars, by enhancing the value of our agricultural productions, which are by its means brought with greater ease to the different markets, and has moreover entailed an expenditure in our midst of more than seventy millions of dollars for its construction alone. Yes, Mr. SPEAKER, if we entered the union with a debt of four hundred thousand dollars, and if to-day we leave it with a debt of thirty millions of dollars, we can at all events show what we have done with the money, by the immense extent of territory, then uncleared, which is now covered with abundant crops, and which have served to keep in the country, not indeed all the children of our farmers, but at least a very great number of them, who but for these improvements would have emigrated *en masse* to the neighboring country. Under the Confederation we shall have the control of our lands, and we can settle them so as to retain in our midst all those of the rising generation of both origins who too often take to a foreign land their strong right arms, their energy and devotion. Our mineral lands, so rich and so productive, the opening up of which has

hardly been begun, will also be a source of enormous revenue to the country, and will largely contribute to increase the sum of our population, by keeping in Canada many men who would have gone in search of fortune elsewhere, and it inspires me with still greater confidence that Providence has been pleased to join to His other blessings conferred upon us, the possession of mines the richest and perhaps the most abundant in the world. As regards our fisheries, they were hardly opened up at the time of the union; and now, although much more may be done with them, it is, nevertheless, undeniable that every year they are more and more developed, and that they are destined, at no distant period, to be a source of immense revenue to the country. (Hear, hear.) There are many other points of view, Mr. SPEAKER, from which we might examine the advantages we have derived from the union of the Canadas, in return for the sacrifice we have imposed upon ourselves. We might look at the political position we occupied at that period. We should see that we had just come out of a terrible crisis, during which blood had been spilt on battle-fields and elsewhere; our Constitution had been suspended, and the whole country had witnessed scenes such as its inhabitants, hitherto happy and prosperous, had never seen before. Now we enjoy responsible government, one of the most glorious of England's institutions, and one that has stood the test of ages. This great constitutional guarantee we take with us into the Confederation, into which we are about to enter in a state of peace and prosperity, with happiness in our midst, and with the conviction that this peace, this prosperity and this happiness will be made more lasting than ever. We enter it with the legitimate and patriotic aim of placing our country in a position more worthy of our population and of greater importance, and meriting higher consideration from foreign nations. The hon. member for Hochelaga, not content with calling up past events, has also alluded to the constitution of the courts of law in Lower Canada under the Confederacy. He declared that he did not understand the meaning of that article of the resolutions which leaves to the Central Government the appointment of the judges, whilst by another article it is provided that the constitution and maintenance of the courts was entrusted to the Local Parliament. The honorable member should have observed that

by the powers conferred on the local governments, Lower Canada retains all her civil rights, as prescribed by the 17th paragraph of article 43, as follows:—

The administration of justice, including the constitution, maintenance and organization of the courts, both of civil and criminal jurisdiction, and including also the procedure in civil matters.

This is a privilege which has been granted to us and which we shall retain, because our civil laws differ from those of the other provinces of the Confederation. This exception, like many others, has been expressly made for the protection of us Lower Canadians. It was our desire, as the representatives of Lower Canada at the Conference, that we should have under the control of our Local Legislature the constitution and organization of our courts of justice, both civil and criminal, so that our legislature might possess full power over our courts, and the right to establish or modify them if it thought expedient. But, on the other hand, the appointment of the judges of these courts had to be given, as it has been, to the Central Government, and the reason of this provision is at once simple, natural and just. In the Confederacy we shall have a Central Parliament and local legislatures.—Well, I ask any reasonable man, any man of experience, does he think that, with the ambition which must naturally stimulate men of mark and talent to display their powers on the theatre most worthy of their talents, these men will consent to enter the local legislatures rather than the Federal Parliament? Is it not more likely and more reasonable to suppose that they would rather appear and shine on the largest stage, on that in which they can render the greatest service to their country, and where the rewards of their services will be the highest? Yes, these men will prefer to go to the Central Parliament, and among them there will be doubtless many of our most distinguished members of the legal profession. The members of this profession are often accused of going into Parliament for the purpose of monopolizing the representation. If this be the case at the present time, is it not to be supposed that they will do the same thing under Confederation? Were the appointment of the judges left to the local legislatures, the local governments would be subjected to a pressure which might be brought to bear upon them by the first advocate who would attain influence in the Local Legislature. To get rid of an inconvenient member who might have three or four followers, the Local Government would have to take

this troublesome advocate of the second, third or fourth order of talent, and place him on the bench, whilst by leaving these appointments to the Central Government, we are satisfied that the selection will be made from men of the highest order of qualifications, that the external and local pressure will not be so great, and that the Government will be in a position to act more freely. It may be remarked, in passing, that in the proposed Constitution there is an article which provides that the judges of the courts of Lower Canada shall be appointed from the members of the bar of that section. This exception was only made in favor of Lower Canada, and it is a substantial guarantee for those who fear the proposed system. Besides, the honorable member for Hochelaga, who fancies that he sees danger in the powers given to the Central Government, knows by experience, as having himself been a minister of the Crown, that in respect of every appointment of a judge the Cabinet always consults the ministers for the section in which the appointment is to be made, and accepts their choice. The same practice would necessarily be followed by the Central Government, who would be forced to respect it, because behind the ministers from each section would be found the members from that section, and behind our ministers for Lower Canada will be found the sixty-five members whom we shall have sent to represent and protect our interests in the Federal Parliament. It is then advantageous, and there could be no danger in the provision that the judges should be appointed by the Central Government; indeed, it is for our interest, and the interest of all, that it should be so. And although it may be looked upon as a secondary consideration, yet it may as well be mentioned now, that by leaving the appointment of our judges to the Central Government, we are the gainers by one hundred thousand dollars, which will have to be paid for their services by the central power. This consideration will perhaps have some weight with the honorable member for Hochelaga, who makes such an outcry to alarm the people that we shall be obliged to have recourse to direct taxation to defray the expenses of our Local Legislature. Notwithstanding the advanced hour of the evening, I cannot pass over in silence another observation made by the honorable member, and I beg he will accord me his undivided attention at the present moment. The honorable gentleman has asked the Government what meaning was to be attached to the word "marriage," where

it occurred in the Constitution. He desired to know whether the Government proposed to leave to the Central Government the right of deciding at what age, for example, marriage might be contracted. I will now answer the honorable gentleman as categorically as possible, for I am anxious to be understood, not only in this House, but also by all those who may hereafter read the report of our proceedings. And first of all I will prove that civil rights form part of those which, by article 43 (paragraph 15) of the resolutions, are guaranteed to Lower Canada. This paragraph reads as follows:—

15. Property and civil rights, excepting those portions thereof assigned to the General Parliament.

Well, amongst these rights are all the civil laws of Lower Canada, and among these latter those which relate to marriage; now it was of the highest importance that it should be so under the proposed system, and therefore the members from Lower Canada at the Conference took great care to obtain the reservation to the Local Government of this important right, and in consenting to allow the word "marriage" after the word "divorce," the delegates have not proposed to take away with one hand from the Local Legislature what they had reserved to it by the other. So that the word "marriage," placed where it is among the powers of the Central Parliament, has not the extended signification which was sought to be given to it by the honorable member. With the view of being more explicit, I now propose to read how the word marriage is proposed to be understood:—

The word marriage has been placed in the draft of the proposed Constitution to invest the Federal Parliament with the right of declaring what marriages shall be held and deemed to be valid throughout the whole extent of the Confederacy, without, however, interfering in any particular with the doctrines or rites of the religious creeds to which the contracting parties may belong.

This is a point of great importance, and the French Canadian members ought to rejoice to see that their fellow-countrymen in the Government have not failed in their duty on a question of so serious a nature. On many other points many of them will doubtless claim that we have not thoroughly fulfilled our duty, but as regards the matter in question there can be no difference of opinion, as we have all a common rule to guide us; and I repeat that they ought to rejoice that their co-religionists in the Conference have not been found wanting on this occasion. The whole

may be summed up as follows:—The Central Parliament may decide that any marriage contracted in Upper Canada, or in any other of the Confederated Provinces, in accordance with the laws of the country in which it was contracted, although that law might be different from ours, should be deemed valid in Lower Canada in case the parties should come to reside there, and *vice versa*.

HON. MR. DORION—There was no necessity for that provision.

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—I have just proved that it was necessary.

MR. ARCHAMBEAULT—I would ask of the Hon. Solicitor General if a marriage contracted in the United States, before a magistrate, and not according to canonical laws, would be deemed valid in Lower Canada?

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—It would be so, from a civil point of view, if it were contracted in accordance with the laws of the state in which it was celebrated.

MR. GEOFFRION—If a marriage contracted in the United States is valid here, as a matter of course a marriage contracted in a British colony in conformity with the laws of the country must be valid; therefore the explanation of the Hon. Solicitor General is inadmissible, or the resolution is useless.

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—The honorable member for Verchères does not choose to be convinced; so I will make no further attempt to convince him. The resolution in question signifies just what I have stated.

HON. MR. DORION—That is to say, it means nothing at all.

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—I beg your pardon, it means that a marriage contracted in no matter what part of the Confederacy, will be valid in Lower Canada, if contracted according to the laws of the country in which it takes place; but also, when a marriage is contracted in any province contrary to its laws, although in conformity with the laws of another province, it will not be considered valid. Let us now examine the question of divorce. We do not intend either to establish or to recognize a new right; we do not mean to admit a thing to which we have constantly refused to assent, but at the Conference the question arose, which legislature should exercise the different powers which already exist in the constitutions of the different provinces. Now, among these powers which have been already and frequently exercised *de facto*, is this of divorce. As a member of the Conference, without admitting or creating any new right in this behalf, and while declaring, as I now

do, that as Catholics we acknowledge no power of divorce, I found that we were to decide in what legislative body the authority should be lodged which we found in our Constitutions. After mature consideration, we resolved to leave it in the Central Legislature, thinking thereby to increase the difficulties of a procedure which is at present so easy. We thought then, as we still think, that in this we took the most prudent course. The following illustration will prove this still more forcibly. It is known to the House how zealous a partisan the honorable member for Brome (Mr. DUNKIN) is of the cause of temperance. Well, we will suppose that the honorable gentleman were present as a member of a municipal council in which it was to be decided whether all the taverns in a very populous part of the parish, which could not be suppressed, should be banished to a remote corner of the parish, where they would no longer be a temptation and a stumbling-block; would he not vote for such a measure? Would he not send them to a place where they would be least accessible to the population, and would he not think he had done a meritorious act, an act worthy of a good friend of the temperance cause? Just so in a question of divorce; the case is exactly analogous. We found this power existing in the constitutions of the different provinces, and not being able to get rid of it, we wished to banish it as far from us as possible. One thing it would be vain to deny, namely, that although we, as Catholics, do not admit the liberty of divorce, although we hold the marriage bond to be indissoluble, yet there are cases in which we both admit and require the annulling of the marriage tie—in cases, for instance, where a marriage has been contracted within the prohibited degrees without the necessary dispensations. An instance of this occurred very recently. A few months since, an individual belonging to my county, who had married a young girl of a neighboring parish, without being aware at the time of his marriage of the relationship which existed between him and his wife, found out several months afterwards that they were related in such a degree that they required a dispensation from the bishop. That dispensation had not been obtained. He spoke of it to his wife, who refused to apply for a dispensation, as a step towards the legal celebration of their marriage. It became necessary, therefore, to have the marriage annulled. The affair was brought before the Ecclesiastical Court, and, after a minute investigation, the diocesan

bishop gave judgment, declaring the marriage null in a canonical sense. Regarded in a civil point of view, the marriage was still valid until it should have been declared null by a civil tribunal. It became necessary, therefore, to carry the cause before the Superior Court, and my honorable friend, the member for Beauce, who took the case in hand with his usual zeal and legal address, obtained from the court, after a suitable inquiry, a judgment declaring the marriage null in a civil sense, and ordering that it should be registered as such in all places where it should be needful. If this affair had occurred in Upper Canada, what recourse would the parties have had? The parties being Catholics, the case would have been brought before the bishop, who would also have declared the marriage null after suitable inquiry; but the cause would not have had the same conclusion in the civil court, particularly had it depended on certain impediments which have force in Lower Canada, but none in Upper Canada. It would have become necessary to go to Parliament to pray for an act, which, in a Catholic point of view, would be a mere decree of separation, but which the Parliament would have termed an act of divorce. This power to grant a separation is therefore necessarily vested in the Parliament, by whatever name such separation may be designated, and we are not to be reproached for the interpretation which others may give to such name, different from that which we assign to it. I thought it right to make myself understood on this point, because I do not choose that people should be able to say we are afraid of explaining our position with regard to the question of divorce and marriage, and I believe that I have shown that our position is consistent with our religious laws and our principles as Catholics. I regret that I have dwelt so long on the matters touched upon by the honorable member for Hochelaga; but after his speech, and considering the position he assumed, he must have expected an answer. And, having done with him, I come to the honorable member for Lotbinière (Mr. JOLY). That honorable member has endeavored to prove that all confederations die of consumption, and has cited, in support of his argument, the political condition of the Spanish republics of South America. Why did he say nothing of the Germanic Confederation? If he had mentioned that, he would have had to confess that it had proved a success. He would have said also that it is a monarchical confederation consisting of thirty-one states, the chiefs of

which are almost all kings, princes, or electors. There are not more than four or five states which are not monarchical, and, nevertheless, that confederation works well.

MR. GEOFFRION—Are they sovereign states?

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—Yes, but they have done what we are now about to do. In order to hold their own among the great powers, and not to be at the mercy of the first who might choose to assail their rights, they have united their strength because they conceived that "union is strength." When the honorable member for Lotbinière was talking about the weakness inherent in confederations, he ought to have recollected late events in Italy, as they happened a few years ago. He should have called to mind the conquests of Garibaldi, and reflected that if he had succeeded in overcoming a number of petty states and even the kingdom of Naples for the benefit of the king of Sardinia, it was because the Italian States, being divided as he found them, were too weak to resist an invasion, and that, had they been confederated, neither Garibaldi nor Victor Emmanuel would ever have succeeded in getting the upper hand of them. And what happened when the little states of Italy were banded together with Piedmont? This happened—when Garibaldi aimed at making conquests on his own account, he soon found out that the small states no longer existed, and that a large state had been formed out of their fragments, the consequence of which was that he was beaten at Aspromonte. The honorable member says that our connection with the Mother Country, under the Confederation, would be one of paper, and that the Upper Canadians would detest the Lower Canadians.

MR. GEOFFRION—He did not say that such things would be, but that such might be the effect of Confederation.

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—Why should such be the effect of Confederation? No questions will be decided in the Federal Parliament but such as relate to general matters. Local matters will not be treated of, nor questions of race, of religion, or of institutions peculiar to the several provinces, and consequently there can be no collision of opinions on such questions. Such a fear, therefore, is quite unfounded. The honorable member says, moreover, that the Confederation would lead rather to divide than to unite us, that civil war would be the result, and that the Upper Canadians would rather be annexed to the United States than subjected to Lower

Canadian rule. For my part, I believe no such thing. I believe that the Upper Canadians are too loyal to wish to be annexed to the United States. They are quite disposed to trade with their neighbors, to keep up a good understanding with them, but they do not wish to be annexed. The honorable member for Lotbinière, getting over his fears and predictions and speaking of the sixty-five members from Lower Canada, put the following question—"Suppose the population in Lower Canada should in ten years increase thirty-four per cent., while that of the other provinces increases only thirty per cent., would it not be unjust to Lower Canada that the number of its representatives should remain the same, should still be sixty-five, while that of the other provinces will be increased; while in any case the number of representatives from the other provinces is not to be diminished unless their population should diminish five per cent?" This point is very important, but we must observe that whatever the increase of the population in the other provinces, the part from Lower Canada is fixed and known. Thus, for instance, if the population of Upper Canada should increase more than that of Lower Canada, the latter will always have sixty-five members, the other provinces receiving such increased number of representatives as their increased population would entitle them to. But the resolutions do not prevent Lower Canada from having more than sixty-five representatives, if its population should increase faster than that of the other provinces. The French translation of these resolutions is erroneous, for it says that "for the purpose of determining the number of representatives from each province at the end of every decennial census, Lower Canada shall never have either more or less than sixty-five representatives," whereas the English version of the resolutions, which is the official version, says: "Lower Canada shall always be assigned sixty-five members." This does not mean that Lower Canada can never have more than sixty-five members, but that it can not have less than sixty-five members. That is, I think, a categorical answer to the honorable member's objection. If the honorable member for Lotbinière were here, I would answer him on other points; but I will not attack him as he last night attacked the Honorable Attorney General. The honorable member compared the conduct of the Honorable Attorney General, in moving the scheme of Confederation, to that of a man who, pre-

siding over a savings bank in which every one came to deposit his savings, having confidence in his honesty, should some fine day turn defaulter, betray their confidence and ruin them. He said that the honesty of the Honorable Attorney General for Lower Canada had yielded to the temptation of honors, titles and places, and that he had forgotten all his obligations and duties and sold his fellow-citizens. I shall not retort on the honorable member, but I shall take upon me to continue the comparison made by him and tell him that the Honorable Attorney General has in fact opened a savings bank and has invited every one to deposit in it his title deeds and his savings. Accordingly we find one day the seigniors and the *censitaires* coming and depositing in his keeping their title deeds, their lands and all they have. These the Honorable Attorney General takes and deposits in his bank, and when he is called upon to restore them, when he is required to account for them, he pays as never man paid before him; to the *censitaires*, instead of their title deeds burthened with mortgages, *lods et ventes*, *corvées* and all sorts of services and duties, he restores their lands free from all burthens; while to the seigniors he tenders the full value of their seigniorial rights; and if this day there are seigniors holding a hundred thousand acres of land in full right of property, which they can safely estimate as worth eight dollars per acre, they may thank the Honorable the Attorney General for Lower Canada for it. The suitors in our courts come next; they were oppressed with enormous costs, which amounted almost to a denial of justice; they went and deposited their briefs, declarations and pleas in the Honorable Attorney General's savings bank, and he returned them, giving them at the same time judicial decentralisation and diminished costs of suit. Thus it is that he has earned the respect and gratitude of his fellow-citizens. It is the same as regards the inhabitants of the townships; in place of their ambiguous civil law, he gave them a civil law applying to the whole of Lower Canada, the townships as well as the seignories; and all are now unanimous in expressions of gratitude towards the Hon. Atty. General for extricating them from the judicial chaos in which they were involved. Pleaders, advocates, in fact the whole country, deposited their complaints in the Hon. Atty. General's hands, and at the end of five years he has given them a civil code which will do honor to Lower Canada, honor to the three distinguished Codification Commissioners selected by the

Hon. Atty. General, whose name it will transmit to posterity. Yes, his name is attached to that work, and the attacks of the honorable member for Lotbinière will hardly prevent that name from going down to our descendants surrounded with the respect of all those who know the services he has rendered to his country. But the Hon. Attorney General for Lower Canada was not satisfied with these services. In the midst of a terrible crisis his country confided to him all its interests, all its rights, all its institutions, its nationality, its religion, in a word everything it held most dear. The Hon. Attorney General received the whole trust into his safe and faithful keeping, and when called upon to render an account, he exhibited all these interests, rights, institutions, our nationality and religion, in fact everything that the people held dear, and restored them guaranteed, protected and surrounded by every safeguard, in the Confederation of the British North American Provinces. He has been a faithful banker, and has not betrayed the trust reposed in him, he has honestly paid his debt; rich and poor, seigniors and *censitaires*, advocates and pleaders, all have received their due, and the banker is blessed from one end of the province to the other. The honorable member says that the Hon. Attorney General will have his reward. He is right; my honorable colleague will have his reward—his day will come as did that of the late Sir LOUIS HYPOLITE LAFONTAINE. When that eminent citizen held the position occupied to-day by the Hon. Attorney General, the opposition heaped upon him the same reproaches, the same insults that are now offered to my honorable friend. He was accused of being a traitor to his country; it was broadly asserted that he was selling his fellow-citizens, and that he was the enemy of his race. Nevertheless, that defender of the rights and institutions of Lower Canada had but one ambition, namely, to secure for his fellow-countrymen the splendid position they have ever since occupied. He let the disaffected continue to assail him, and before descending into the tomb, he had the happiness of seeing his patriotic efforts and the purity and nobleness of his intentions acknowledged; and when his mortal remains were carried to their last resting place, all classes of his fellow-citizens were eager in doing honor to that great man, and all united in blessing the memory of one who was no longer accused of being a traitor, but whose name was universally admitted to be deserving of a place among the very highest in parliamentary history. It will be the same

as regards the present Hon. Attorney General for Lower Canada. He will have his reward; his day will come, not in the sense of the honorable member for Lotbinière, who makes use of the expression as a menace, but by retaining that confidence of his fellow-citizens which appears so completely incomprehensible to the honorable member for Lotbinière. That he should enjoy the confidence of his fellow-citizens appears to me a thing perfectly natural, and not by any means difficult to understand. During his whole life, like Sir LOUIS HYPOLITE LAFONTAINE, the present Honorable Attorney General for Lower Canada has devoted himself to protecting and promoting the material and religious interests of his fellow-countrymen, and he has now crowned his gigantic labors by the important share he has had in the framing of the new Constitution, which is destined to govern one of the greatest empires in the world, a Constitution beneath which all races and all religions will find protection and respect. He will have his reward, and like his predecessor, his name will go down to posterity as one of the greatest benefactors of his country. I regret, Mr. SPEAKER, having spoken at such great length, but the importance of the question must be my excuse for having, perhaps, wearied the House. After the long speeches delivered by the honorable member for Hochelaga and the honorable member for Lotbinière, it was impossible for me to curtail my remarks, when I had to refute and destroy all the hazardous assertions of the two honorable members. I think I have said enough to show that the honorable member for Hochelaga made a false prediction when he said that the day on which Confederation was accomplished would be an evil day for Lower Canada. No, Mr. SPEAKER, the Confederation, I am perfectly convinced, will afford the best possible guarantee for our institutions, our language and all that we hold dearest in the world; under its protection we shall be strong against the common enemy, we shall advance rapidly in the way of prosperity, and when we withdraw from the arena it will be with the consolation of leaving to our descendants an inheritance worthy of a free people. (Cheers.)

MR. JOLY—While the Honorable Solicitor General was speaking, I twice asked permission to explain what I had stated, because I thought he had not understood me; but from the manner in which he has acted towards me, twice refusing me the opportunity of explaining myself, I am now convinced that he perfectly well understood what I wished to

say, and that he merely pretended not to understand it. I am not willing to bear the onus of the charge he has brought against me. I shall take the opportunity of setting him right, and of explaining what I said yesterday. I am quite ready to bear accusations of imprudence or ignorance, but I will not stand a charge of cowardice, and that is the accusation I find in the *Journal de Québec* of this day. The honorable member charges me with having appealed to the religious prejudices of the French-Canadians. I did not appeal to their religious prejudices; I made an appeal to their national prejudices. I look upon this measure of Confederation as fatal to the interests of Lower Canada, and I consider that that was the only means of breaking the bands by which the French-Canadians are bound, and of arousing them while it is yet time; that is what I have done and ever will do. But I am not the man to appeal to the national prejudices of the English after my appeal to the French-Canadians, as the honorable member has stated. I shall now state the manner in which I explained the passage from Lord DURHAM's report. I said it was impossible that both races should long continue to live in peace; that some day or other the two nationalities would come into collision; that judgment would be given by the Federal Parliament, in which the English were to have the majority, and from which the French-Canadians could not hope to obtain justice. I did not state that the French-Canadians would act unjustly towards the British; but I said that the latter might complain, and that the Federal Legislature would be called upon to decide as to whether injustice had been done; and that its sympathies must be distrusted. I added that the Federal Parliament being composed of a majority of English members, would be inclined to give ear to the English of Lower Canada rather than to the French-Canadians. I then quoted Lord DURHAM's report to prove that English-Canadians would never willingly submit to the majority in Lower Canada. And in citing the two extracts from Lord DURHAM's report, I first read them in English and then translated them into French. How can it be asserted, therefore, that I made use of the English language in order to make an appeal to the prejudices of the Anglo-Canadians? The charge is absurd. Far from desiring to influence them in that sense, I read the passages with hesitation, because I felt that the British ought to blush for them. There was no need of quoting the passages

referred to in order to tell the English of Lower Canada what their sentiments were; I cited them in order to make them known to the French Canadians. With regard to the second passage, I could not cite it in order to attract the sympathies of the British, since it was an extract against them. How can it be shown that I cited that passage for the purpose of exciting the national prejudices of the English? I appealed neither to the religious prejudices of the Canadians, nor to the national prejudices of the English.

HON. MR. CAUCHON—I did not say that the honorable member for Lotbinière was a coward; I found fault with him for treating the question incompletely and putting it in a wrong light. With reference to the quotations, the honorable member did not translate into French that part in which it was stated that the English will never submit to a French Canadian majority.

MR. JOLY—I translated it word for word.

HON. MR. CAUCHON—I did not hear it, but I am quite willing to take his word. The honorable member has said that he wished to excite the national prejudices of the French-Canadians, but that is quite as bad as exciting religious prejudices. All I said was, that he was wrong in exciting the prejudices of the one race against the other.

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—After the explanations given by the honorable member for Lotbinière, and though he has stated in a moment of excitement that he felt convinced that when I made an accusation against him I knew it was not well founded, I must conclude that I was mistaken, and that he translated his quotations from Lord DURHAM's report unknown to me. I take his word in the matter, but I am quite sure that if he had not been excited at the moment, he would not have charged me with wilfully misrepresenting him.

MR. JOLY—I am the more clear in my recollection of having translated the passage from Lord DURHAM's report, from the fact that I had great difficulty in translating it, as the House will remember.

MR. DUNKIN—And in fact your translation was not quite correct, particularly as to the word British.

MR. JOLY—But since the Honorable Solicitor General has given explanations and has withdrawn what he had said against me, I feel it to be my duty to state that I regret to have expressed myself so strongly with reference to him.

The debate was then adjourned.

WEDNESDAY, February 22, 1865.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Before the debate is resumed, I would enquire whether it is the purpose of the Government to bring down the promised measure on the subject of education in Lower Canada, before the House is invited to pass finally the scheme of Confederation now under discussion? I need not say to honorable gentlemen that this is a matter which is regarded with a great deal of interest by a very large portion of the people of Lower Canada, and I think that before my honorable friend for Montreal Centre (Hon. Mr. ROSE) proceeds to take part in this debate, the position of the Government upon that question should be clearly defined.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—Although the question is not put regularly, I have no hesitation in answering the honorable gentleman. My answer is the answer which has already been given by my honorable friend the member for Sherbrooke (Hon. Mr. GALT).

HON. MR. HOLTON—The honorable member for Sherbrooke has not stated to the House—

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—Order!

HON. MR. HOLTON—I think I am quite in order, on the calling of the Orders of the Day, to put a question of this kind. But I rise again, simply to give notice to the honorable gentleman that I shall renew the question on the Orders of the Day being called to-morrow evening. I do think it is dealing slightly with the House and with the country for honorable gentlemen to refuse to state explicitly what are their purposes with regard to this important question—whether or not their measure is to be brought down before a final vote is taken on Confederation. I shall renew the question to-morrow.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—The question has been answered twice, but the Government are ready to answer it again, if the honorable gentleman so desires.

HON. MR. ROSE then resumed the adjourned debate. He said—Before I proceed, Mr. SPEAKER, to offer any observations on the motion in your hand, I wish to acknowledge very cordially the consideration which the House evinced last evening during my absence, and especially to acknowledge the courtesy of my honorable friend from Lambton (Mr. A. MACKENZIE), my honorable friend from Chateauguay (Hon. Mr.

HOLTON), and my honorable friend the member for Brome (Mr. DUNKIN). I certainly feel indebted to them for the manner in which they yielded me precedence, at the request of the honorable member for Montmorenci (Hon. Mr. CAUCHON); and I shall endeavour to shew my sense of the kindness of the House, by not trespassing on its indulgence any longer than I can possibly help. And, before I offer any remarks on the question itself, I would premise this, that I hope in the course of them I shall not give utterance to a single expression which would seem to reflect upon those who entertain strong opinions adverse to the proposition now before the House. Far be it from me to deprecate discussion—discussion of the amplest, widest, and most searching character, on this important question. And far be it from me, by the use of a single word, to impute to those honorable members, who feel it their duty to oppose this measure, any absence of patriotism. I believe they are actuated by the same ardent desire for the good of the country, which I claim for myself. (Hear, hear.) It is right that the question should be considered in all its details—not merely in its bearings on the present state of parties, but as respects its influence in all time to come on the country at large. And with that view I think it ought to be calmly, deliberately and patiently investigated, and instead of deprecating the fullest and most ample discussion, I trust the opportunity will be afforded to every honorable member of this House to speak on it in his own way and at his own time. (Hear, hear.) Well, sir, I presume there are few who, in the abstract, would not favour the idea of a union between a number of small states adjoining each other, rather than that they should remain isolated under separate governments. To the idea of union in the abstract between states so circumstanced, I take it no one would be opposed. But the principal ground of the opposition which is made to the present scheme by a not unimportant class, is this—that the mere abstract principle of union does not apply with full force to colonies circumstanced as Canada, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and Newfoundland—the five colonies that are parties to this scheme. It is feared by many that it is the first step towards independence—that it must tend to loosen the ties now existing between this and the mother country—that it changes our relations, and will produce a strength incom-

patible with Imperial sovereignty—that it may probably result in not only severing our connection with the Mother Country, but in forcing us to a union with the neighbouring republic. That I have heard urged as the greatest and most important objection which strikes at the root of the proceedings of the Quebec Conference. I know that many of the opponents of the scheme entertain the apprehension—perhaps the conviction—that that will be the result. (Hear, hear.) Far from deprecating, then, the discussion of that question in its broadest aspect, I think all of us who desire to perpetuate our connection with England, should listen calmly and anxiously to the objections which are urged by those who conscientiously entertain those opinions which are not only blameless, but entitled to respect. (Hear, hear.) Now, I do not deny that the effect of the present movement may be to change the character of the actual relations which subsist between this province and the Mother Country.

HON. MR. HOLT—Hear! hear!

HON. MR. ROSE—I do not deny that the result may be to change the character of these relations. But I maintain, and I hope I shall be able to satisfy the House of the soundness of the position I take, that the change will be of that character, that, instead of loosening or weakening or diminishing the connection with the Mother Country, it will tend to put it on a footing which will make it stronger and more enduring. (Hear, hear.) Though I believe these relations will be somewhat changed, and we may have to consider what new aspect they will present, I believe this measure is forced upon us by the necessities of our position. The irresistible force of passing events will not allow us to stand still. But, whether by this inevitable change the country shall gradually lose its dependent or protected character and assume more of the Federal relation, constituting this a territorial division of the Empire, I believe it will result in placing those relations on a surer and more steadfast footing, and that we will still acknowledge the same Sovereign, owe the same fealty, and maintain the same veneration for the English Constitution and name. (Hear, hear.) It cannot be denied that there is a state of public opinion growing up in England just now—not confined, as it was a few years ago, to a class of extreme theorists—that the connection which subsists between the colonies—Canada especially—and the Mother Country,

is a source of expense and danger. It cannot be denied that that kind of opinion has obtained a good deal more force within the last few years, than those of us who desire to maintain the connection between these colonies and England would like that it should have obtained; and we cannot ignore the consequences which that increasing volume of public opinion may have upon the legislation of England. Then there is another consideration which makes this subject stand out more prominently before the people of England at the present time than otherwise it would do, and that is, the state of its relations with the republic adjoining us, and the enormous military power which the United States have shewn, within the last two or three years, that they possess. In consequence of this, the state of opinion in England which might have been confined for many years perhaps to mere theory, has been brought to a head. It is not now merely a question of abstract opinion, whether under such and such circumstances it would be better for this and other colonies to assume a more independent attitude towards England. But it has been pressed with unexpected abruptness to a practical issue before the people of England, and they have now to consider what the relations of Great Britain to these colonies would be, in the event of war with the United States; how far, in that event, it would be possible to protect this remote dependency of the empire, to avoid disaster to the English flag, and at a distance of 8,000 miles to maintain the prowess of the English name. It is this which has forced public opinion so strongly in England to a consideration of the actual relations between this country and the Mother Country, and it is this state of facts with which we must deal now. It is, I repeat, past discussing as a mere abstract matter of doctrine. We must look our situation in the face. We must consider the eventualities which press themselves on our notice, and it is our bounden duty to see whether we cannot find in the union of these colonies security to ourselves and a source of strength to the Empire at large. (Hear, hear.) With respect, then, to the objections urged by those who consider that this scheme may be leading us along a new and untrodden path towards independence, or at least to a more independent relation with reference to England than that in which we now stand towards her, I say we cannot forget that our

surroundings are of a peculiar kind. I would grant that there would be much force in the argument that it might sever our ties with England, if we were circumstanced as some of the smaller states of Europe—if we had, for example, a state like Switzerland on the one side and any of the German Principalities on the other. If we had, as our neighbours, states like Belgium or Denmark—if, so situated, we were one of a number of small states, I grant you that, if a union of all these provinces were to take place, it might lead possibly to that independence which those who oppose the scheme now fear, and which for one, I hope from my heart, may never occur. (Hear, hear.) No doubt, if situated in that way—if we had no powerful and over-awing neighbor, such a political combination as we now propose might lead to practical independence of England. If we were a mere congeries of small states, with no powerful neighbor, that result which we so much deprecate might possibly follow. We should, probably, in time aspire to have foreign relations of our own, to have our own army and navy, and to seek for that complete emancipation which with communities as with individuals, maturity prompts. But independence in a state must always be relative, and none of us can expect to live to see the day when the British dominions in this part of the world will be peopled to such an extent, and become so powerful, that they can afford to be independent of England. We must, from the necessities of our geographical position—so long as the United States continue to be as powerful as they are; and even if they were divided into two or three portions—we must always find in them a source of danger which must force upon us a dependence on England. We find, I repeat, in our position towards the United States, and in the great preponderating power they possess, a guarantee that we need not apprehend that there will be anything like practical independence of England asserted by the colonies of North America; because, from the very necessities of our position, we shall always have to look up to her for protection and aid. I say nothing of the sentiment of loyalty, of that attachment to the British Crown, that love for the person of the Sovereign which we all possess so strongly and try to instill into our children. I do not speak for the moment of the pride we all have in the constitution of England, and in

our being identified, in all our associations and feelings, with the glory of the English name. I put aside, for the moment, the instinct of attachment to the Mother Country, and I put the case on this ground alone, that the necessity of self-preservation will for centuries—for generations at all events—prevent the possibility of these colonies asserting their independence of England, unless it were, indeed, to become a portion of the republic which adjoins us, and to which, I think, it is neither the interest nor the inclination of any member of this House to become united. (Hear, hear.) Whatever fate may be in store for us, that is a destiny to which no one looks with favor. The genius and instincts of our people are monarchical and conservative—theirs leveling and democratic. But, sir, though I have said that I was disposed to look upon this question—the danger of Federation—rendering us independent of England, quite apart from the considerations that spring out of sentiments of loyalty, yet I believe that those attachments will be increased tenfold by this proposed union. We will have a sentiment of nationality among ourselves; and I consider it to be one of the first duties of a statesman to inculcate that national feeling that gives the people a strong interest in their country's welfare. We will feel that we have something here, in the way of constitutional blessings due to our union with England, and that we have stable material interests which we can transmit to our posterity. We shall feel very differently from what we now do as colonists, apart and alienated from each other, and in some respects jealous of one another. With a stable government and a strong central power controlling an immense territory, we shall be able to enter upon a well considered, well devised and attractive system of immigration. (Hear, hear.) We will be enabled shortly, I trust, to commence to bring from the Mother Country a constant stream of immigration by which those sentiments of attachment to home and devotion to the Crown will be perpetuated. And in this continuous recruiting of our population I see one of the great elements we will have to look to for the perpetuation of the attachment of this country to the Crown. We have not, in time past, been able to devise or carry out any extensive system of immigration. We could not, in our divided and isolated condition, offer those attractions which we

will be enabled to offer to emigrants when we can throw open to them the choice of a large country, a country which will have a name and a nationality—a country in which they and we can all feel an honest pride. (Hear, hear.) They will not feel as we have hitherto done, doubtful how long our system of constitutional government, and the blessings flowing from it, were to last. I trust, therefore, that the formation of a stable government, and the devising of a system of emigration that will be attractive to the people of England, Ireland and Scotland, will do a vast deal to keep up that constant attachment to the Mother Country which we all desire to see strengthened. (Hear, hear.) We shall then not only have the ordinary motive to present to emigrants, of self-interest—the opportunity to make money merely, but the other interest of attachment in a permanent way, to the soil, without a desire to go back to the Mother Country after a competence shall have been gained—for the sentiment of nationality will soon take root among us. Now, sir, I think that so far as the danger of union leading to independence is concerned, those who are most earnest in desiring to perpetuate the union, need not have much apprehension. But, it may be said, that from the necessity of our position there is danger that we shall feel our material and commercial interests so strongly bound up with the United States, and feel so reliant in our own strength as a great country, that we will eventually form a closer alliance with that republic than any of us desire, and that the formation of the present union is the first step towards annexation. I do not think we need have any fears on that score. I do not think our interests would lead us in that direction. At the present time we are almost entirely dependent upon the United States commercially. We are dependent upon them for an outlet to the ocean during the winter months. If they choose to suspend the bonding system, or by a system of consular certificates make it practically useless; if they abolish the reciprocity treaty, and carry the passport system to a greater degree of stringency, we should feel our dependence upon that country even in a greater and much more practical way than we do at the present time. And perhaps, sir, it is worth our while to consider whether this may not be the real motive which dictates the policy they are now pursuing! (Hear, hear.) But, give us this Intercolonial Railway, affording

us communication with Halifax and St John at all seasons of the year, and we shall be independent of the United States commercially as we now are politically. We may not find this route to the ocean more economical, especially in the winter season, than to go through the United States, but if we have a route of our own to which we may resort, in case of necessity, our neighbors will find it to their interest to give us the use of their channels of communication at a cheaper rate. (Hear, hear.) They will not do that if they find we have no other outlet; but if we are prepared with an opening for our produce, all the year round, they will not act so foolishly as to deprive themselves of the opportunity of carrying our goods through their territory. If we had this railway built, we should have no need to fear the withdrawal of the bonding system, or the continuance of the passport system, because they would be inflicting upon themselves a greater injury by so doing than upon us. Let me say then once more that I can perceive no one element of danger to us in this union. I certainly did try, during the many months in which the process of incubation of Federation, if I may so speak, was going on—I certainly did try to bring as unprejudiced and dispassionate a consideration to its various phases as I possibly could. I looked upon it, I confess, with suspicion at the outset; I felt it was launching us into an unknown future, and that we were changing a system, that we got along with in comparatively a satisfactory manner, for one that was, in some of its aspects, new under the British Constitution. I say now, however, after giving to it the fullest consideration I am capable of giving, that I do not see, in any one respect, how the cementing of these colonies together in the bonds of government can tend to make us independent of Great Britain. If I did, I should feel it my duty to offer it a most uncompromising opposition, and to endeavor to defeat it by every means in my power. But, sir, I do see a great danger the other way. I see that if we remain a mere congeries of isolated colonies, hostile in some degree to each others' interests, there is danger ahead. I see that danger existing and threatening us in the United States. I see that if we do not unite and form one Central Government, giving it the power to direct all the physical energies of this country in whatever direction may be necessary, that we are liable to be overrun by that power. And this I con-

ceive to be one of the very strongest arguments in favor of the Confederation of the provinces, that it enables us to prepare appropriate defences along the whole frontier of our country. I believe I shall be able to show in a very few words, that if we are united, we shall afford to England sufficient inducements for undertaking those works of defence that are essential to our own security and to the maintenance of her flag on this continent for all time to come, and that if we do go into this union, as I believe we will we shall be placed in a position to defend ourselves successfully from attack. And this, sir, unfortunately, is not a contingency which we can hope will never occur. It is not now a mere vague possibility in a far distant future which we have to consider. So long as the present civil war continues, it is impossible for any man to foresee that such national complications will not arise as may at any day or hour involve us in actual hostilities. It is impossible for any prudent man to disregard that dark threatening cloud that has been gathering upon our borders, ready at almost any moment to burst upon us. It behoves us therefore to lose no time, if we believe that union offers a guarantee of safety against the dangers that threaten us—it becomes important that we lose no time to consummate the proposed union, in order that the General Government may put us at once in a proper state of defence. The public opinion of England, as we unhappily know, does not at the present time tend very much to warrant the Imperial Government in making any large expenditure for colonial purposes. There must be some reasonable prospect, that if expenditure is incurred in erecting necessary works of defence, those works will be actually available, when constructed, to protect the country upon whose frontier they are established. We cannot expect England to enter upon a course of expenditure for fortifications on our frontier, unless she has the assurance of our ability with her aid to hold those works against attacks from a hostile power. I believe that if the proposed plan of union breaks down—fails to get the assent of the several provinces—and we go back to our old condition of separate colonies, we shall so discourage the statesmen of England in reference to us, that they will feel very much embarrassed with the prospect before them. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—No, no!

MR. DUNKIN—What reason have you to think so?

HON. MR. ROSE—I believe that the formation of a government, having the power to direct the whole strength of five colonies would greatly add to our security. Who doubts that there is greater security in such a union than in isolation, each with separate interests and having no common action? I think the advantages of union for purposes of defence are not properly appreciated. (Hear, hear.) What would be the strength of Great Britain if there was a separate government for England, another for Wales, another for Ireland, and another for Scotland; each directing its own military and naval power? If one national government had not called forth all the national materials and elements of strength, would the prowess of her fleet or of her armies have been what it is? Is there no benefit in having a power that can bring to bear the whole military strength at any point desired? If there is not, then I am willing to say that this argument which carries conviction to my mind is of no value whatever.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Are we not all connected with the Mother Country?

HON. MR. ROSE—Certainly.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Then what stronger could we be by merely having a mere political connection with others? It would give us no more men.

HON. MR. ROSE—Does my honorable friend think that if each province had control of its own militia force, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island control over the seamen, and Canada the direction of her own militia, that the military forces of these five provinces could be brought to bear with the same advantage as if they were under the control of one central power? We could not take them out of their own provinces contrary to the laws of those provinces. Is it of no importance to make the hardy seamen of Newfoundland, or the people of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick feel, that if a hostile force lands at Sarnia in Upper Canada, their territory and their soil are invaded, or their independence threatened! We should have embroilment and difficulty among ourselves at the very moment when united action in presenting a bold front to the enemy was necessary to our safety. If we go back to our old condition of isolation, now that the solemn approval of the Mother Country has been

given to this proposition of Federation (and her statesmen see in this a great source of strength in enabling her to avert a war, and a ready means of defending the country)—do you believe that those statesmen will look kindly upon the act? Even my honorable friend from Hochelaga has admitted that there must be in that case a dissolution of the union between Upper and Lower Canada. That honorable gentleman stated in his speech the other night, that if this measure failed there must be Federation between the Canadas; and what, I would ask, is that but a dissolution of the present union? It is certainly a dissolution of the present union to adopt some new Federative system as between Upper and Lower Canada. But does the honorable gentleman think that he will find in the separation of these provinces an element of strength?

HON. MR. HOLTON—That is what you propose to do now.

HON. MR. ROSE—No, Mr. SPEAKER, I do not propose to do anything of the kind, as my honorable friend will acknowledge, if he will but bring his mind, dispassionately and earnestly, to the consideration of the question. There is no one more capable of seeing and appreciating the important features of this scheme than he. But my hon. friend has strong feelings, and sometimes is led away by preconceived jealousies or fears; I say that if my honorable friend will bring his strong intellect to bear on this scheme, he will find in it none of those dangers which ordinarily attach to the Federal form of government. I must now say a few more words in reference to the question of our ability to provide for the defences of the country. I have already stated—and I must apologise to the House for the digression which has been forced upon me—that I do not believe that, if we reverted back to our original condition, the Imperial Government would be as much disposed to aid us in the construction of the works necessary for our defence, as if they found that in the presence of a common danger we were united together to repel the common enemy. I say the Imperial Government would not in such a case be actuated simply by a regard to the expense of constructing these works—in which I understand the Lower Provinces will have to bear a share—but she would be deterred from so doing by the further consideration, that when built, these works would be less likely to serve the purpose they were designed to; accomplish, namely,

to enable the country to be efficiently defended. It is one thing to have a population of four millions united under one common head, and enabled to direct all their energies to the point of danger; and it is another thing to have a number of separate units, with no common action—each under a different government, and distracted and separate at the very time when they ought to be most united. (Hear, hear.) What we have to guard against is this: a sudden conquest or surprise, for which we might be unprepared. I believe myself that, if works can be constructed, by means of which we can effectually defend the country against sudden attack, no one will grudge the expense. Of course they will cost no inconsiderable sum; but I hope, as I believe my hon. friend the Finance Minister, although he may be pressed for other purposes, will not hesitate to recommend the appropriation necessary for the purpose, and to impose increased taxation for that purpose. (Hear, hear.) For I am sure that no member of this house, nor man in this country, would hesitate, if need were, to put their hands in their pockets and give a tenth of their substance for the construction of the works required to protect the country from the ravages of the aggressor, and to secure to ourselves a perpetuation of the inestimable blessings derived from our living under the British flag. (Hear, hear.) I am the more earnest in this question on account of the observations which have been made by my honorable friend the member for Hochelaga, (Hon. Mr. DORION) observations which I am sure he did not mean to have such an effect, but which nevertheless have a most mischievous tendency. That hon. gentleman stated that our true policy was, in fact, neutrality; that it was hopeless for us to attempt to defend ourselves against the overwhelming force which the United States could bring to bear against us, and that with our small population we would be very much in the same position as Denmark when opposed to the armies of Austria and Prussia. Indeed, he almost went as far as a gentleman who no longer holds a seat in this House, when he said that “the best armament for Canada was no armament at all.” I am sure that had the honorable gentleman felt that any injury would be done—any false impression produced on the public mind—by the use of observations like these, he would not have employed them at all. But I may say that they all tended to this end—the taking away

of that confidence we should have in our energy and resources, by telling us that the prospect before us is practically a hopeless one—that there is no use undertaking public works for our defence—no use in organizing, training, and arming our militia—that all attempts to hold our own would be fruitless on account of our inability to bring sufficient able-bodied men in the field to cope with the force to which we might be opposed. Why, sir, is it by such a tone as that, that you can keep up the spirit of the people for the defence of the country, by telling us that four millions of British subjects could offer no resistance whatever, even when backed by the power of England, against the United States or the greatest military nation on earth? I assert that even were we to be put in the unfortunate position of Denmark, ninety-nine out of every hundred of our population would be prepared to make a stand, hopeless though it might be for them, and to resist until the last foot of ground was wrested from us. (Hear, hear.) But if England, in case of war, should, for the first time in her history, decline to come to the aid of her colonies, future generations would not glory in the name of being Englishmen, as the past had such just reason to do. Sure I am, however, that we should occupy no hopeless or isolated position. It is in order that the observations of my honorable friend the member for Hochelaga may in some respect be counteracted, that I would yet trespass upon the indulgence of the House for a few minutes more on this head. We know that in modern warfare, if you can erect certain works which will compel an enemy to sit down before them, so as to prevent him from making progress into the country, you may by such means defend it for many months. I do not know what the scheme of the defence commissioners may be. But it is well known that they express the conviction that by the construction of certain works at various points, the manning of which is quite within the compass of our power, we can arrest the progress of an invader for many months, we can compel him to expend and exhaust his strength before these works, and we could throw embarrassments in his way such as would take an invading force many months to overcome. Because honorable members must remember that it is impossible to have more than a six months' campaign in this country. And supposing you were to erect works

before which an enemy was compelled to sit down in the month of May, it would take him fully three months before he could bring up his supplies and siege train and protect his communications, and by the time he was ready to make a determined attack, he would be overtaken by winter, be compelled to raise the siege and go into winter quarters. In truth our winters are our safeguard and defence. Such, at any rate, is the opinion of military men. During six months only are military operations practicable in this country, and thus whatever is done one season has to be abandoned on the approach of winter and begun again the following spring. If therefore we can only, by manning certain salient points in the country, prevent the progress of invasion, we are safe. Sudden conquest would be impossible—delay and impediments are everything. Every one knows the history of the celebrated lines of Torres Vedras, which extended thirty miles, and by means of which the invasion with which Napoleon terrified Europe was first rolled back. These lines were defended by but a small number of men, and they compelled Napoleon to retire before them. Then, on this continent we have the experience of Richmond, which has forced the army of General Grant to become a mere corps of observation, and of Charleston which has fallen at last, but after what delay and at what cost! Going to the Crimea, we see Sebastopol defying for months and months the joint efforts of England and France. If we therefore can keep the invader from our doors for a certain number of months, our Canadian winter will do the rest, whilst English ships would be engaged in harassing their coasts and in the destruction of American commerce in every sea. I, therefore, entreat those who are disposed to take a desponding view of the question to consider these things. An aggressive warfare in this country is one thing, and a defensive warfare another, and a very different. (Hear, hear.) Our country is well adapted for defensive purposes, and it is next to impossible to subdue us. The badness of our roads, the difficulties presented by our winters, our deep, broad and unfordable rivers, and the means we could establish for keeping an enemy in check at certain points for the necessary time, would enable us to resist the United States with all their power and resources. No man can have a greater appreciation of the enormous re-

sources, of the courage, of the varied appliances, of everything in fact which tends to success in war than I have of the American nation. I have seen them in the field, and seen them at sea. They certainly have come out as a military nation in such a way as almost to astonish the world. But, sir, let us consider a little more closely what their circumstances are in other respects. No doubt they have an enormous navy, but that very navy would not be more than sufficient to defend their harbors in case of a war with England. It is not because I imagine their ships could not cope singly with British ships—it is not because I believe their men are lacking in skill or courage, or that they are unable to build sufficient vessels—but they lack this—and it is a consideration which we cannot and ought not to forget—that they have not a single harbor in any sea, except on their own coast, to refit their vessels. (Hear, hear.) Supposing them to send a fleet of 20 or 30 ships to England.

AN HON. MEMBER—Or Ireland. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. ROSE—If they went to Ireland, they would have a very warm reception indeed. (Hear, hear.) No doubt they could get there with the coal they could carry; but where would they get the coal to bring them back or to carry on operations there? Sailing vessels now-a-days can do nothing; all vessels of war have to be propelled by steam; and there is no neutral port in the world where in time of war with England, the navy of the United States would be able to obtain assistance. For I take it for granted that in the event of a war with England the United States would have few allies. And, as I before remarked, there is not a port in the world where they could get an ounce of coal or any addition to their armament. In this would consist our great safety. They have no ports in the Indian Sea, in the east Atlantic, the Mediterranean or China seas, and it is simply because men of war could not exist without coaling and refitting that the navy of the United States would be placed at so great disadvantage. It is contrary to international law, as the House is well aware, that the ships of a belligerent nation can be received in a neutral port and assisted, beyond what is required by the dictates of humanity, to enable them to face the elements. They would be unable, I say, to get a single man, a ton of coal, an ounce of gunpowder, or a pound of iron, in

any neutral port, and I would like to know what the United States could do in a war with England so circumstanced? (Hear, hear.) Well, sir, this is one state of things. But there is yet another view to be taken of the question. Do we not know that in the event supposed, we should find the Atlantic coast swarming with English vessels carrying moveable columns of troops, menacing and landing at every point. The navy of England, the arsenals of England, the purse of England, and all the appliances and requirements of war would be brought to bear upon and be available to us in such a struggle. We should not suffer from the lack of the material of war, which is perhaps the very thing of all other things the most essential. In all respects we should be in a very different position from the Confederate States at the present day. We should simply be required to hold our own, while the United States were being harassed on the seaboard, and then when the winter came we should be comparatively safe. Think of the exhaustion to the United States of such a war! I have ventured to say thus much with a view of counteracting, so far as my feeble observations will enable me to do, the remarks of the hon. member for Hochelaga the other night, because I think it was a most pernicious, unmanly, and unpatriotic view of the case to be allowed to be disseminated, when we ought to do all we can to encourage and evoke a military spirit on the part of the youth of this country. Neutrality has been spoken of. But how could neutrality be possible in a struggle between England and the United States? The country which cannot put forth an effort to defend itself occupies a despicable position, and forfeits on the score of weakness, even the wretched privilege of being neutral. How is it possible, I again ask, that we could maintain a neutral position in such a war? We could not. We should have to make common cause with one or the other. Do you suppose the United States would allow us to stand aside?

HON. MR. HOLTON—It is the Minister of Agriculture's opinion that we should hold a neutral position.

HON. MR. MCGEE—Not at all.

HON. MR. ROSE—I have listened with pleasure to many speeches from my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture, but I have never heard one in which it was

implied that we ought to remain neutral in the event of a war between England and the United States. My hon. friend is well able to speak for himself; but I must say I have no recollection of hearing him utter so unpatriotic a sentiment.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Hear! hear!

HON. MR. ROSE—I have no doubt that what my hon. friend meant by neutrality was this, that we, as part of the British Empire, were bound to remain neutral as between the two warring sections of the neighboring states.

HON. MR. HOLTON—No; the hon. gentleman expressly gave it as his opinion that the neutrality of this country should be guaranteed by treaty, the same as is the case with Belgium and Switzerland.

HON. MR. MCGEE—I had this idea once. It was shortly after my hon. friend opposite (Hon. Mr. HOLTON) declared in favor of annexation. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—The sentiment has been expressed by the hon. gentleman within the last two or three years.

HON. MR. ROSE—Events have changed very much within the last two or three years, and we have got to deal now, not with mere party questions only, but with events that are transpiring. I will not say anything further on this point, however, as my hon. friend from Hochelaga is, not in his place, although the hon. member for Chateauguay chivalrously defends him in his absence. I say then, Mr. SPEAKER, that while I do not wish to exaggerate the danger, I cannot be insensible to it. It is a danger, dark, imminent and overwhelming, and if it was on that consideration alone, I say that I find in this question of defence sufficient not only to justify me in voting for the scheme now before the House, but to demand of me every effort to carry it into effect. (Hear, hear.) If we show that we are in earnest on this question of defence, England will be encouraged to come to our assistance in time of danger, knowing that she can look to us not only to contribute towards the construction of works, but effectually to defend them when constructed. (Hear, hear.) If we show England that she can depend on a population of four millions, with a strength wielded from a common centre, she will be encouraged to aid us with both men and material of war, and will lend us the assistance necessary to protect ourselves both now and in time to come. Let me repeat then, sir, that were there

nothing in addition to the great considerations to which I have adverted, I should go heartily for these resolutions, and I should be disposed to overlook many inequalities and some objectionable features which I see in the scheme. I do not intend to advert in detail to these, for I feel that I have to consider this question as a whole, and that unless I see objections to it, so great and numerous as to make me vote against it as a whole, it is useless to criticise that which I cannot mend. The scheme is in the nature of a treaty. It will not do to cavil at this or at that; we must either accept it or reject it. (Hear, hear.) I see the difficulties of the scheme, and the inequalities of it; but we must not complain if one colony gets a few thousand dollars more than another, or if one colony has to assume more of the debt than another. Unless I saw enough in the whole scheme to make me vote against it, I think it would be a mere waste of time to cavil at these small matters. Because without the consent of all the other colonies they cannot be altered, and on the whole there is no reason why the whole scheme should be rejected, and these slight inequalities will soon right themselves. (Hear, hear.) There is one thing I would ask the House to consider—apart from the higher consideration of defence; apart from the cementing of our union with England, which I believe is involved in the adoption of this measure, and apart from the chance of our falling a prey to the United States—and it is this: are we prepared, looking at Canada alone, to go back to the old state of things of twelve or eighteen months ago? Are we willing to revert to the chronic state of crisis in which we constantly found ourselves for years past? (Hear, hear.) This House and the whole Government had lost the confidence of the country, and the most lamentable recriminations and difficulties existed on the floor of this chamber. Indeed at the time of which I speak affairs were in such a state as to make every man with any feeling of self-respect disposed to abandon public life. I think we see in this alone enough to reconcile us to the change, and I believe I should see sufficient cause in this to induce me to vote for a change in our political system. The dread of going back to the past, the apprehension lest old party cries should be revived, and the fear lest difficulties in which we found ourselves might be perpetuated, would impel me to vote for the scheme now in our hands. (Hear, hear.)

Having said so much on the general policy of the union, I might have been disposed to enter at greater length into it, were it not that I wished to keep faith with my honorable friend from Lambton; but, having said so much on the higher grounds which recommend this scheme, I will now say a few words in reference to the objections which have been urged against its character, viz., because it embraces those elements of disruption which are to be found in every federal union. That is the objection of many who, while they would be willing to go for a purely legislative union, object to one of a federal character. They see in it that which tends to a disruption, and collision with the Central Government. Now, sir, I do not deny that if a legislative union, pure and simple, had been practicable, I, for one, would have preferred it; but I cannot disguise from myself that it was, and is at present, utterly impracticable, and I cannot help expressing my astonishment and extreme gratification, that five colonies which had been for so many years separate from each other, had so many separate and distinct interests and local differences, should come together and agree upon such a scheme. Remembering the difficulties that had to be encountered in the shape of local interests, personal ambition, and separate governments, I certainly am surprised at the result, and I cannot withhold from the gentlemen who conducted these negotiations, the highest praise for the manner in which they overcame the difficulties that met them at every step, and for the spirit in which they sunk their own personal differences and interests in preparing this scheme of Confederation. (Hear, hear.) It is remarkable that a proposition having so few of the objections of a Federal system, should have been assented to by the representatives of five distinct colonies, which had heretofore been alien, practically independent, not only of each other, but almost of England, and almost hostile to each other. (Hear, hear.) There had been very much to keep these colonies apart, and very little to bring them together, and the success which has attended their efforts speaks well for those statesmen who applied their minds earnestly to the work of union. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. HOLT—The necessity was urgent.

HON. MR. ROSE—I quite understand the ironical spirit of my honorable friend—

but the work of Confederation was no less one of vital importance to the country. I cannot help saying that I had no sympathy with the hon. member for Hochelaga (Hon. Mr. DORION), the other evening, in his historical detail of all the antecedent difficulties which existed in our political position. That honorable gentleman told us what were the opinions of this member and of that one at different periods,—commented on their inconsistency, and claimed that he himself had always been firm in his opposition to the project. Well, sir, I do not care what may have been the views of one member or of another, or how inconsistent he may have been. What we have to consider is the scheme which is now presented to us. Let us forget the past; let us forget former differences; do not let us revive former animosities! Let us consider that we are starting fresh in life, or as the term has been used, that we are entering upon a new era of national existence. (Hear, hear.) Let us cast aside past recriminations and look at the merits of this scheme. I have only to say that a man who does not change his opinions is a very unsafe man indeed to guide the affairs of a nation. Such a man is like an old sign-post on a road that is no longer used for travel. The sign-post is consistent enough, it remains where it had been placed, but though a type of consistency it is an emblem of error. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member for Hochelaga spoke of his consistency and the inconsistency of others, but he was like the sign-post which pointed out a road that existed twenty years ago, but which no one could now pass over. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) I think, therefore, that instead of endeavoring to find objections to this scheme because it does not give us a legislative instead of a federal union, we ought to acknowledge the sacrifices of those men who came together and prepared it. (Hear, hear.) Whatever may be said of our desire to get out of our own constitutional difficulties in Canada, that objection cannot be urged against the public men of the Lower Provinces. Newfoundland has not been in a state of crisis like us, and New Brunswick has been tolerably faithful to Mr. TILLEY for the last ten years; a short time ago the Premier of Nova Scotia had a majority of thirty in a very small house—everything went on swimmingly there, and even Prince Edward Island was not much embarrassed.

A VOICE—It wanted a railway.

HON. MR. ROSE—Let us attribute no motives, but rather give to every man who has had anything to do with this measure the credit of being actuated by the utmost patriotism and singleness of purpose. Such, I believe, is the feeling of nine-tenths—yes, ninety-nine hundredths of the people of this country. What inducement, except those of a public kind, had my hon. friend the President of the Council, or the Attorney General West to enter the same Government, if it was not with a view to bring about a union of the colonies? And even if they had only in view to heal the constitutional difficulties of the past, we ought to be deeply thankful to them. (Hear, hear.) I stated that I would not criticise many of the features of this scheme; but there are two main features which to my judgment commend themselves to the attention of every one who has any doubts as to the stability of the system, and which give us a sufficient guarantee, that guarantee which federal unions have heretofore wanted, namely: that it establishes a central authority which it will not be within the power of any of the local governments to interfere with or rise up against. It appears to me that they have avoided the errors into which the framers of the American Constitution not unnaturally fell. They have evidently learnt something from the teachings of the past, and profited by the experience afforded in the case of our American neighbors. They have established this Central Government, giving it such powers, and so defining the powers of the local governments, that it will be impossible for any Local Parliament to interfere with the central power in such a manner as to be detrimental to the interests of the whole. The great advantage which I see in the scheme is this, that the powers granted to the local governments are strictly defined and circumscribed, and that the residuum of power lies in the Central Government. You have, in addition to that, the local governors named by the central authority—an admirable provision which establishes the connection of authority between the central power and the different localities; you have vested in it also the great questions of the customs, the currency, banking, trade and navigation, commerce, the appointment of the judges and the administration of the laws, and all those great and large questions which interest the entire community, and with which the General Government ought

to be entrusted. There can, therefore, be no difficulty under the scheme between the various sections—no clashing of authority between the local and central governments in this case, as there has been in the case of the Americans. The powers of the local governments are distinctly and strictly defined, and you can have no assertion of sovereignty on the part of the local governments, as in the United States, and of powers inconsistent with the rights and security of the whole community. (Hear, hear.) Then, the other point which commends itself so strongly to my mind is this, that there is a veto power on the part of the General Government over all the legislation of the Local Parliament. That was a fundamental element which the wisest statesmen engaged in the framing of the American Constitution saw, that if it was not engrafted in it, must necessarily lead to the destruction of the Constitution. These men engaged in the framing of that Constitution at Philadelphia saw clearly, that unless the power of veto over the acts of the state legislatures was given to the Central Government, sooner or later a clashing of authority between the central authority and the various states must take place. What said Mr. MADISON in reference to this point? I quote from *The Secret Debates upon the Federal Constitution*, which took place in 1787, and during which this important question was considered. On the motion of Mr. PINKNEY "that the National Legislature shall have the power of negating all laws to be passed by the state legislature, which they may judge improper," he stated that he considered "this as the corner stone of the system, and hence the necessity of retrenching the state authorities in order to preserve the good government of the National Council." And Mr. MADISON said, "The power of negating is absolutely necessary—this is the only attractive principle which will retain its centrifugal force, and without this the planets will fly from their orbits." Now, sir, I believe this power of negative, this power of veto, this controlling power on the part of the Central Government is the best protection and safeguard of the system; and if it had not been provided, I would have felt it very difficult to reconcile it to my sense of duty to vote for the resolutions. But this power having been given to the Central Government, it is to my mind, in conjunction with the power of naming the local governors, the appointment and payment of the judiciary, one of the best features

of the scheme, without which it would certainly, in my opinion, have been open to very serious objection. (Hear, hear.) I will not now criticize any other of the leading features of the resolutions as they touch the fundamental conditions and principles of the union. I think there has been throughout a most wise and statesmanlike distribution of powers, and at the same time that those things have been carefully guarded which the minorities in the various sections required for their protection, and the regulation of which each province was not unnaturally desirous of retaining for itself. So far then as the objection is concerned of this union being federative merely in its character, and liable to all the difficulties which usually surround federal governments, I think we may fairly consider that there has been a proper and satisfactory distribution of power, which will avert many of those difficulties. (Hear, hear.) But, sir, there is another objection made to it, and one upon which, from my stand-point, I desire to make some observations, and that is with reference to the manner in which the rights of the various minorities in the provinces have been protected. This is unquestionably a grave and serious subject of consideration, and especially so to the minority in this section of the province, that is the English-speaking minority to which I and many other members of this House belong, and with whose interests we are identified. I do not disguise that I have heard very grave and serious apprehensions by many men for whose opinions I have great respect, and whom I admire for the absence of bigotry and narrow-mindedness which they have always exhibited. They have expressed themselves not so much in the way of objection to specific features of the scheme as in the way of apprehension of something dangerous to them in it—apprehensions which they cannot state explicitly or even define to themselves. They seem doubtful and distrustful as to the consequences, express fears as to how it will affect their future condition and interests, and in fact they almost think that in view of this uncertainty it would be better if we remained as we are. Now, sir, I believe that the rights of both minorities—the French minority in the General Legislature and the English speaking minority in the Local Legislature of Lower Canada—are properly guarded. I would admit at once

that without this protection it would be open to the gravest objection; I would admit that you were embodying in it an element of future difficulty, a cause of future dissension and agitation that might be destructive to the whole fabric; and therefore it is a very grave and anxious question for us to consider—especially the minorities in Lower Canada—how far our mutual rights and interests are respected and guarded, the one in the General and the other in the Local Legislature. With reference to this subject, I think that I, and those with whom I have acted—the English speaking members from Lower Canada—may in some degree congratulate ourselves at having brought about a state of feeling between the two races in this section of the province which has produced some good effect. (Hear, hear.) There has been, ever since the time of the union, I am happy to say—and everybody knows it who has any experience in Lower Canada—a cordial understanding and friendly feeling between the two nationalities, which has produced the happiest results. Belonging to different races and professing a different faith, we live near each other; we come in contact and mix with each other, and we respect each other; we do not trench upon the rights of each other; we have not had those party and religious differences which two races, speaking different languages and holding different religious beliefs, might be supposed to have had; and it is a matter of sincere gratification to us, I say, that this state of things has existed and is now found amongst us. (Hear, hear.) But if, instead of this mutual confidence; if, instead of the English-speaking minority placing trust in the French majority in the Local Legislature, and the French minority placing the same trust in the English majority in the General Legislature, no such feeling existed, how could this scheme of Confederation be made to work successfully? (Hear, hear.) I think it cannot be denied that there is the utmost confidence on both sides; I feel assured that our confidence in the majority in the Local Government will not be misplaced, and I earnestly trust that the confidence they repose in us in the General Legislature will not be abused. (Hear, hear.) I hope that this mutual yielding of confidence will make us both act in a high-minded and sensitive manner when the rights of either side are called in question—if ever they should be called in question—in the respect-

ive legislatures. This is an era in the history of both races—the earnest plighting of each other's faith as they embrace this scheme. It is remarkable that both should place such entire confidence in one another; and in future ages our posterity on both sides will be able to point with pride to the period when the two races had such reliance the one on the other as that each was willing to trust its safety and interest to the honor of the other. (Hear, hear.) This mutual confidence has not been brought about by any ephemeral or spasmodic desire for change on the part of either; it is the result of the knowledge each race possesses of the character of the other, and of the respect each entertains for the other. (Hear, hear.) It is because we have learnt to respect each other's motives and have been made to feel by experience that neither must be aggressive, and that the interests of the one are safe in the keeping of the other. And I think I may fairly appeal to the President of the Council, that if, during the ten years in which he has agitated the question of representation by population, we the English in Lower Canada had listened to his appeals—appeals that he has persistently made with all the earnestness and vigor of his nature—if we had not turned a deaf ear to them, but had gone with those of our own race and our own faith, the people of Upper Canada, who demanded this change, where, I would ask him, would have been our union to day? Would not a feeling of distrust have been established between the French and English races in the community, that would have rendered even the fair consideration of it utterly impracticable? (Hear, hear.) Would the French have in that case been ready now to trust themselves in the General Legislature, or the English in the Local Legislature of Lower Canada? No; and I pray God that this mutual confidence between two races which have so high and noble a work to do on this continent, who are menaced by a common danger, and actuated by a common interest, may continue for all time to come! I pray that it may not be interrupted or destroyed by any act of either party; and I trust that each may continue to feel assured that if at any time hereafter circumstances should arise calculated to infringe upon the rights of either, it will be sufficient to say, in order to prevent any aggression of this kind—"We trusted each other when we entered this union; we felt then that our rights would be sacred with

you; and our honor and good faith and integrity are involved in and pledged to the maintenance of them." (Hear, hear.) I believe this is an era in our history to which in after ages our children may appeal with pride, and that if there should be any intention on either side to aggress upon the other, the recollection that each trusted to the honor of the other will prevent that intention being carried out. (Hear, hear.) Feeling as I do thus strongly that our French fellow-subjects are placing entire confidence in us—in our honor and our good faith—we, the English speaking population of Lower Canada, ought not to be behind hand in placing confidence in them. I feel that we have no reason as a minority to fear aggressions on the part of the majority. We feel that in the past we have an earnest of what we may reasonably expect the future relations between the two races to be. But although this feeling of mutual confidence may be strong enough in our breasts at this time, I am glad to see that my hon. friend the Attorney General East, as representing the French majority in Lower Canada, and the Minister of Finance, as representing the English speaking minority, have each carefully and prudently endeavored to place as fundamental conditions in this basis of union such safeguards and protection as the two races may respectively rely upon. (Hear, hear.) I feel that it has been carefully considered and carried out, and with the same amount of mutual confidence in the future working as in the past, we need not have any apprehension in trusting the interests of the two races either in the Federal or Local Legislature. (Hear, hear.) But although we here, and as members of this House, feel this confidence in each other, no doubt those who prepared these resolutions were conscious that the powers must be so distributed, and the reservations of power so made, as to commend them to the people of the country at large. You must carry the people with you in this movement, for you cannot force a new Constitution, a new state of political being, upon a people, unless their own judgment and their own convictions as to its safety go along with it.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. ROSE—You cannot, I say, force a new Constitution upon an unwilling people, but in this instance I believe a very great majority approve of, and are earnestly desirous of the change. I know you must

satisfy them that their interests for all time to come are safe—that the interests of the minority are hedged round with such safeguards, that those who come after us will feel that they are protected in all they hold dear; and I think a few observations will enable me to show the House that that has been well and substantially done in this case. (Hear, hear.) Looking at the scheme, then, from the stand-point of an English Protestant in Lower Canada, let me see whether the interests of those of my own race and religion in that section are safely and properly guarded. There are certain points upon which they feel the greatest interest, and with regard to which it is but proper that they should be assured that there are sufficient safeguards provided for their preservation. Upon these points, I desire to put some questions to the Government. The first of these points is as to whether such provision has been made and will be carried out that they will not suffer at any future time from a system of exclusion from the federal or local legislatures, but that they will have a fair share in the representation in both; and the second is, whether such safeguards will be provided for the educational system of the minority in Lower Canada as will be satisfactory to them? Upon these points some apprehensions appear to exist in the minds of the English minority in Lower Canada, and although I am free to confess that I have not shared in any fear of injustice at the hands of the majority, as I consider that the action of the past forms a good guarantee for the future, yet I desire, for the full assurance of that minority, to put some questions to my hon. friends in the Government. I wish to know what share of representation the English-speaking population of Lower Canada will have in the Federal Legislature, and whether it will be in the same proportion as their representation in this Parliament? This is one point in which I think the English inhabitants of Lower Canada are strongly interested. Another is with regard to their representation in the Local Legislature of Lower Canada—whether the same proportion will be given to them as is now given to them in this House, that is to say, about one-fourth of the Lower Canadian representation, which is the proportion of the English speaking to the French speaking population of Lower Canada, the numbers being 260,000 and 1,100,000 respectively. Now, the spirit of the resolutions as I understand them—and I

will thank my hon. friend the Attorney General to correct me if I am in error in regard to them—provides that the electoral districts in Lower Canada for representatives in the first Federal Legislature shall remain intact as they now are; and, although the resolution is somewhat ambiguously expressed, I take that to be its spirit.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Have the kindness to read it and see.

HON. MR. ROSE—The 23rd resolution reads: "The Legislature of each province shall divide such province into the proper number of constituencies, and define the boundaries of each of them." Then the 24th resolution provides that "the Local Legislature may from time to time alter the electoral districts for the purpose of representation in such Local Legislature, and distribute the representatives to which the province is entitled in such Local Legislature, in any manner such legislature may see fit." In these resolutions I presume that power is given to the Legislature of each province to divide the province into the proper number of constituencies for representation in the Federal Parliament, and to alter the electoral districts for representation in the Local Legislature. Now, to speak quite plainly, the apprehension which I desire to say again I do not personally share in, but which has been expressed to me by gentlemen in my own constituency, is this, that with respect to the Local Legislature, it will be competent for the French majority in Lower Canada to blot out the English-speaking minority from any share in the representation, and so to apportion the electoral districts that no English speaking member can be returned to the Legislature. That is an apprehension upon which I would be very glad to have an expression of opinion by my hon. friend the Attorney General East. As I read the resolutions, if the Local Legislature exercised its powers in any such unjust manner, it would be competent for the General Government to veto its action, and thus prevent the intention of the Local Legislature being carried into effect—even although the power be one which is declared to be absolutely vested in the Local Government, and delegated to it as one of the articles of its constitution.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—There is not the least doubt that if the Local Legislature of Lower Canada should apportion the electoral districts in such a way as to do injustice to the English-speaking population, the General Government will have the right to vet

any law it might pass to this effect and set it at naught.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Would you advise it?

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—Yes, I would recommend it myself in case of injustice. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. ROSE—I am quite sure my hon. friend would do it rather than have an injustice perpetrated. There is another point upon which I would like to have from the Attorney General East an explicit statement of the views of the Government. I refer to the provision in the 23rd resolution which I have just read; what I wish to know is whether the Legislature therein spoken of means the Legislature of the province of Canada as it is now constituted, and whether it is contemplated to have any change in the boundaries of the electoral districts for representation in the first session of the Federal Legislature?

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—With regard to Lower Canada, it is not the intention to make any alteration in the electoral districts, because there will be no change in the number of representatives sent to the General Parliament. But with regard to Upper Canada, there will be a change in the electoral districts, because there will be an increase of members from that section.

HON. MR. ROSE—So that I clearly understand from the statement of the hon. gentleman that in Lower Canada the constituencies, for the purposes of the first election to the Federal Legislature, will remain as they are now?

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—Yes, as they are now.

HON. MR. ROSE—And that as regards the representation in the Local Legislature, the apportionment of the electoral districts by it will be subject to veto by the General Government.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—Yes, in case of injustice being done. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. ROSE—I have to thank the hon. gentleman for the manner in which he has answered the questions, and for the assurances he has given on these two points—assurances which, I feel persuaded, will remove some apprehension felt in the country with regard to them. An hon. gentleman who sits near me (MR. FRANCIS JONES) asks me to enquire who is to change the electoral districts in Upper Canada.

HON. MR. GALT—The Parliament of Canada. (Hear, hear)

HON. MR. ROSE—The hon. gentleman wants to know if it is the present Parliament of Canada; but I am quite willing to let Upper Canada take care of itself, and I think its representatives are able to do so. One minority is quite enough for me to attend to at present. (Laughter.) I trust the Attorney General East, from my putting these questions to him, will not infer that I have any doubt as to the fair dealing that will be accorded to the minority by the majority in Lower Canada. But it is very desirable, I think, that we should receive a clear, emphatic, and distinct declaration of the spirit of the resolutions on these points, in order that the minority may see how well their rights and interests have been protected. (Hear, hear.) I am fully persuaded that in the past conduct of the majority in Lower Canada there is nothing which will cause the minority to look with doubt upon the future; for I will do my hon. friend the justice of saying that in the whole course of his public life there has not been a single act on his part either of executive, administrative, or legislative action, tinged with illiberality, intolerance, or bigotry. (Hear, hear.) I say this to express my belief that in the future, wherever he has control, there will be no appearance of bigotry or illiberality, and I feel that the confidence I repose in him in this respect is shared in by many others in this House and throughout the country. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—Will my hon. friend allow me to interrupt him? Perhaps it would be well, while he is asking questions of the Government, to elicit an answer to the question I have put once or twice touching the proposed measure of the Administration on the subject of education in Lower Canada, as it affects the English-speaking minority. Perhaps he will ascertain whether it will be submitted to the House before the final passage of the Confederation scheme.

HON. MR. ROSE—I intend to come to that presently, and to put a question to my hon. friend the Attorney General East in reference to that subject. What I wish to do now is to point out the objections I have heard on the part even of some of my own friends to this scheme—objections which, as I have said, are grounded on an undefined dread of evil rather than on anything that they actually now see obnoxious in the scheme itself. These fears, I have said, are vague and undefined, and difficult therefore to combat. If I go among one class and ask

them what they fear, I am told—"Oh, you are going to hand us over to the tender mercies of the French; the English influence will be entirely annihilated; they will have no power in the community; and all the advantages we have gained during the past twenty-five years by our union with the people of our own race in Upper Canada will be entirely lost." I can but answer—"What are you afraid of? Where is the interest affecting you that is imperilled? You have, in conjunction with a majority of your own race, power in the General Legislature to appoint the local governors, administer justice and name the judges, to control the militia and all other means of defence, and to make laws respecting the post office, trade, commerce, navigation; and you have all the great and important interests that centre in the community I represent—all matters that affect the minority in Lower Canada—within your control in the Federal Legislature. The French have surrendered the questions relating to usury, to marriage and divorce, on which they hold pretty strong opinions, to the Central Government. What, then, are you afraid of in the action of the Local Legislature?" "Well," I am answered, "all that may be true enough; but we shall not get a single appointment; the administration of local affairs in Lower Canada will be entirely in the hands of the French majority, and they will control all the patronage." You say to them again—"Is it the exercise of patronage you are afraid of? Is not the appointment of the judges, the patronage of the post office, the customs, the excise, the board of works, and all the other important branches of the administration in the hands of the Federal Government? What is there, then, but a few municipal officers to be appointed by the local legislatures; and for the sake of this petty patronage, are you going to imperil the success of a scheme that is fraught with such important consequences to all the Provinces of British North America? Is it for this that you will oppose a measure that contains so many merits, that possesses so much good, and that is calculated to confer such lasting benefits upon these provinces, if not to lead to the formation of a territorial division of the British Empire here?" Well, these questions I have put, and these explanations I have made, but some still seemed to entertain an undefined dread that they could not realise to themselves—a dread which to a great extent appears to be shared by my hon.

friend opposite (Hon. Mr. DORION) in regard to the General Legislature. Well, if we look to the history of the past twenty-five years and see how we have acted towards each other, I think neither party will have any cause for apprehension. Has there been a single act of aggression on the part of my hon. friend the Attorney General East on us the English minority, or a single act of aggression on our part towards the race to which he belongs? (Hear, hear.) Has there not been mutual respect and confidence, and has there been an act on either side to destroy that feeling? (Hear, hear.) I think the past gives assurance to us that no such difficulty will arise in the future, and that we shall continue to live and work harmoniously together, each holding the other in respect and esteem. (Hear, hear.) But we are told—and it is urged as an objection against the scheme—that works of improvement will be obstructed by the Local Government in Lower Canada. Now, I think the day has long gone by when acts which were formerly committed could possibly be repeated—when, for instance, before the union, the work carried on by the Montreal Harbor Commissioners could not be proceeded with because Mr. PAPINEAU opposed it. The days of progress and advancement have come since that time. This is an age of progress, the very spirit of which is hostile in the strongest degree to such a state of things. It is impossible for either race to treat the other with injustice. Their interests are too much bound up together, and any injustice committed by one would react quite as injuriously upon it elsewhere; and I believe that the mutual confidence with which we are going into this union ought to and will induce us all to labor together harmoniously, and endeavor to work it out for the best. (Hear, hear.) I do not disguise from myself that the minority in Lower Canada has always been on the defensive. That is a condition which is natural under the circumstances; for we cannot be in a minority without being more or less on the defensive. But I think that under this scheme the French minority in the General Legislature and the English minority in Lower Canada, will both be amply and satisfactorily protected. (Hear, hear.) Now, sir, I come to the question adverted to by the hon. member for Chateauguay, in reference to the education measure which the Government has promised to bring down to the House. I believe this is the first time almost in the history of

Lower Canada—and I call the attention of my hon. friends from Upper Canada to the fact—that there has been any excitement, or movement, or agitation on the part of the English Protestant population of Lower Canada in reference to the common school question. (Hear, hear.) It is the first time in the history of the country that there has been any serious apprehension aroused amongst them regarding the elementary education of their children. I am not aware that there has ever been any attempt in Lower Canada to deprive the minority of their just rights in respect to the education of their youth. I do not state this simply as my own opinion, or as the result of observations which I have made alone. I have received letters from those who have been cognizant of the educational system in Lower Canada for many years, confirmatory of this in the strongest degree. It was also observed and commented upon by the three commissioners who came out from England to this country in 1837, and who in their report said it was one of the most remarkable circumstances that came under their notice, that they found two races, speaking different languages and holding different religious opinions, living together in harmony, and having no difference or ill-feeling in respect to the education of their children. Now we, the English Protestant minority of Lower Canada, cannot forget that whatever right of separate education we have was accorded to us in the most unrestricted way before the union of the provinces, when we were in a minority and entirely in the hands of the French population. We cannot forget that in no way was there any attempt to prevent us educating our children in the manner we saw fit and deemed best; and I would be untrue to what is just if I forgot to state that the distribution of State funds for educational purposes was made in such a way as to cause no complaint on the part of the minority. I believe we have always had our fair share of the public grants in so far as the French element could control them, and not only the liberty, but every facility, for the establishment of separate dissentient schools wherever they were deemed desirable. A single person has the right, under the law, of establishing a dissentient school and obtaining a fair share of the educational grant, if he can gather together fifteen children who desire instruction in it. Now, we cannot forget that in the past this liberality

has been shown to us, and that whatever we desired of the French majority in respect to education, they were, if it was at all reasonable, willing to concede. (Hear, hear.) We have thus, in this also, the guarantee of the past that nothing will be done in the future unduly to interfere with our rights and interests as regards education, and I believe that everything we desire will be as freely given by the Local Legislature as it was before the union of the Canadas. (Hear, hear.) But from whence comes the practical difficulty of dealing with the question at the present moment? We should not forget that it does not come from our French-Canadian brethren in Lower Canada, but that it arises in this way—and I speak as one who has watched the course of events and the opinion of the country upon the subject—that the Protestant majority in Upper Canada are indisposed to disturb the settlement made a couple of years ago, with regard to separate schools, and rather to hope that the French majority in Lower Canada should concede to the English Protestant minority there, nothing more than is given to the minority in the other section of the province. But still it must be conceded that there are certain points where the present educational system demands modification—points in which the English Protestant minority of Lower Canada expect a modification. I would ask my honorable friend the Attorney General East, whether the system of education which is in force in Lower Canada at the time of the proclamation is to remain and be the system of education for all time to come; and that whatever rights are given to either of the religious sections shall continue to be guaranteed to them? We are called upon to vote for the resolutions in ignorance, to some extent, of the guarantees to be given by subsequent legislation, and therefore my honorable friend will not take it amiss if I point out to him where the Protestant minority desire a change, with a view of ascertaining how far the Government is disposed to meet their views by coming down with a measure in which they may be embodied. The first thing I wish to mention has caused a good deal of difficulty in our present system, and that is, whether non-resident proprietors shall have the same right of designating the class of schools to which their taxes shall be given as actual residents. That is one point—whether a person living out of the district or township

shall not have the same privilege of saying that his taxes shall be given to a dissentient school as if he resided upon the property. A second point is with reference to taxes on the property of incorporated companies. As it is now, such taxes go in a manner which is not considered satisfactory to the minority of Lower Canada. What I desire to ascertain is whether some equitable provision will be made, enabling the taxes on such property to be distributed in some way more satisfactory to the owners—perhaps in the same way that the Government money is. Some have urged that it should be left to the directors of such companies to indicate the schools to which such taxes should be given, while others think that each individual shareholder should have the power to say how the taxes on his property should be applied. I am inclined to think the latter method would be found utterly impracticable. I confess it is an extreme view, and I do not think we could expect that. But I do think there ought to be some more equitable way of appropriating the taxes on such property. These are two points, of perhaps inferior importance to the third, and that is, whether a more direct control over the administration and management of the dissentient schools in Lower Canada will not be given to the Protestant minority; whether in fact they will not be left in some measure to themselves. I am quite well aware that this is a question that concerns both Catholics and Protestants, for I believe that about one-third of the dissentient schools are Catholic schools.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Dissentient on account of language.

HON. MR. CARTIER—There are none dissentient on account of language.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Well, what for then?

HON. MR. CARTIER—Well, not on account of language; there is no difficulty on account of that.

HON. MR. ROSE—The question relates to all dissentient schools, from whatever cause they may have been led to dissent. The remedy can be made to apply equally to all. I do not ask what precise measure will be brought down, but I do think they ought to have more control than they now possess. The final question is one relating somewhat to the finances, and therefore belongs more properly to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance.

HON. MR. GALT—You shall have an answer immediately.

HON. MR. CARTIER—MR. SPEAKER, as usual, I am ready to answer categorical questions, and I will answer my hon. friend in such a way as to satisfy both the House and my hon. friend. With regard to the first point, respecting non-residents in the townships, I may say that it is the intention of the Government, in a measure which is to be introduced, to give those who are in a minority power to designate to what dissentient schools their assessment shall be paid.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—Only in townships?

HON. MR. CARTIER—Everywhere. Not to Catholics alone either. With regard to the second question—the distribution of money raised from commercial companies—I am well aware that to this day there has been a complaint with regard to the distribution of those moneys. It is the intention of the Government to have in the measure a provision which will secure a more equitable distribution of those moneys, distributing them in such a way as to satisfy everyone. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) Now, with regard to the third enquiry, I am ready also to answer my honorable friend from Montreal Centre, that it is the intention of the Government that in that law there will be a provision that will secure to the Protestant minority in Lower Canada such management and control over their schools as will satisfy them. (Laughter and cheers.) Now, with regard to my hon. friend from Chateauguay, who said that there were dissentient schools on account of language.

HON. MR. HOLTON—The hon. gentleman must have misunderstood what I said. The honorable member from Montreal Centre was saying that there were dissentient schools on account of religion. I merely suggested that there might be dissentient schools on account of language. There was nothing in the law to prevent it. There might be Catholic dissentient schools in municipalities where the majority was Protestant.

HON. MR. CARTIER—The honorable member for Chateauguay has the laws of Lower Canada in his possession. Well, he will not find there that there is any such thing as Catholic or Protestant schools mentioned. What are termed in Upper Canada separate schools, come under the appropriate word, in Lower Canada, of dissentient. It is stated that where the majority

is of either religion, the dissentient minority—either Catholic or Protestant—have the right to establish dissentient schools. In the cities the majority being Catholics, the dissentient schools are Protestant, but in the townships, the majority is sometimes Protestant and the dissentient schools Catholic.

MR. POPE—What will be the provision made, where the population is pretty sparse, as in some parts of my county? Will you allow the minority of one township to join with a neighboring township for the purpose of establishing a dissentient school?

HON. MR. CARTIER—Yes. There will be a provision enabling the minority to join with their friends in a contiguous municipality in order to make up the requisite number.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—While the Government is in a communicative mood—(laughter)—I think it is of some importance that we should know whether it is the intention of the Government to extend the same rights and privileges to the Catholic minority of Upper Canada that are to be given to the Protestants of Lower Canada?

HON. MR. CARTIER—I cannot do my own work and the work of others. The Hon. Attorney General for Upper Canada is not present, but I have no doubt that on some future occasion he will be able to answer my honorable friend from Cornwall.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—In the absence of the Hon. Attorney General West, perhaps the Hon. President of the Council will be kind enough to give us the desired information?

HON. MR. BROWN—If my hon. friend wants an answer from me, I can only say that the provisions of the School bill relating to Upper Canada have not yet been considered by the Government. As soon as a bill is framed there will be no delay in laying it before the House.

HON. MR. ALLEYN—I sincerely hope that the Government feel disposed to grant to the Catholics of Upper Canada the same privileges they have just promised to the Protestants of Lower Canada.

HON. MR. ROSE—The manner and spirit in which the Government have given explanations on the subject ought to be satisfactory to the people of Lower Canada of the Protestant religion. The liberal manner in which they have been dealt with in the past gives us every reason to be convinced that we will receive justice. (Hear, hear.) I

have no hesitation in saying that I have full confidence that the Lower Canada section of the Administration will deal with us in a fair and liberal spirit. I have confidence in my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, and in my hon. friend the Attorney General East, and I am glad to learn that he will give all proper consideration to that financial question, the distribution of the assessment of commercial companies in a satisfactory manner. I hope the Minister of Finance will be disposed to go further, and deal in a similar spirit with the endowment of colleges.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Bring the pressure to bear, and you will get it. Now is the time, before the Confederation scheme comes to a vote.

HON. MR. ROSE—Well, it happens that my honorable friend from Chateauguay and myself hold very dissimilar views respecting the importance of Confederation. If I were disposed to follow such tactics, I might possibly profit by his advice. But I am inclined to overlook a great many things on which my honorable friend would hesitate, for the purpose of seeing so important a measure carried out. While I have every confidence in the present Government, I feel that we may expect as much justice at the hands of the Lower Canada Local Parliament as from any Government of United Canada that we ever had. We have never yet had occasion to appeal to the Protestant majority of Upper Canada for help, and if we ever should deem it proper to do so, I have no reason to believe that we should receive more attention than our wants received at the hands of the Catholic majority of Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) Now, sir, so far as the three questions to which I have made allusion are concerned, the apprehensions of being shut out from the General Government—being handed over to the French in the Local Parliament of Lower Canada, and our educational rights being interfered with, I feel every assurance that the spirit of the answers just given will be carried out. I will now say a few words respecting the argument presented by my hon. friend from Hochelaga (Hon. Mr. DORION) in the course of his speech the other evening—that the plan for Federation would inflict great financial injustice upon Canada, and that it would, through the Intercolonial Railway and works of defence, entail such enormous burdens upon the people of Canada

as to ultimately lead them to rise up against and overthrow it. Well now, for the life of me I cannot see how it is to increase our expenditure. I cannot see how it can go beyond what the Minister of Finance stated—that it could not in any case add to the present cost more than the expenses of the General Government. The Local Governments cannot be more expensive than the present Government, and therefore all we need to add at the very most is the expense of the General Government. I do not see how it is possible to add any more. I would, however, ask the attention of the House to another statement made the other evening by the hon. member from Hochelaga. He said that we were making a mistake in supposing that we were discussing a question of colonial union. Confederation, he said, was simply tacked on to the Intercolonial Railway at the suggestion of Mr. WATKIN, and that the whole arrangement was merely a nicely planned scheme for the benefit of the Grand Trunk Railway.

MR. WALLBRIDGE—That was the very motive.

HON. MR. ROSE—Well, does any one suppose that my hon. friend the President of the Council could be duped in that way? Is it possible that my hon. friend from Hochelaga believes he has so little astuteness as not to see through such an attempt as that? The argument was used to get the support of the opponents of railways in this House against the Federation. Sir, it would appear that the hon. President of the Council, and the hon. Provincial Secretary and the other members of the Government, who are anti-railway in their views, have been altogether mistaken, and that we are merely going to build up another gigantic railway-monopoly for fraudulent purposes. They may all be deceived by this imaginary project, and it would seem too, sir; that Mr. WATKIN, possessing the wiles of MEPHISTOPHELES, had hoodwinked the Governor General, and the Colonial Secretary, and caused them to fall into the trap also. Nay, further, it would appear that his wiles had reached the Throne itself, for Her Majesty has expressed herself in the speech to Parliament in favor of the scheme. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. HOLT—Order, order.

HON. MR. ROSE—Can it be supposed that a grave and important matter of this kind would have received such consideration from the Home Government, if it were nothing more than a Grand Trunk job? My

hon. friend opposite sonorously cries "Order," when I come to deal with his late colleague's arguments as the only answer he can give. Does he suppose I am going to allow a grave charge of such a nature to go unanswered?

HON. MR. HOLT—If I called "Order," it was because I considered that Her Majesty ought not to have been mentioned in connection with the term "hoodwink." Her advisers were the responsible parties. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. ROSE—I repeat that the Speech from the Throne which we have received to-day, and to which I have a perfect right to refer, does not treat this measure as anything akin to a Grand Trunk job. It is really presuming too much on the part of my hon. friend from Hochelaga to get up and say in effect to the members of this House: "You know nothing about this scheme; you cannot see or understand what it really is; but my astuteness enables me to see that it is nothing more than a mere railway job." (Laughter.) Does the hon. member really believe what he has stated? Does he really believe that the whole project is for the benefit of the Grand Trunk? It is a most unworthy course for him to pursue to endeavor to bring old prejudices against the Grand Trunk Company, to bear in the manner he has been doing; prejudices and animosities based upon stories that have been repeated until a further reference to them seems almost childish. But it is not possible that any honorable member's judgment can be carried away by those little appeals to side issues, on a question of this important nature. What does the Speech from the Throne say:—

Her Majesty has had great satisfaction in giving her sanction to the meeting of a conference of delegates from her several North American Provinces, who, on an invitation from Her Majesty's Governor General, assembled at Quebec. These delegates adopted resolutions having for their object a closer union of those provinces under a Central Government. If those resolutions shall be approved by the Provincial Legislatures, a bill will be laid before you for carrying this important measure into effect.

(Loud cheers.) This is the language used by our Sovereign when addressing the Imperial Parliament, and are we now to be urged to under estimate the value of the great project by mere appeals to the prejudices of the people at large against the threatened monopoly of the Grand Trunk Railway. The opinion of Her Majesty is shared in, too, by some of the

greatest statesmen of England, whose names are identified with the history of the nation. What said Lord DERBY in reference to Confederation? Does he consider it to emanate from a mere clique of railway speculators? Speaking of the relation of Canada to the United States—and his remarks come in most opportunely in connection with the observations I made at the outset—speaking of defending the upper lakes with armed vessels, the noble lord says:—

I do not ask Her Majesty's Government what steps they have taken, but I do say this, that they will be deeply responsible if they are not fully awake to the position in which this country is placed by these two acts of the United States. If the preponderating force upon the lakes should be in the hands of the United States, it could only be used for purposes of aggression. (Hear, hear.) An attack on the part of Canada upon the United States is a physical impossibility. The long frontier of Canada is peculiarly open to aggression; and assailable as it is by land, unless there be a preponderating force upon these lakes, you must be prepared to place the province of Canada at the disposal of the United States.

I prefer the appreciation of Lord DERBY, and his opinion of the state of these affairs, to the ironical cheers or opinion of my honorable friend from Chateaugay. I place what the noble lord has said as to the Confederation question in its relation to the defence of these provinces and the strength to be thereby added to the Government of England, before anything which he or the other opponents of this scheme can express. The noble lord says with regard to the great measure itself:—

Under the circumstances I see, with additional satisfaction, the announcement of a contemplated step—I mean the proposed Federation of the British North American Provinces. I hope I may regard that Federation as a measure tending to constitute a power strong enough, with the aid of this country, which, I trust, may never be withdrawn from these provinces—to acquire an importance which separately they could not obtain. If I saw in this Federation a desire to separate from this country, I should think it a matter of much more doubtful policy and advantage; but I perceive with satisfaction that no such wish is entertained. Perhaps it is premature to discuss at this moment resolutions not yet submitted to the different legislatures; but I hope I see in the terms of that Federation an earnest desire on the part of the provinces to maintain for themselves the blessing of the connection with this country, and a determined and deliberate preference for monarchical over republican institutions.

(Hear, hear, and cheers.) Now, sir, could there be anything more opportune? This is the lan-

guage of one of the ablest statesmen of England. Be united, he says, that you may be strong, and depend upon it you will have the whole power of England to sustain you. Can there be anything more cheering or encouraging to those who have taken an interest in the subject, than the language I have just quoted, and which was uttered in the House of Lords not three weeks ago? (Hear, hear.) And yet my honorable friend from Hochelaga presumes to stand up here and tell us, in effect, that we are so many children—that we are deceived with the idea that we are going to establish a great nation or Confederation of provinces, and that there is nothing of that kind in it; and he appeals to prejudices formerly entertained by members on this side of the House, in order that he may induce them to withdraw their support from the important measure which the Government has brought down, and which the greatest statesmen of England have stamped with their approval. (Hear, hear.) Perhaps the House will indulge me if I read a few more words from the discussion in the House of Lords upon the Speech from the Throne. Earl GRANVILLE, the President of the Council, said:—

And what ought to make us still more proud of the good government which must undoubtedly have prevailed amongst us, is to find that our North American colonies, in expressing their wish to continue their connexion with this country, and in adopting the new institutions they have been considering with such calm and prudent statesmanship, have thought it desirable to keep as close as possible to the constitution and institutions under which we so happily live.

(Loud cheers.) He does not belittle the men who have sacrificed so much, as honorable gentlemen opposite are inclined to do. He does not sneer at those who have gone into the matter with the honest view of carrying it out; but, on the contrary, he praises their "calm and prudent statesmanship," and says that it is a matter of which they may feel proud, and I say that those who have taken part in originating and bringing this project to the present advanced stage, may well feel proud of their work, when the greatest statesmen of the world commend it as a thing of wonderful perfection, considering the difficulties with which it is surrounded. And these opinions were not confined to any one party, but were uttered by both liberals and conservatives. Lord HOUGHTON said in the course of the same debate:—

On the other side of the Atlantic the same impulse has manifested itself in the proposed amal-

gamation of the Northern Provinces of British America. I heartily concur with all that has been said by my noble friend the mover of this address in his laudation of that project. It is, my lords, a most interesting contemplation that that project has arisen and has been approved by Her Majesty's Government. It is certainly contrary to what might be considered the old maxims of government in connection with the colonies, that we should here express, and that the Crown itself should express satisfaction at a measure which tends to bind together in almost independent power our colonies in North America. We do still believe that though thus banded together they will recognize the value of British connection, and that while they will be safer in this amalgamation we shall be as safe in their fealty. The measure will, no doubt, my lords, require much prudent consideration and great attention to prevent susceptibilities. It will have to deal with several British provinces, but with a race almost foreign in their habits and origin. I do hope it will ultimately succeed, and that the French-Canadians forming part of this great integral North British American empire will have as much security and happiness as they can attain.

Those who say that the people throughout the country are opposed to this measure, I am satisfied, know very little what the sentiment of the country is. I believe there is a deep-rooted sentiment of approbation of the steps that have been taken. I know that those who are perhaps most fearful with reference to it, and whose interests are perhaps most in jeopardy—the English speaking minority in Lower Canada—have considered it carefully, and with all their prejudices against it at the outset, are now warmly in its favor. I speak particularly of those who have great interests at stake in the community which I represent—the great and varied interests of commerce, trade, banking, manufactures and material progress generally, which are supposed to centre in the city of Montreal. These men—and there are none more competent in the province—have considered the scheme in a calm and business-like way, and have deliberately come to the conclusion that it is calculated to promote the best interests and greatly enhance the prosperity of this country. (Hear, hear.) Well knowing that they are to be in a minority in the Local Legislature, and to be cut off, as it were, from those of their own race and religion in Upper Canada, yet, after considering how the change is to affect the important interests which they have at stake, they are prepared to cast in their lot with the measure, and endeavor to make it work harmoniously. (Hear, hear.) And I believe, Mr. SPEAKER, that we have not a day to lose

in carrying out the project. I believe the question of preparing for the defence of this country is an imminent one. (Hear, hear.) There is not, I repeat, a day or an hour to be lost, and I believe that if this country is put into a proper condition of defence, the union will be the best safeguard we can have. If our neighbors see that we have the means of causing them to sit down on our frontier and spend a summer before they can hope to make any impression upon the country, we will then be in a pretty good condition to defend ourselves. I trust that the blessings of peace may long be preserved to us, that the good feeling which ought to subsist between Canada and the United States may never be interrupted; that two kindred nations which have so many ties, so many interests, and so many associations in common, may never become enemies, and I think that we ought to make every honorable concession in order to avert the calamities of war. No man can appreciate the blessings of peace more than I do, and no one is more alive to the horrors of war than I am. But at the same time we cannot conceal from ourselves the fact that within the last three or four years we have several times been seriously threatened. It is not in the power of any man to say when the cloud, which so darkly overshadows us, may burst in full fury on our heads, and those who have the direction of the destinies of this country ought to be prepared to do all that in them lies to place it in a position to meet that event. We cannot recede from the position we have assumed. We cannot go back, we must go forward; and it is certain to my mind that if what has now been undertaken is not consummated, we will regret it in years to come. I have but to add one word more, and I must apologize to the House for the time I have already occupied. (Cries of "Go on.") I am afraid I have very much transgressed the limits I had assigned to myself. There is but one point more, and I have done. My honorable friend opposite (Hon. Mr. DORION) says that this scheme is going to ruin us financially—that it is financially unfair. But he has failed to point out in what feature this can be regarded as financially injurious to any particular section. There can be nothing fairer to my mind than that, in forming a partnership between these five provinces, the amount of the debt should be equalized at the time the partnership is formed, and that whatever one is short should be made up by an annual grant to the other, not an increasing one but a fixed

sum. There can be nothing unfair in the application of such a principle as that. Of course the interest on the debt, whatever it may be, must be met by taxation. "And," says my honorable friend, "the Lower Provinces are less able to pay taxation than we are, and therefore the great bulk of the taxation will have to come out of the inhabitants of Upper and Lower Canada, and particularly the merchants of the city of Montreal." Well, sir, is not this just? Is it not fair that the richest portion of the community should pay the most taxes? Does my honorable friend mean to say that those who consume most ought not to pay most to the revenue? And if the people of Upper and Lower Canada are larger consumers than the people of the Lower Provinces, ought they not to contribute according to their consumption to the revenue? "But, oh," says my honorable friend, "the people of the Lower Provinces get their 80 cents per head, and we get no more, although we are much larger contributors to the revenue." And, he adds, "the amount to be derived from the contributions to the revenue by the Lower Provinces will be very infinitesimal." But granted, for argument's sake, that this is so, I think we ought not to undervalue in this discussion the collateral advantage which the control of the fisheries will give to the united government in the union to be formed. Remember that these fisheries will form an important part in the future negotiations with the United States in reference to reciprocity, which Upper Canada attaches so much importance to. Hence Canada in this union will have the control of the policy in regard to the concession of fishing rights to the American Government. And it is in this respect that the future commercial position of the Upper Canada farmer and the Lower Canada merchant will be enhanced by the fact that the concession of the fisheries will procure for them advantages in other branches of trade; for I repeat that the future policy will be directed in a great measure by the influence wielded by Canada in the Confederation.—(Hear, hear.) My honorable friend, however, goes on to say, "But you are about to incur a large amount of debt. Lower Canada entered into the present union with a debt of only \$300,000 or \$400,000, and the united debt of the two provinces is now \$67,000,000." Well, sir, this is quite true. But Lower Canada, when she entered the union, had only a population of 600,000, and Upper Canada a population of 400,000. There was not at

that time a mile of railway; now there are upwards of 2,000. (Hear, hear.) There was hardly a light-house, and see how the St. Lawrence and lakes are lighted now from Lake Superior to Belleisle. (Hear, hear.) She went into the union without a canal, and she has now the finest canal system in the world. (Hear, hear.) She had no educational system, and look at the state of education among us at the present time. (Hear, hear.) She was without a municipal system, and look at the municipal institutions of Lower Canada as they are to be found to-day. (Hear, hear.) She went into the union with the seigniorial tenure grinding as it were the people, and weighing down the industry and enterprise of the country; and has not the seigniorial tenure been abolished? (Hear, hear.) Does not my honorable friend see the advantages of all these reforms and improvements? And does not my honorable friend know that of the \$62,000,000 which is regarded as Canada's proportion of the joint debt, \$49,000,000 and more have been actually expended in and are now positively represented by public works of that value?

HON. MR. DORION—Not in Lower Canada.

HON. MR. ROSE—My honorable friend says "Not in Lower Canada." But does he not see that the chain of canals which have been constructed to bring down the trade of the West to Montreal and Quebec, is a benefit of the most substantial kind to Lower Canada? (Hear, hear.) What but these very facilities have increased the shipping of Montreal some five hundred per cent. within the last few years. Does my honorable friend mean to say that the connection of the Grand Trunk with the western railways of the United States is not a benefit to Lower Canada? Does he mean to assert that the slides constructed on the Ottawa so as to bring lumber to Quebec is of no advantage to Lower Canada? Surely he does not measure everything that is done in the way of improvement by a petty, narrow, sectional standard, which would exact that unless a pound of money laid out in a particular spot or locality benefited that particular place, it was thrown away. Is this the policy which he would like to see introduced into the new régime?

HON. MR. CARTIER—We have, too, the Victoria Bridge.

HON. MR. ROSE—Yes, we have also the Victoria Bridge. And does my honorable friend think that we would have had this

great work had the views he enunciates been acted upon?

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—Leave us as we are.

HON. MR. ROSE—We cannot be left as we are. I should be content, Mr. SPEAKER, were I to live for twenty-five years after the union now contemplated is consummated, I should be content to know that I had taken a humble part in bringing it about, if the prosperity of the country during the next twenty-five years under it were only as great as during the twenty-five years that have past. (Hear, hear.) My honorable friend seems to think that the Intercolonial Railway is an undertaking of doubtful advantage, if it is not one of positive uselessness. But does my hon. friend think we can safely continue in our present position of commercial dependence on the United States? Shall we be denied access to the seaboard for a bale of goods or a bag of letters? Are we to be for all time to come dependent on the fiscal legislation of the United States? Is it to come to this, that in the winter season the Upper Canada farmer shall have no means whereby he can send a barrel of flour, or the Lower Canada merchant a bale of goods, to the seaboard, without the leave of the United States? Is my honorable friend disposed to leave us in this condition of commercial dependency for ever? I can hardly believe he will deliberately say that we are to continue in such circumstances as these—that under no conditions shall the expense of constructing the Intercolonial Railway be incurred. I believe with him that that work is a great and grave undertaking, and one that will involve a serious charge on the wealth of the country. But then I contend that it is one which we cannot avoid—it is a necessity. We must have it. It is called for by military reasons and commercial necessity, and the date of its construction cannot safely be postponed. Why, what have we not seen within a very recent period? Restrictions have been put on goods sent through the United States, by the establishment of consular certificates, to such an extent that you could not send a bale of goods through the States without accompanying it with one of these certificates, the cost of which I am told was nearly \$2—perhaps more than the worth of the package, or more than the cost of the freight. (Hear, hear.) Still further, the Senate of the United States had also before them a motion to consider under what regulations foreign merchandise is allowed to pass in bond through the neighbouring coun-

try; and this was evidently done with an intention of abolishing the system under which goods were permitted to pass in bond from England through the United States. I do not hesitate to say that if the bonding system were done away with, half the merchants in Canada would be seriously embarrassed if not ruined for the time. (Hear, hear.) In the winter season you could not send a barrel of flour to England—you could not receive a single package of goods therefrom. The merchants would have to lay in a twelve months' stock of goods, and the farmer would be dependent on the condition of the market in spring, and would be compelled to force the sale of his produce at that moment, whether there was a profitable market for it then or not, instead of having as now a market at all seasons, as well in England as the United States. So that whatever sacrifices attach to the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, we must have it, seeing that it is impossible for us to remain in our present position of isolation and suspense. It is one of the unfortunate incidents of our position which we cannot get rid of. It will be a costly undertaking, but it is one we must make up our minds to pay for, and the sooner we set about its construction the better.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—We must always expect to pay for what is good.

MR. WALLBRIDGE—But when it is good for nothing, what then?

HON. MR. ROSE—I have just done. I do not hope to convert my honorable friend; but I desired to show how indispensable and how desirable those communications are, and how necessary it is that they should be effected. No one can foresee what the future of the neighboring States will be—whether they will be reconstructed as one union, or split up into two or more confederacies. They have a dark and uncertain future before them, for no one can doubt that no matter what their condition as regards reconstruction may be, they will have an enormous load of debt weighing upon them, and that they will have to encounter great difficulties before they finally settle down into the same state of permanent security as formerly. If we are alive to the natural advantages of our position, unless we deliberately throw them away, we can, whatever that future may be, secure a profitable intercourse with them. Unless the St. Lawrence and Ottawa cease to flow, and the lakes dry up, those roads to the ocean are the natural outlets for the west, and we can turn them to good account. We know some-

thing of the great productiveness of the Western States. There is, in fact, no limit to that productiveness, and the necessity of their having another outlet to the sea, without being altogether dependent upon New York and Boston, is to my mind very plain. This necessity of the powerful western interests must have a controlling influence in the commercial policy of the United States; and if we can direct the trade of the Western States down the St. Lawrence by giving them additional facilities, it cannot be doubted that we shall find therein a great element of security for the future peace of the two countries. This House will remember the resolutions, of a couple of years ago, of the states of Wisconsin and Illinois in reference to this question. These resolutions contained one or two facts which are of the greatest importance, as showing the necessity existing in the Western States for a channel of communication through the St. Lawrence. The memorial founded on it stated these facts:—

With one-tenth of the arable surface under cultivation, the product of wheat of the North-Western States in 1862 is estimated at 150,000,000 of bushels; and from our own State of Illinois alone there has been shipped annually for the last two years, a surplus of food sufficient to feed ten millions of people. For several years past a lamentable waste of crops actually harvested has occurred in consequence of the inability of the railways and canals leading to the seaboard to take off the excess. The North-West seems already to have arrived at a point of production beyond any possible capacity for transportation which can be provided, except by the great natural outlets. It has for two successive years crowded the canals and railways with more than 100,000,000 of bushels of grain, besides immense quantities of other provisions, and vast numbers of cattle and hogs. This increasing volume of business cannot be maintained without recourse to the natural outlet of the lakes. The future prosperity of these states bordering on the great lakes depends in a great measure on cheap transportation to foreign markets; hence they are vitally interested in the question of opening the St. Lawrence, the great natural thoroughfare from the lakes to the ocean, through, and by which the people of England may enlarge their supplies of breadstuffs and provisions, greatly exceeding the quantity heretofore received from the United States, at one-fourth less cost than it has heretofore been obtained. From actual experience derived from shipments of Indian corn from Chicago to Liverpool, it is shown that the freight charges often covered seven-eighths of the value of the bushel of corn at Liverpool; more than one-half of the cost of wheat is also often consumed by the present very inadequate means of transportation. The European customer for

our breadstuffs determines their price in all our markets. The surplus of grain derived from the North-West is fifty or sixty millions of bushels beyond the demand of the Eastern States, and when that surplus is carried to their markets, the foreign quotations establish the value of the entire harvest. The interior of North America is drained by the St. Lawrence, which furnishes for the country bordering upon the lakes a natural highway to the sea. Through its deep channel must pass the agricultural productions of the vast lake region. The commercial spirit of the age forbids that international jealousy should interfere with great natural thoroughfares, and the governments of Great Britain and the United States will appreciate this spirit and cheerfully yield to its influence. The great avenue to the Atlantic through the St. Lawrence being once opened to its largest capability, the laws of trade, which it has now been the policy of the Federal Government to obstruct, will carry the commerce of the North-West through it.

I say, then, give us the Intercolonial Railway, give us the command of the St. Lawrence, give us a government by which we can direct our national policy, give us the control of the fisheries, and we will be able to secure such reciprocal trade with the United States for Upper Canada as it requires. But if we are disunited—if the Lower Provinces retain the control of the fisheries, and Canada has nothing to give in exchange for the concession she seeks from the United States in the way of commercial intercourse, in breadstuffs and otherwise—I say that in such a case as this we are very much hampered indeed. I have detained the House very much longer than I intended, and I fear that I have exhausted the patience of honorable members. (Cries of "No, no," and "go on.") I have fallen into the same error which has been attributed to others. But there is a single observation I desire to offer in conclusion, and it has reference to the demand made by some honorable members, that there should be a dissolution before the question is finally decided. Well, sir, time presses. We have, and I cannot repeat it too often, not a day or an hour to lose in undertaking those great works of defence which may be absolutely necessary to our existence.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—What works of defence?

HON. MR. ROSE—The works to which I have alluded.

MR. WALLBRIDGE—Where are they?

HON. MR. ROSE—Does any honorable gentleman know, or, if he does know, ought he to say publicly where they are to be? All we know is that there must be a large outlay

on the defences of the country, of which the Lower Provinces will bear their share and the Imperial Government will bear its share; but how do I know, or ought any honorable gentleman here to enquire if I did, whether these works will be at Point Lévis, at Montreal, at Kingston, at Toronto, or where? But that there are to be works, and extensive works necessary to be constructed, so as to check sudden conquest or invasion, does not admit of a doubt. Does not the honorable gentleman know that there have been out here time and again eminent military officers, under directions from the Imperial Government, to ascertain where would be the best points for the erection of those fortifications?

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—And how much of the cost are we to contribute?

HON. MR. ROSE—I hope as much as may be necessary and fair. (Cheers.) For my part—and I know that this feeling is shared in by every honorable member who hears me—I am prepared not only to stake the money of others, but, if necessary, to expend my last shilling on these works, if they are declared to be essential for the defence of the country. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) I consider such precautions as much a necessity as insuring one's house against fire. If the honorable gentleman means to say that, in providing for the continuance of our national existence, the people would bargain whether they should give a hundred pounds or a thousand pounds, I can assure him he knows very little of the spirit of the country. The people are prepared to tax themselves to the extent of their last shilling in order to defend themselves against aggression. (Hear, hear.) I do not pretend to know anything of military operations, but any man with a head on his shoulders must see that there must be works of some kind constructed to enable us to resist aggression.

MR. WALLBRIDGE—I pretend to have a head on my shoulders as well as the honorable gentleman, and I would ask him whether the railway, which is made part of the Constitution, is considered part of the works he alludes to or not?

HON. MR. ROSE—I do not think the Intercolonial Railway is part of the Constitution, but its construction is provided for, and a railway from such point as shall be considered on the whole best, both in reference to commercial considerations and military considerations, is indispensable; and what is more, I believe the country will cheerfully bear the expense. (Hear, hear.) But in

regard to the question of an appeal to the people, I would just ask, is there a single member of this House who does not already know what is the feeling of his constituents on this question, who is not aware whether they are for the union or against the union? Is there a member who does not know what his constituents desire in respect to it, and who is not himself prepared to take the responsibility of his vote? I believe there is not. And does any honorable gentleman think that if there was to be a dissolution and an appeal to the country on this question, the elections would turn upon the scheme itself, that there would not be individual predilections, personal questions, and local questions affecting the elections, far more than Confederation? And would it not be most anomalous to elect a Parliament, the first vote given by which would be its own death? The sole business of the new Parliament would be to agree upon a Constitution which should annihilate itself. There is something so anomalous, almost unconstitutional and absurd in such a step, that I think it could not commend itself to the common sense of the country. I think we are already sufficiently aware of what the feeling—the mature and dispassionate feeling—the calm conviction and views of the country are, and that too after an intelligent appreciation of it in all its bearings, and I do not think there is anything to be gained, but on the contrary much to be imperilled, by the expense and delay of an election. I know that in my own constituency—not the least important in the province—this conclusion has been come to, not from any inconsiderate love of change—not from any ardent and temporary impulse or vague aspirations to be part in name of a future nation, at the risk of imperilling their relations with England or of injury to their interests, but I believe the scheme is stamped with their approval, because their reason and judgment convince them that it is not only desirable but a necessity of our condition. (Hear, hear.) I again apologise for the time I have occupied the attention of the House, and express my thanks for the kind consideration honorable members have extended to me. (Loud cheers.)

MR. A. MACKENZIE moved the adjournment of the debate.

HON. MR. HOLTON—I would like to say a word, and only a word, before the motion to adjourn the debate is put. I have listened with very great attention to the speech of my honorable friend from Montreal Centre, a large portion of which was devoted to the

subject of the defences of the country. I admit to the full the importance of that subject, but I maintain that as yet we are not in a position to give the proper weight to the arguments of my honorable friend and of other honorable gentlemen on that question, that in fact we are hardly in a position to consider the subject at all; and I do maintain that it is hardly fair to introduce it as an element into this discussion, so long as the Government withhold from us the official information which may be assumed to be in their possession on that subject. I have risen, therefore, to express the hope that the honorable gentlemen on the Treasury benches will see the propriety of submitting to this House the fullest possible information on that subject. (Hear, hear.) I am sure my honorable friend who has just taken his seat will himself admit the force of what I am now urging, and that we cannot give the consideration he asks to that branch of the general subject of Confederation without having the amplest information that the Government can give us with regard to it. I would, therefore, express the desire—which I am sure is shared by a large number of the honorable members who sit around me—that at once, before we proceed further in this debate, this important information should be submitted to the House in a distinct form. (Hear, hear.)

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—My honorable friend from Chateauguay (Hon. Mr. HOLTON) has very properly called the attention of the Government to the necessity of having laid before this House information as to the amount we shall have to appropriate for the defences of the country. It is well known that Imperial officers were sent out some time ago to make a survey, and report on the defensive condition of this country, and the best points at which to build fortifications—the *points d'appui*, where in cases of disaster we should be obliged to take shelter, if the enemy drove us into our garrisons. The report of those officers was made before I left office, more than a year ago. Surely during that time, with such a loyal administration as that composed of the honorable gentlemen now on the Treasury benches, the secret of the amount of the appropriation that will be required at our hands has not been kept from them. (Hear, hear.) It appears to me that this is a branch of the question to which we must address ourselves, before we are in a condition to deal satisfactorily with the general subject. It is a principle of the British Constitution that the appropriation of any

moneys from the taxes paid by the people, shall be at the disposal of Parliament. We have a right therefore to know, at the earliest possible period, before we go blindly into this scheme of Confederation, what we are called upon to appropriate in connection with this matter. (Hear, hear.) And there is another point on which, as yet, we have had no information, beyond what was given to-night when the hon. member for South Oxford answered me in his curt way. The Government may as well at an early date—I mean the portion of the Government who will have to speak for Upper Canada, and who are especially responsible for the acts of the Administration with reference to that section of the province—give their attention to the question how far the Catholics of Upper Canada are to be placed in the position of maintaining their schools and claiming their portion of the public funds, and enjoying generally the same privileges which are to be enjoyed, according to the declaration of the Honorable Attorney General East, by the Protestants of Lower Canada. I express no opinion at this time as to the propriety of the demands made by the Protestants of Lower Canada, or as to what I shall be prepared to do when that question comes up. Nor do I express now any opinion as to the propriety of giving the Catholics of Upper Canada more rights than they have got. But I say the Government ought to address themselves at once to the question, whether they are to make the same provision for the Catholics of Upper Canada, as for the Protestants of Lower Canada. This is a matter which comes home to the feelings of the Catholics of Upper Canada, and they have here at this moment delegates to express their opinions. No doubt, to enforce what they conceive to be their own rights, they will use as a lever the proposition to extend to the Protestants of Lower Canada the privileges which they claim as their due. And depend upon it, that when the time comes for the Protestants of Lower Canada to ask what they assert to be their rights, they will be expected to stand up also for the Catholics of Upper Canada, and to deal out to them the same justice which they expect the Catholics of Lower Canada to extend to them.

HON. MR. BROWN—My honorable friend from Cornwall does not of course agree himself with the views he is now urging. I think he ought to wait till the parties he speaks for ask him to express their views, or allow them to get as their advocate one who does share their views. He surely does not want to urge

views upon us in which he does not sympathize himself.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—Is my honorable friend ignorant of the resolutions which have been passed by the Catholics of Upper Canada? Is he ignorant that Vicar-General McDONNELL of Kingston is here at the Palace, to give effect to them? And does he say that whatever opinions I may entertain on the question, I must not presume to ask the Government to state their intentions with regard to it? Their answer should not be delayed on the plea set up to-night by the President of the Council (**HON. MR. BROWN**), that they are to consider the matter. It is a matter worthy of consideration, and I press it on the attention of the Government in order that they may be prepared, for it must come.

MR. A. MACKENZIE—What must come?

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—The question must be brought up in this House.

HON. MR. BROWN—Well, bring it.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—I want the gentlemen on the Treasury benches, when the question is brought up and put to them, to be prepared to say what they are to do with reference to the Catholic minority of Upper Canada, as the Attorney General East has manfully stated what he will do for the Protestant minority of Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) I have never come to this House to act as the champion of any religious sect. I have come to do justice to all parties, and I claim that we are entitled to understand, when it is intended to make distinctions for the benefit of the minority in one section of the province, whether similar distinctions are to be made also for the benefit of the minority in the other section. (Hear, hear.)

The motion for adjourning the debate was then agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

THURSDAY, *February 23, 1865.*

THE SPEAKER reported that the House had that day waited on His Excellency the Governor General, with their Address to Her Majesty the Queen, on the subject of uniting the colonies of Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island in one government, with provisions based on the resolutions which were

adopted at a Conference of delegates from the said colonies, held at the City of Quebec, on the 10th of October, 1864; and also, the Address to His Excellency the Governor General, requesting him to transmit the same to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in order that the said Address to Her Majesty may be laid at the foot of the Throne,—and that His Excellency was pleased to return the following gracious reply:—

“**MR. SPEAKER AND HONORABLE GENTLEMEN**:—I shall have much satisfaction in transmitting your Address to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in order that it may be, by him, laid before Her Majesty the Queen.”

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

THURSDAY, *February 23, 1865.*

MR. A. MACKENZIE resumed the adjourned debate. He said—Before proceeding, **MR. SPEAKER**, to discuss the measure of Confederation itself, I think it desirable to revert for a moment to the position which we have occupied, in discussing those constitutional questions that have so long separated parties, and involved the two sections of the province in serious dissensions. I do this to meet the charges of inconsistency brought against myself and others, because we support the present Coalition Government with a view to obtain the solution of the difficulties with which we have had to contend—in a way not perhaps hitherto advocated very extensively, especially in that part of the province to which I myself belong. Since I had the honor of having a seat in this House, I have never advocated representation by population as the sole measure I would accept as a settlement of those difficulties. In the first speech I ever made in this House, I used the following language:—

I am not myself bound down to representation by population as the only possible measure. If the opponents of that measure can suggest any other remedy, I am quite willing to give it a candid consideration; and I am quite sure that the large constituency I represent will support me in considering any measure which will place it out of the power of the Government of the day to perpetrate sectional injustice; but until such a remedy is suggested, I feel bound to advocate

reform of the representation on the basis of population as one remedy I believe to be an effective one.

(Hear, hear.) The hon. member for Hochelaga (Hon. Mr. DORION) asserted that we had advocated this measure merely as a means of remedying the financial injustice of which we complained. That was not the case. It is quite true that we urged very strongly—and I am not prepared at this moment to withdraw a single statement I have made with reference to that—we urged very strongly the injustice of the position in which we were placed, in contributing largely to the public revenue, and finding that that revenue was expended without due consideration being given to that part of the country which contributed most heavily towards it. But, at the same time, we felt that we were treated unjustly in another respect. We felt that it was not fair—that it could not be just—that four men in Lower Canada should be equal, politically, to five men in Upper Canada. We complained that our laws were framed by an eastern majority, in spite of our protestations. It was this which aggrieved us much more deeply than the mere loss of a certain sum of money. (Hear, hear.) Up to the beginning of 1862 the agitation for a redress of this grievance had been carried on throughout the whole of Western Canada; and I am convinced that at that time there was not an individual who could appear in public in Canada West, and take any share in the public discussions of the day, with any chance of getting a favorable hearing, unless he asserted that he was in favor of representation by population.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—Oh! oh!

MR. A. MACKENZIE—The hon. member for Cornwall cries "Oh!" Well, I will except him.

HON. MR. BROWN—No! no!

MR. A. MACKENZIE—It is true, perhaps, that even that hon. member cannot be excepted; for no one spoke more strongly than he did of the injustice perpetrated on Upper Canada.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—Hear, hear.

MR. A. MACKENZIE—He went even further in his assertion of the rights of Upper Canada, and of the justice due to it, than I would be disposed to do. He asserted on the floor of this House that he would not submit to any legislation, good, bad or indifferent, that came from the Administration of

the day, simply because they would not accord justice to Upper Canada.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—Any Upper Canada legislation.

MR. A. MACKENZIE—The hon. gentleman could not have taken stronger ground than that. I shall come to speak presently of his own Administration. The hon. member for Hochelaga seemed to think that, because the people of Canada West conducted their agitation with a good deal of system and order, there was nothing very alarming or dangerous about it. But the hon. gentleman should have remembered that it is a characteristic of the British people, that they on all occasions conduct a political agitation with due decorum and due respect to the laws, and that it is not the less serious on that account. When they have a deep-seated feeling that injustice is being perpetrated upon them, they will not sit still under it, although they will at the same time, while conducting the agitation against it, respect the rights of other parties. (Hear, hear.) I am free to confess that, when I first came into this House, I labored under some slight misapprehension of the position which the Lower Canadians occupied towards us of Western Canada. There is, or there was then, a popular opinion that the Lower Canadians were only afraid of representation by population, because they dreaded that the people of Canada West would use the larger power they would thereby obtain for the injury, if not the destruction, of their religious institutions. That is entirely an error. I am convinced that the people of Lower Canada have no such opinion and no such fear. In speaking the other day on that subject, the honorable member for Hochelaga (Hon. Mr. DORION) quoted from a speech of mine delivered in Toronto a few days before this session commenced; and I do not think the hon. gentleman shewed his usual candor or fairness in making the representation he did. He represented me as having stated at that meeting, that I had abandoned representation by population, as a thing that was not advisable, or possible, or something of that sort. Now what I did say was this:—

Having taken some part in public affairs, he (Mr. MACKENZIE) had long felt it would be almost impossible, by representation by population, to obtain to the full extent the justice that Upper Canada should receive with a legislative union as the basis of our power.

HON. MR. BROWN—Hear, hear!

Mr. A. MACKENZIE—

He had looked at it in this way. The time had been when the people of Upper Canada imagined that the Lower Canadians were afraid to grant representation by population lest western reformers should interfere with their religious institutions. He was fully satisfied that that idea was entirely erroneous—that the French people never had the slightest fear of the kind, because they knew it would be political suicide, it would be absolute ruin to any political party having the administration of affairs in their hands, to perpetrate injustice on any section of the people, to whatever church they belonged. (Cheers.) There was one element, however, which always entered largely into the discussion of all our national questions, and that was that the French people were a people entirely different from ourselves in origin, and largely in feeling. We all had a certain pride in our native country, and gloried in the deeds of our ancestors. The French people had that feeling quite as strongly as any of us; this reason, and also because they were a conquered people, they felt it necessary to maintain a strong national spirit, and to resist all attempts to procure justice by the people of the west, lest that national existence should be broken down. He (Mr. MACKENZIE) felt for one that mere representation by population, under such circumstances, would perhaps scarcely meet the expectations formed of it, because although Upper Canada would have seventeen more members than Lower Canada, it would be an easy thing for the fifty or fifty-five members representing French constituencies to unite with a minority from Upper Canada, and thus secure an Administration subservient to their views.

These were the sentiments that I uttered at that meeting, and the sentiments to which I am prepared now to give utterance again. (Hear, hear.) I believe that that feeling of nationality has been our sole difficulty, in working our present political system. But I do not believe for one moment that it would be possible or perhaps desirable to extinguish that strong feeling of nationality. Break down that feeling and all patriotism will be broken down with it. (Hear, hear.) I do not think it would be fair, or kind, or honorable, to attempt to do so. When Britain conquered the country, she accepted the responsibility of governing a foreign people in accordance with their feelings, so far as consistent with British policy. That feeling of nationality obtains so strongly in all countries, that, where attempts have been made, as in Austria, to break it down, they have signally failed. When such an attempt failed, though made by a despotic government, with a powerful army at its command, how could we expect it to succeed in a free coun-

try. In Austria, at this moment, eighteen different nationalities are represented in the national councils; and, notwithstanding all its military power and *prestige*, Austria has been compelled to accord local parliaments or assemblies to every one of those eighteen nationalities. (Hear, hear.) I have felt, therefore, that it would be utterly impracticable to obtain representation by population so long as the French people believed, as I came to find they did believe, that this concession to us would involve destruction to them as a separate people.

HON. MR. HOLTON—That is what they fear will be the result of the scheme now proposed.

MR. A. MACKENZIE—No; I have yet to learn that they have any such fear. The Attorney General East (Hon. Mr. CARTER), in his speech, a few evenings ago, adverted to the position taken by the French inhabitants of Lower Canada at the time of the French revolution, and claimed credit for them, because they remained loyal to the British Crown, when all the other North American Colonies threw off the British sway. The honorable gentleman's claim was perfectly just. But I believe that they were actuated by another feeling beyond the feeling of loyalty—that they felt their only safeguard as a distinct people—the only way to preserve their nationality, was to remain attached to Great Britain. Their existence for twenty years as a French colony under British rule, was not perhaps sufficient to give that attachment which they have now to the British Government. But it was perfectly clear to them that, if they entered the American Union, they would be absorbed and lost, just as the French colony of Louisiana has since been. (Hear, hear.) I have been charged, and others with me, who have held the same political views, with deserting our party, because we have ceased to act with the gentlemen from Lower Canada with whom we formerly acted. I think there is no fair ground for such a charge. For what, after all, is party? It is but an association of individuals holding opinions in common on some grounds of public policy, or some measures which they may believe to be necessary for the conduct of the government of the country to which they belong. Looking at the matter in that light, there is no part of our party politics in the west, that we have insisted upon so strongly as that which concerns the representation of the people in Parliament.

HON. MR. BROWN—Hear, hear!

MR. A. MACKENZIE—And, as soon as our former political friends in Lower Canada ceased to take advanced ground on that question, while the other party, hitherto opposed to us, became willing to take that advanced ground, it became clearly our duty to unite with that party who held opinions in common with us on matters that concerned us above all others. (Hear, hear.) At the time of the formation of the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Government, I was, with many others, strongly blamed, because we allowed that Government to come into existence at all. It is quite possible we were wrong; but I think after all it was fortunate that the hon. member for Cornwall (Hon. J. S. MACDONALD) had a fair opportunity to try his favorite remedy for our constitutional difficulties—the “double majority principle.” That principle had been pressed on the attention of the country for ten years as one amply sufficient as a remedial measure, under which the existing political system could be harmoniously worked. In the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Government it had a fair trial and a speedy death. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) The existence of that Government, if it served no other purpose, showed the utter impracticability of the one means, by which my hon. friend hoped to accomplish what he, in common with ourselves, had long aimed at. (Hear, hear. Now, supposing the Liberal party of the west had refused the terms offered by the present Administration—if we had declined to support a government which was really giving us nearly all we demanded—I do think we would have been fairly chargeable with creating if not advocating a state of anarchy. I think it would have been a most suicidal thing, if, having obtained—if not to the full extent, yet to a very great extent—the concession of the principle we had contended for so long, we had refused to accept the settlement offered, merely because a certain number of gentlemen, to whom we had been strongly opposed before, were among the leaders of the new movement. I for one felt it would be quite impossible for me to maintain my ground in Canada West, if I took the responsibility of acting in that way. Some honorable gentlemen have asserted, and truly asserted, that this measure is not as perfect as it might have been—and that it is not as complete as some of us might have desired it to be. It is not perhaps, consider-

ing everything, in the exact form in which we demanded it. But, where there are two great parties in a nation—as there have been with us—it is quite clear that, when they agree to effect a settlement of the constitutional difficulties which have separated them, this can only be accomplished by mutual compromise to a greater or less extent. And the true question to be determined in this discussion, and by the vote at the close of this debate, is this—whether this a fair compromise or not. I am prepared to say it is perhaps as fair as could reasonably be expected, and I have therefore no hesitation in giving it all the support in my power. (Hear, hear.) In its main features it is the very scheme which was proposed by the Toronto Convention—only carried to a greater extent than the convention thought advisable or possible at the time. The speeches which were delivered at that convention, as well as the resolutions which were passed, shewed clearly that it was the opinion of the delegates there present, that a Confederation of the whole provinces would be desirable, if it were possible to attain it as speedily, as they expected they could obtain a Federation of the two Provinces of Canada. That, I believe, was the sole reason why resolutions were not moved and adopted in favor of the larger instead of the smaller scheme. But we have been told by the two hon. gentlemen beside me—the hon. member for Chateauguay (Hon. Mr. HOLTON) and the honorable member for Hochelaga (Hon. Mr. DORION)—that the scheme of the Toronto Convention took no hold upon the public mind. As to this I have to say that having had as fair an opportunity perhaps as most men to ascertain the feelings of the people in Western Canada, I can assert, without any fear of contradiction by hon. gentlemen from that part of the country, that no scheme ever took a greater or more complete hold upon the public mind in Upper Canada than the scheme of the Toronto Convention. (Hear, hear.) And for the very reason that the present scheme is merely an expansion of that one, it has received almost universal approval in Canada West. (Hear, hear.) It is true that after the Toronto Convention was held, there was not any very strong agitation in its favor. But I have observed this, that at all the elections which have been held subsequent to the convention, gentlemen who have taken the same side of politics as myself have been accustomed to say that as soon as the Lower

Canadians who were opposed to representation by population would agree to the scheme of the Toronto Convention, they were ready to meet them on that ground. Personally, I have always been in favor of a legislative union, where it can be advantageously worked. If it could be adapted to our circumstances in these colonies, I would at this moment be in favor of a legislative union as the best system of government. I believe that is the general opinion of the people in the west. But it is the duty of every public man to shape his course with reference to theoretical principles of government, according to the circumstances which may prevail locally. And it is quite clear that, if the legislative union could not be worked well with Upper and Lower Canada, it would work still worse with the other provinces brought in. There remained, therefore, in my opinion, no other alternative than to adopt the Federal principle, or to dissolve entirely the connection which exists between Upper and Lower Canada at the present moment; and that I would look upon as one of the greatest calamities which could befall these provinces. Even if this scheme were more objectionable than it is, had I the alternative put before me to accept dissolution of the union or to accept this, I would without hesitation accept Confederation rather than dissolution. (Hear, hear.) In the scheme as propounded, we have all that we could possibly demand in the way of representation in the Lower House. And, besides that, we have provision made for extending the representation east or west, as occasion may require, according to the increase of our population shown at the decennial periods for taking the census. Any thing fairer than that could not possibly be demanded. And if Lower Canada increases more rapidly in population than Canada West, she will obtain representation accordingly. For, although the number of her members can not be changed from sixty-five, the proportion of that number to the whole will be changed relatively to the progress of the various colonies. On the other hand if we extend, as I have no doubt we will do, westward, towards the centre of the continent, we will obtain a large population for our Confederation in the west. In that quarter we must look for the largest increase of our population in British America, and before many years elapse the centre of population and power will tend westward much farther than most people

now think. The increase in the representation is therefore almost certain to be chiefly in the west, and every year will add to the influence and power of Western Canada, as well as to her trade and commerce. The most important question that arises relates to the constitution of the Upper House. It is said that in this particular the scheme is singularly defective—that there has been a retrograde movement in going back from the elective to the nominative system. I admit that this statement is a fair one from those who contended long for the application of the elective principle to the Upper House; but it can have no weight with another large class, who, like myself, never believed in the wisdom of electing the members of two Houses of Parliament with coördinate powers. I have always believed that a change from the present system was inevitable, even with our present political organization. (Hear, hear.) The constitution of an Upper House or Senate seems to have originated in the state of society which prevailed in feudal times; and from being the sole legislative body—or at least the most powerful—in the State, it has imperceptibly become less powerful, or secondary in importance to the lower chamber, as the mass of the people became more intelligent, and popular rights became more fully understood. Where there is an Upper House it manifestly implies on the part of its members peculiar duties or peculiar rights. In Great Britain, for instance, there is a large class of landed proprietors, who have long held almost all the landed property of the country in their hands, and who have to pay an immense amount of taxes. The fiscal legislation of Britain for many years has tended to the reduction of impost and excise duties on articles of prime necessity, and to the imposition of heavy taxes on landed property and incomes. Under such a financial system, there are immense interests at stake, and the House of Lords being the highest judicial tribunal in the kingdom, there is a combination of peculiar rights and peculiar duties appertaining to the class represented which amply justify its maintenance. We have no such interests, and we impose no such duties, and hence the Upper House becomes a mere court of revision, or one of coördinate jurisdiction; as the latter it is not required; to become the former, it should be constituted differently from the House of Assembly. The United States present the example of a community socially similar to ourselves,

establishing an Upper House. They have—reasoning doubtless from the same premises—not only given the legislatures of the respective states the power of nominating the members of the Senate, but have also given that body powers entirely different from those possessed by the elective branch. It is a remarkable fact that there is only one other government in Europe which has a system similar to Great Britain, and that is Sweden. There is another class, represented by a number of the German nations. There are Wurtemberg, Hesse Darmstadt, Prussia, Saxony, Hanover, Baden and Bavaria, with an aggregate population of about 30,000,000, whose Upper Chambers are partly hereditary, partly nominative, and partly *ex-officio*. The purely hereditary principle, as found in Great Britain and Sweden, obtains among a population of some 32,000,000. Then there is another class nominated by the Crown for life from a list chosen by intermediate bodies. The councils choose three lists and the Sovereign nominates therefrom. In this way, Spain, Brazil and the new nation of Roumania, composed of the Turkish principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia, appoint their Upper Houses—Spain, with a population of 16,801,850; Brazil, 7,677,800; Roumania, 3,578,000; altogether 27,556,650. There is another class where the members of the Senate are nominated for life, where the number is limited, and where some few members of the royal family have the privilege of sitting as members. Italy, with a population of 21,777,384; Portugal, 3,584,677; Servia, 1,693,281; Austria, 34,000,000. This class represents altogether a population of 61,460,292. Then there is another class where the members are elected for a term of years, and it is a remarkable fact in this connection that the countries I refer to are, with the exception of three British colonies and one monarchy, entirely republican. The one monarchy in the list that elects its Upper Chamber in this way, is Belgium; but Belgium, although a monarchy, is well known to be one of the most democratic countries in Europe. This list includes Switzerland, whose people number 2,534,242; La Plata, 1,171,800; Chili, 1,558,319; Peru, 2,865,000; United States, 30,000,000; Liberia, 500,000; Belgium, 4,529,000; South Australia, 126,830; Tasmania, 89,977; Victoria, 540,322—having a total population of 43,915,490. In Nassau we find the Upper Chamber partly nominative and partly *ex-officio*, the population being 457,571. Then there is Denmark,

with a partly nominative and partly elective system, the elections being held by the Provincial Councils, the population being 1,600,000; while in the Netherlands, with a population of 3,372,652, the members are elected entirely by the Provincial Councils. In one of the British colonies, New South Wales, the members are nominated for a term of years; whilst in two of the youngest and most enterprising of the British colonies, New Zealand and Queensland, they have the system which we propose to adopt, of nominating a limited number of members for life. There is evidently room here for great latitude of opinion as to the constitution of the Upper Chamber, and I do not think we can be fairly charged with retrogression because we choose to make the members of our Upper House nominative instead of elective. Our people comprise but one class, and if the members of the two chambers are to be chosen by the same electors, it is very clear that it will be extremely difficult for both to maintain their individuality, possessing similar powers and privileges, and avoid collisions. It is evident that two chambers which have originated in precisely the same way, will claim to exercise the same rights and privileges, and to discharge the same functions; but were the Upper Chamber nominative, instead of elective, the jurisdiction of that chamber would be, of course, correspondingly changed, and the chances of collision made more remote. There are quite a number of states (some of them very considerable in size and population, and of recent origin) which have dispensed with an Upper Chamber altogether. I confess my arguments would lead to the adoption of this system, as the one most suited to our circumstances. (Hear, hear.) The nations which have adopted this system are Hesse Cassel, with a population of 726,000; Luxemburg, 413,000; Saxe Weimar, 273,000; Saxe Meiningen, 172,000; Saxe Altenburg, 137,000; Saxe Cobourg, 159,000; Brunswick, 273,000; Mecklenburg Schwerin, 548,000; Norway, 1,328,471; Mecklenburg Streilitz, 99,060; Oldenburg, 295,245; Anhalt, 181,824; Lippe-Deimold, 108,513; Waldeck, 58,000; Schwarzburg, 71,913; and in the kingdom of Greece, with a population of 1,096,810, where a new constitution has been recently adopted, the statesmen of that country have, after some experience of the duplicate system, resolved to legislate with a single chamber. But while it is my opinion that we would be better without an Upper House, I know that the question is

not, at the present moment, what is the best possible form of government, according to our particular opinions, but what is the best that can be framed for a community holding different views on the subject.

HON. MR. BROWN—Hear, hear. That is the point, and therefore I accept, as a fair compromise, a second chamber nominated by the Confederate Cabinet.

MR. A. MACKENZIE—One honorable member—I think the honorable member for Lotbinière (Mr. JOLY)—used the argument that the Federal system was a weak one. I do not think the Federal system is necessarily a weak one; but it is a system which requires a large degree of intelligence and political knowledge on the part of the people, and I think it was entirely unfair on the part of the honorable member to compare our probable prospects in the future, under Confederation, with the past history of the Spanish republics in South America. We have in this country a population habituated to self-government, and this entirely destroys the parallel sought to be instituted. For my part, I hold it would be altogether impossible for the honorable member for South Oxford, for instance, or some other honorable members we know of, to carry on the same agitation in any of the South American republics—(laughter)—that we have seen them doing in Upper Canada, without producing a complete revolution, and instead of my honorable friend (Hon. Mr. BROWN) finding himself at the head of a newspaper, controlling his columns, he would find himself at the head of an army marshalling its columns. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. GALT—He would, perhaps, be found issuing a *pronunciamento*. (Laughter.)

MR. A. MACKENZIE—Yes, a *pronunciamento* would undoubtedly be the legitimate result in such a state of society. The fact is, we cannot compare such a population with those who are educated to our own form of government. I have time and again attended political meetings with my honorable friends opposite, and after seven or eight hours indulging in strong language, and sometimes bitter enough speeches, the people have separated quietly without any personal feeling being entertained the one against the other. For, then, asserting that the people of this country are incapable of governing themselves, or that the Federal principle is a weak one, it is necessary to prove that we are not more civilised than were the people of South America thirty years ago. (Hear, hear.) I assume, therefore, that it is necessary to

prove that our people are less civilised than the populations of the South American republics were thirty years ago, or that they have already shown an incapacity for governing themselves before we can receive the assertion that the Federal principle as proposed to be applied in our case is a weak one. If the honorable member based his argument against the Confederation on the question of weakness or strength as exemplified in existing governments, he would be bound to accept Russia as the model for his government, there being no stronger government on the face of the earth. But a despotism is only possible where the people are ignorant, and an attempt to establish a republic among such a people would be out of the question,—it would only produce weakness. Were a republic to be established at this moment in Russia, it would occasion a state of anarchy, because the people are too ignorant to exercise intelligently the franchise bestowed upon them. It is for this reason unfair to institute comparisons between these unfortunate republics and the proposed government for the people of British North America. I am certain that, if there were a Federal union between all the colonies of British North America, extending even across the continent to our western confines, although great inconvenience might be experienced by such an extension, we would find a law-abiding people capable of self-government, in all parts of the Confederacy. (Hear, hear.) The example of the United States has been appealed to, and it is true that when the war commenced, when they found themselves unable to enforce their laws in some portion of the states, that it did seem to prove to the minds of those who did not understand the people, and to the writers of certain newspapers in England, that there was an inherent weakness in the system. There is no doubt that there were some indications of such weakness, and the conflict of sovereignty between states and the Federal Government did produce weakness. But I think the attitude of the people of the Northern States fully shows that even with the imperfections of their system, which will be admitted, and which imperfections are avoided in the scheme now before the House—even with these imperfections, a strength, a power, and a vigor have been displayed, which have silenced even the attacks of hostile criticism. (Hear, hear.) The Federal system, then, cannot be said to be a failure with our race, neither can it be said to be a failure in Switzerland. This was admitted in a measure by

the honorable member for Lotbinière, but that honorable gentleman gave as a reason for its apparent success, that Switzerland was surrounded by a number of powerful nations. I think, on the other hand, that the reason assigned would be the very cause of a failure of the system in Switzerland. The government of that country would have broken down long ago if there was any inherent weakness in the form of the constitution, in consequence of the hostile systems which surrounded it. The fact of the Swiss maintaining their independence so long and conducting the administration of their affairs so well and cheaply, is an evidence to my mind that the Federal system of government is not weak where the people are trained and educated to understand and appreciate the benefits of self-government. (Hear, hear.) Then, sir, we are assured that all sorts of calamities will overtake us if we change our Constitution, and many of the honorable gentlemen who prophesy these evil results will no doubt, like many other prophets, do all they can to bring their predictions to pass. (Hear, hear.) This is not the first time in the history of the world that prophecies of this kind have been indulged in. I was a good deal amused the other night in reading the discussions which took place in the Scottish Parliament on the occasion of the proposed union with England in 1707; and in perusing one of the speeches in particular, I could not help remarking the coincidence between the tone therein assumed and that adopted by Her Majesty's loyal Canadian Opposition. The speaker, Lord BELHAVEN, used this language in depicting the dire calamities which he imagined would befall Scotland by joining her fortunes to England:—

MY LORD CHANCELLOR.—I think I see our learned judges laying aside their practices and decisions, studying the common law of England, gravelled with *certioraries*, *nisi priuses*, writs of error, verdicts in dovar, *ejectione firmæ*, injunctions, demurs, &c., and freighted with appeals and avocations, because of the new regulations and rectifications they may meet with. I think I see the valiant and gallant soldiery either sent to learn the plantation trade abroad, or at home petitioning for a small subsistence as the reward of their honourable exploits, while their old corps are broken, the common soldiers left to beg, and the youngest English corps kept standing. I think I see the honest, industrious tradesman loaded with new taxes and impositions, disappointed of the equivalents, drinking water in place of ale—(laughter)—eating his saltless potage—(renewed laughter)—petitioning for encouragement to his manufactories, and answered

by counter petitions. In short, I think I see the laborious ploughman, with his corn spoiling upon his hands for want of sale, cursing the day of his birth, dreading the expense of his burial—(laughter)—and uncertain whether to marry or do worse. (Much laughter.) I think I see the incurable difficulties of landed men, fettered under the golden chain of equivalents, their pretty daughters petitioning for want of husbands—(laughter)—and their sons for want of employment. I think I see our mariners delivering up their ships to their Dutch partners, and what through presses and necessity, earning their bread as underlings in the royal English navy.

And here, Mr. SPEAKER, comes the climax, and if I were asked to point to one of the *dramatis personæ* in our Canadian House of Assembly fitted to take part in a similar scene as is here depicted, I should unhesitatingly turn to the honorable member for Chateauguay (Hon. Mr. HOLTON), who could more suitably than any one else I know personate Lord BELHAVEN when he exclaims: "But above all, my Lord, I think I see our ancient mother Caledonia, like CÆSAR, sitting in the midst of our Senate, ruefully looking round about her, covering herself with her royal garment, attending to the fatal blow and breathing out her last with *et tu quoque mi fili*." (Laughter.) It must have seemed very strange for the statesmen of Scotland, who saw in the union of the two kingdoms all the evidences of coming power and grandeur, to have heard expressed such desponding sentiments as these. (Hear, hear.) No doubt the majority saw in the union which they were then about to consummate, the strength which subsequently grew out of that union, and the influence and greatness by which it would be attended. At the time of the union Scotland had only a revenue of £150,000 per annum, and last year she contributed to the British exchequer nearly £7,000,000. (Hear, hear.) This, however, is but one instance of the benefit of the union, which has worked to the fullest extent as well as could possibly be desired. If necessary I could bring forward many arguments to prove that, in the same manner, union between different peoples who are geographically situated so as to favor it, adds to their strength, and makes them greater and more powerful than they could possibly hope to become in their several states of separation and isolation. (Hear, hear.) I am quite aware, sir, that in a matter of this kind it is exceedingly easy to make objections. There can be nothing easier than to carp at a set of resolutions like these. It would not be diffi-

cult to spend hours in eaptious criticism as to the details of such a scheme as is proposed. But I think we may fairly call on those gentlemen who criticise in a hostile spirit a measure of this character, to say what else they propose to do; for, if we cannot carry this into practical operation now, it is quite evident something else must be devised. I recollect that last year, when the present administration came down to the House proposing such a plan for settling our difficulties, and received, as I for one imagined, the sanction of this House, I remarked that the course of the House was a revolutionary one, the revolution to be a peaceable one certainly, but still a revolution. It implied the opinion on the part of our public men, that our present system could not be gone on with; and if our present system cannot be continued, we ought not to attempt to throw out this measure merely because it does not entirely meet the views of every member of this House. (Hear.) I think it would have been desirable that all the members from Lower Canada should have united with us and studied out a new system, and gone to work earnestly to give it effect by the necessary legislation. (Hear.) I did hope that when the measure came down and we met this session to discuss it, it would not have been thought necessary by any one to organise a regular opposition. Certainly I did not expect that honorable gentlemen like the honorable members for Hochelaga and Chateaugay, who have hitherto appeared to recognize the gravity of our constitutional difficulties, or have at least asserted that they did, would have found it necessary to go into unqualified opposition. I rather thought they would have endeavored to give effect to the measure as the only remedial one within our reach. (Hear, hear.) It is not because I think the measure entirely faultless that I propose to give it my utmost support, but because I believe every other measure to be impossible now, and because, under the proposed government, the country has a great future before it. Looking at the matter commercially, as a question of comparative cheapness, we shall not be, to say the least, any worse off than at the present moment. I believe we shall be able to govern as cheaply united as we now do separately. I apprehend there will be no necessity in the Local Legislature for more than one chamber, and although this branch of the subject has not been discussed in the House, and we do not know what the propositions of the Government are to be, I

may take occasion to say that I hope they will not think of adopting the double system in our local legislatures, for it will cause a serious increase of expenditure, not attended with a corresponding benefit. (Hear, hear.) The honorable member for Montreal Centre devoted a large portion of his speech last night to the military side of the question, and argued very strongly, from the position of the neighboring republic, that it was absolutely indispensable for us to become a military power. Now, while I am not at all disposed to take the view that gentleman does of the position of the United States relatively towards ourselves; while I do not think that any large proportion of the people of the United States have hostile inclinations towards ourselves—though they are apt to indulge in language that is undoubtedly unbecoming and certainly threatening; while I do not at all anticipate they will adopt, in so unjustifiable a manner as he seemed to expect, any hostile measures towards us, it is not to be denied that with a population of three millions and a half, it will be absolutely necessary for us to take some steps that will place us in a more independent position. It is not honorable, it is not manly for so powerful a colony as this is to depend entirely on the Mother Country for protection. (Hear, hear.) I took occasion to express these views last year, when discussing the estimates, and said I hoped the Government would bring down a measure to pay a large portion of the expenditure attendant on the maintenance, by the Imperial Government, of British troops among us. (Hear, hear.) Portugal, with a population as nearly as can be equal to our own, has a standing army of 17,000 men. Holland, with about the same population as ourselves at home, but with extensive colonies abroad, has a standing army of 57,500 men. Denmark, with a population not quite equal to one half what the Confederacy will possess, has an army of 22,900 men. Now I do not think it will be at all necessary for us to maintain a standing army like these nations. I do not think we are in the same position as these countries, because our wealth is, to a great extent, not realized. It would be hardly fair to assess some of our new counties, where people own nothing but their land, at the nominal value of that land, for the purpose of paying a large standing army; and besides we have no colonies, no outside sources of wealth. I think, however, we are nearly as well able, man for man, to maintain a force necessary for our defence as the people of Great Bri-

tain, and whatever measure the Confederate Government may propose of a moderate, reasonable nature, will, I am convinced, receive the support of the majority of the people of this country. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) I apprehend it is not looking at all too far forward to think of the day when another colony to the westward of Canada West will come into the union. I am of course unaware what papers may be brought down by the Government in reference to the North-West and the Hudson's Bay Territory, but I hope when they do come down they will show some progress in that direction, in raising that magnificent country from the state in which it now is. I hope some system will be put into operation for extending roads and telegraphs to that country, so as to open it up for settlement by our own young men and immigrants coming from Europe. The question of the North-West is most intimately connected with our prosperity as a people, and some exception has justly been taken to the 68th and 69th paragraphs in the resolutions, which say:—

68. The General Government shall secure, without delay, the completion of the Intercolonial Railway from Rivière du Loup through New Brunswick, to Truro in Nova Scotia.

69. The communications with the North-Western Territory and the improvements required for the development of the trade of the Great West with the sea-board, are regarded by this Conference as subjects of the highest importance to the Federated Provinces, and shall be prosecuted at the earliest possible period that the state of the finances will admit.

MR. T. C. WALLBRIDGE—That is the point.

MR. A. MACKENZIE—Yes, that is the point my hon. friend is very much exercised over, but he is quite as much in favor of Confederation as I am. In this paragraph, while it is pronounced indispensable to have the Intercolonial Railway built at once, it is only promised that as soon as the state of the finances will permit, the North-West is to be taken in hand. I think it is absolutely necessary for the prosperity of this colony that our canal connection with the upper lakes should be perfected as early as possible. Our canal system must be improved so as to accommodate the large trade that is coming from the North-West. On the northern shores of Lake Superior we have sources of wealth that are perfectly inexhaustible. We read only the other day that a mountain of iron had been discovered close to the coast, quite sufficient to supply the demands of the world for 500

years. We have in that locality an abundant supply of minerals of all kinds, and unless our canals are made capable of carrying that traffic, it will necessarily find channels in another direction. (Hear.) There is an agitation among a portion of the community for making a new canal from Toronto to the Georgian Bay, and I admit it is very desirable it should be constructed, though I do not think it ever can be; and even if it could be, it is entirely beyond our resources at the present time. I am convinced that the true route for a canal (if a new one should be undertaken) to the Georgian Bay is up the Ottawa, because that would be giving a great backbone to the country. If we had a fine canal, capable of carrying vessels of war in that direction, it would be a splendid means of defence, as well as a great highway for the commercial products of the west. Of course I know this to be impossible at the present time, but I think it exceedingly desirable that we should press on the attention of the Government, with all the influence that can be brought to bear, the necessity for having this 69th article attended to, though I am not inclined to go farther than that now. (Hear.) The importance of perfecting the present and other highways to the centre of the continent must be so apparent to all parts of our common country, that I see no reason to fear that the subject will not receive due attention from the Confederate Government at the earliest moment. As regards the Intercolonial Railway, I have taken some little interest in that, as I knew that I would be compelled to discuss it on approaching this subject, and, in examining the maps and reports of Major ROBINSON, I find that there is no difficulty whatever in arriving at a conclusion as to the comparative cost. The route that is most feasible—that alluded to by the honorable member for Richelieu—the northern or eastern route by the Bay of Chaleurs, is about 655 miles from Halifax to Quebec. It is already constructed to Truro, some 55 miles from Halifax, and from Quebec 140 miles to Rivière du Loup. This will leave nearly 400 miles to be built. Major ROBINSON estimates the cost of the road at about £7,000 per mile, or about £2,800,000 altogether. I do not think, judging from the statement he gives of the grades in the road, the bridges to be built, and the material to be found along the line, that it is a fair inference that the cost would equal the amount he sets down. The character of the ground over which the road will pass is very similar to the railways of Canada.

It is represented to be very much of the nature of the country through which the Great Western runs westward of Hamilton over a great portion of the line. The best portion of the line is equal to the worst portions of the Great Western. Even at the cost of £7,000 per mile the expense of constructing the entire road would be a little over fifteen millions of dollars. The proportion of that payable by Canada would be about nine millions. I think it is extremely probable that when we obtain the report of the engineers sent out by our Government, it will be found that a very large portion can be constructed for much less than £7,000 per mile. But, whatever the sum may amount to, it is perfectly clear that without the road there can be no union of the provinces. (Hear, hear.) It is equally clear that on that road there is a very large proportion of the country that is exceedingly desirable for settlement, and that only awaits the opening up of some means of communication with the markets. Major ROBINSON reports that on one portion of it—and I confess that I was not aware of the fact until I examined the report more closely today—that there is a tract of country along the New Brunswick portion of the line not excelled for timber or land in any part of the world that he ever saw. (Hear, hear.) I do not propose taking up the time of the House by reading from this valuable report, but estimates are given showing the amount of population that these districts will support when properly settled. He shows that the country, if the road is once carried through, will be settled very rapidly. I do not, however, expect that that road can possibly pay as a commercial enterprise for a long time to come, and I do not desire to deceive myself or deceive any other person on that point. That it will be of importance more as a military work than for any other purpose, nobody can deny. In 1862, when I opposed the proposition to construct the road, I then felt that this was an argument that could fairly be used in its favor. Military authorities are still unanimously of opinion that its construction would be of great importance as a means of protection in case of hostilities. The most important reason, however, why it should be constructed, in addition to the military reason, is, that without its construction there can be no union of the provinces, and without a Federal union of the provinces we cannot hope to obtain a settlement of our sectional difficulties. The one is dependent upon the other, and I believe the people of Canada are willing

to accept the conclusion that this argument necessarily leads us to engage in the construction of that road. (Hear, hear.) I do not propose to-night to indulge much in figures relative to what our condition will be, financially, after this measure is carried out; but the honorable member for Hochelaga made some statements that I can scarcely allow to pass. He was understood to say that Lower Canada came into the union without any debt, and was to go out with thirty millions of dollars of debt, while only some twelve millions of dollars were expended in that section of the province. Now, sir, there has been spent altogether on the canals of Canada \$20,813,304.03; on roads and bridges in Canada West, \$562,866, and on roads and bridges in Canada East, \$1,163,829.34; on the government buildings at Ottawa there have already been paid over \$1,513,412.56; and on railroads there have been spent altogether \$29,910,825.16, or altogether about \$53,964,236.79. Now, I think that one-half of this enormous amount is fairly chargeable to Lower Canada. One-half or a little more than that of the works on which the money was spent are situated in Lower Canada, and, if we include the Victoria Bridge, it is considerably more than one-half. Besides these, however, there are quite a number of other items which I do not take into account. There is the Quebec Fire Loan, and a deficiency in a number of special funds that I will not take any notice of at this time. Then take it from another point of view. From a return made to Parliament, we find that the entire cost of improving the navigation in Upper Canada, including the cost of light-houses, canals, &c., altogether amounted to \$7,022,665.61; that the revenue derived from Upper Canada harbors and canals has been \$4,887,291.73; leaving a balance against Upper Canada of \$2,145,373.88. In Lower Canada, during the same period, the expenditure has been \$4,484,566.52, while there was a revenue of \$708,086.80, leaving a balance against Lower Canada of \$4,176,479.72. I give these figures simply to prove that the position taken by the honorable member for Hochelaga was entirely incorrect; but it would be superfluous to do that if I were to allude to one item which he gave when he was comparing the amount of debt that we would have to pay per head of our population, compared with that of Great Britain. The amount per head with us is about \$25, and he gravely told the House that the amount per head in Great Britain was only \$37, when every person

knows or ought to know that it is about \$140. Nevertheless he drew a comparison showing that while the comparatively poor people of Canada would have to pay \$25 per head, the rich people of Great Britain had only \$37 to pay. It is very remarkable, however, that the whole of this portion of the honorable gentleman's speech was omitted from the report given in the papers next morning. I do not propose to go into these figures, but merely to refer to a few facts to place the assertions made by that honorable gentleman in their true light before the House. Our debt is indeed very large, and we could all wish that it was very much less than it is, but we have got to bear it and to pay it, and must do the best we can under the circumstances. The measure of Confederation, in my opinion, will not add to nor yet lessen it, except what may be incurred for the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. It is quite possible, of course, that we may undertake enormous expenditures for public works calculated to open up and develop the resources of the country, and thus soon render our debt much heavier than at present, and it will be a question for the Government that may be established after Confederation, to decide how far it will be wise or prudent to undertake works of great cost until we shall have a good surplus in hand. (Hear, hear.) One of the objections urged by the opponents of the measure is, that it is being hurried through too fast—that in a matter of so much much importance to present and future generations, more time for consideration should be given. We have been discussing this question for many years in Canada West. Since the Toronto Convention of 1859, the question has been continuously before the people. It is now nearly a year since it was proposed in something like its present shape in this House, and since that time the whole of our newspapers have been writing upon it continually. We have nearly 300 newspapers in the country—and they have been carrying on a constant argument for or against the scheme, until I do not think it is possible to say or write much more upon the subject with any advantage. If the question is not now fully understood, I fear it will not be much better understood by any delay that can be now accorded. (Hear, hear.) Another objection raised is, that a measure of such vast importance ought not to be carried through without its first being submitted to the people. I have mixed with the people a good deal, and I have found the opinion all but universal amongst them,

that it was expedient to put the measure into practical operation as soon as possible. The people consider it utterly impossible to carry on the former violent political agitation with any benefit to the country, and the desire is general that we should get rid of the present constitutional difficulties and get settled down to some quiet and permanent way of managing our governmental business and political discussions. (Hear, hear.) The charges that are made against members of this House about inconsistency in advocating this measure, are very easily met. In a country like ours, so full of change, with a constant agitation going on for constitutional changes and for new laws, both local and general, it is utterly impossible that a man can remain long in public life without being open to charges of inconsistency; but if these are caused by a strong effort to settle the difficulties under which the country has been laboring, like the present one, I feel certain that the success of the measure in hand will render the charges of only evanescent existence. I think it exceedingly desirable, even for the sake of those people who might reasonably feel the strongest objections to it—I mean the English minority of Lower Canada, and the Catholic minority of Upper Canada—that it should be settled at once. So long as the question remains in its present state, there will be a constant agitation going on, and much injury may be done by the misrepresentations that will be indulged in, and the misapprehensions which will exist; but if these people can be assured that the scheme provides a perfect remedy for any injustice that they might apprehend, they will immediately concur in it. As regards the people of Lower Canada of French origin, and who are Roman Catholics, I have always heard it said in their favor, that a large degree of liberalism characterizes their conduct toward their Protestant neighbors. (Hear, hear.) Lower Canada, I believe, was the first portion of British territory to give political freedom to the Jew. I believe that a person of this persuasion sat in the Lower Canada Legislature thirty years before the same privileges were accorded in Great Britain. People who charged the French Canadians with intolerance should remember this with some degree of favor. With regard to the people of British origin, over the whole Confederacy, I do not think it is at all necessary to defend them from any charges of this kind. I do not think they will be inclined to persecute the people of Lower Canada if they had it in their power; but I ad-

mit that it is reasonable and just to insert a provision in the scheme that will put it out of the power of any party to act unjustly. If the power that the central authority is to have—of vetoing the doings of the Local Legislature—is used, it will be ample, I think, to prevent anything of that kind. But the veto itself is objected to. It is objected that the elected Legislature will be rendered powerless by the influence of the appointed Upper House exercised over them. Well, sir, under the British Constitution, in all British colonies, and in Great Britain itself, there is a certain elasticity to be presumed. Everything is not provided for, because a great deal is trusted to the common sense of the people. I think it is quite fair and safe to assert that there is not the slightest danger that the Federal Parliament will perpetrate any injustice upon the local legislatures, because it would cause such a reaction as to compass the destruction of the power thus unjustly exercised. The veto power is necessary in order that the General Government may have a control over the proceedings of the local legislatures to a certain extent. The want of this power was the great source of weakness in the United States, and it is a want that will be remedied by an amendment in their Constitution very soon. So long as each state considered itself sovereign, whose acts and laws could not be called in question, it was quite clear that the central authority was destitute of power to compel obedience to general laws. If each province were able to enact such laws as it pleased, everybody would be at the mercy of the local legislatures, and the General Legislature would become of little importance. It is contended that the power of the General Legislature should be held in check by a veto power with reference to its own territory, resident in the local legislatures, respecting the application of general laws to their jurisdiction. All power, they say, comes from the people and ascends through them to their representatives, and through the representatives to the Crown. But it would never do to set the Local above the General Government. The Central Parliament and Government must, of necessity, exercise the supreme power, and the local governments will have the exercise of power corresponding to the duties they have to perform. The system is a new and untried one, and may not work so harmoniously as we now anticipate, but there will always be power in the British Parliament and our own to remedy any defects that may be discovered after

the system is in operation.. Altogether, I regard the scheme as a magnificent one, and I look forward to the future with anticipations of seeing a country and a government possessing great power and respectability, and of being, before I die, a citizen of an immense empire built up on our part of the North American continent, where the folds of the British flag will float in triumph over a people possessing freedom, happiness and prosperity equal to the people of any other nation on the earth. If there is anything that I have always felt anxious about in this country, it is to have the British possessions put in such a position that we could safely repose, without fear of danger from any quarter, under the banner which we believe after all covers the greatest amount of personal freedom and the greatest amount of personal happiness that is to be found in the world. (Hear, hear.) And when we look to the vast territory we have in the North-West; when we know that the great rivers which flow through that territory, flow through immense beds of coal, and that the whole country is rich in mineral deposits of all kinds—petroleum, copper, gold and iron; that the land is teeming with resources of wealth calculated to build up an extensive and valuable commerce, and support a powerful nation; that all this we can touch and seize upon the moment we are prepared to open up a way to reach them and allow the settler to enter; when we remember this, I say, I think we can look forward with hope to a prodigious increase in our population and an immense development of strength and power. (Hear, hear.) So far our people have had to contend with the usual difficulties common to the people of all new countries like ours; but now Canada is beginning to assume a position of commercial importance, and in proportion as that importance increases we will be able to devote ourselves to the opening up and settlement of the interior, and to the development of a new nationality—to use the term that has been so sharply criticised—in that vast western country where there is hardly a white man living to-day. (Hear, hear.) I do not propose, sir, to follow the example that has been set of speaking four or five hours upon this subject. I proposed at the beginning briefly to give my own views in reference to the Confederation of these provinces, and then to leave the ground to other honorable gentlemen. I am exceedingly desirous of seeing the debate proceed as rapidly as possible; and believing it will be necessary for us to

speaking briefly upon the question rather than indulge in long set speeches, I determined to give an example in this respect and bring my remarks within reasonable bounds. (Hear, hear.) I believe then, sir, in the first place, that Confederation is desirable; in the second, that it is attainable; and, in the third place, that it is the best thing we can get, and this last is perhaps the strongest reason of all for accepting it. It is quite clear that we must have a settlement of our difficulties in some way, and I think the scheme proposed is a very favorable settlement of them. I think it is more than perhaps some of us expected at the time when the present Government was formed to bring about a settlement; and I do think, sir, that it would be the greatest act of madness that western members of this House could perpetrate to vote against it. (Hear, hear.) I am not, however, afraid that it will be voted against by them. I believe that under it we have obtained representation by population, that we have obtained what we have long contended was justly due to us, that we have obtained our legitimate influence in framing the financial policy of the country, and that beyond this we have obtained the prospect of building up a great British Union on this continent. We should, therefore, I think, in view of these great advantages, overlook those objections which may be regarded as antecedent to the scheme, and endeavor heartily to carry out the work successfully. I shall willingly yield my support to the scheme, and I believe it will be acceptable to the people I represent—not only to the people of the locality, but to those who surround me in Upper Canada. (Cheers.)

MR. MORRIS said—Mr. SPEAKER, the member for Lambton has, I think, set a good example, and I shall endeavor if it be possible to follow it. I desire to state at the outset that this, as has been well observed by many who have spoken upon the subject, is no new question; but that in one phase or another, as was very properly stated in the narrative given to the House by the honorable member for Montreal West, it has been before the people of this country from time to time for many years past. It is not my intention to follow that honorable gentleman in his interesting narrative of the history of this question, but I desire to ask the attention of the House to the fact that this is the third time that this question has been formally brought before Parliament by the Government of this country. The first occasion was, I believe, in 1858, when the then Governor General, in

closing the session of Parliament for that year, used in the Speech from the Throne the following words:—"I propose, in the course of the recess, to communicate with Her Majesty's Government and with the government of the sister colonies, on another matter of very great importance. I am desirous of inviting them to discuss with us the principles on which a bond of a federal character uniting the provinces of British North America may, perhaps, hereafter be practicable." That formal statement was followed by the despatch which has been referred to frequently in this House and during this debate, and which was made the basis of the motion laid before the House last session by the honorable member for South Oxford—which motion has had the effect of causing present and, as I believe, future great results. (Hear, hear.) I believe the appointment of the committee moved for by that honorable gentleman will be looked back to as an era in the history of this country. (Hear, hear.) Now, as to the second occasion on which this question was formally brought before the attention of the House and country, we have heard from those who object to this scheme, that the people of the country have been taken by surprise, that they do not understand it, and that they are not prepared to discuss it. I would ask, sir, in reference to that, if this present Government was not formed on the very basis and understanding that it would bring about a settlement of this question, and if the people of the country did not know this to be the fact? I hold in my hand the basis upon which the Government was formed, in which the following is stated as the result of a long negotiation between the leading members of it:—

The Government are prepared to pledge themselves to bring in a measure next session, for the purpose of removing existing difficulties by introducing the Federal principle into Canada, coupled with such provision as will permit the Maritime Provinces and the North-West territory to be incorporated into the same system of Government.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Hear, hear!

MR. MORRIS—I trust the honorable gentleman will say "Hear, hear," with the same emphasis when I read the next paragraph:—

And the Government will seek, by sending representatives to the Lower Provinces, and to England, to secure the assent of those interests which are beyond the control of our own legislation to such a measure as may enable all British

North America to be united under a general legislature based upon the Federal principle.

This, sir, was the pledge given to this House and country by the present Government on its formation. It was pledged to introduce the Federative system into the Government of Canada, with special provisions for the incorporation into this Federation of the Maritime Provinces, and it was also pledged to send delegates to those provinces and invite them to join us in this Federation. (Hear, hear.) And yet we are told forsooth that these delegates, who were thus appointed in conformity with the pledge of the Government, were "a self-constituted junta,"—we were told that they had no authority for their action in the face of the distinct obligation resting upon the Government to send delegates to those provinces and to England with a view of bringing about this Confederation. No self-constituted junta were those delegates who framed these resolutions; but they met in accordance with a pledge given by this Government, and must be held to have been called together with the sanction of the Parliament of Canada, because Parliament gave the Government, formed to effect the Federation, its confidence. They met also with the sanction of the Imperial Government, as now appears from statements and despatches in possession of this House. (Hear, hear.) But coming now to the present aspect of the matter, I feel that this country has reason to be satisfied with a scheme of so practical a nature as that now under the consideration of the House. I believe that the plan of union proposed will be found to meet the exigencies of our local position, give latitude to local development, and due protection to local interests, and yet secure that general control which is essentially necessary for the proper government of a country placed under the dominion of the British Crown. (Hear, hear.) And while I thus look upon the plan, I desire to state emphatically and clearly that it is no new principle that the people of this country and the members of this House are asked to give their sanction to. The question of colonial union, in one shape or another, is one that has engaged the attention of high intellects and able statesmen in England; and I think I will be able to show to the House that the very principle we are now endeavoring to introduce as a principle of government in these British North American Provinces, is one that has received the sanction of eminent men in England, and more than that, the sanction of a solemn act of the Imperial Parliament.

(Hear, hear.) I will go back a few years, when the condition of the Australian colonies rendered it necessary for the statesmen of Great Britain to endeavor to find a practical solution of the difficulty of governing those great and growing dependencies of the British Crown. What was the practical mode adopted when events made it necessary that they should form a new Constitution for the more perfect government of those colonies? Why, the Imperial Government revived an old committee of the Privy Council, called the "Committee on Trade and Foreign Plantations," and referred the question to it, calling in to its aid, as new members of the committee, Lord CAMPBELL, then Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Sir JAMES STEPHEN and Sir EDWARD RYAN. The result of the deliberations of that committee was a report in which the eminent men who composed it recommended the formation of a general assembly, to which the control of the general affairs of the Australian colonies should be entrusted, with local governments having local jurisdiction and certain defined powers granted to them. I hold in my hands a series of letters on the colonial policy of England, addressed by Earl GREY to Lord JOHN RUSSELL, which contain the report of the committee of the Privy Council that I have referred to, and I find that the plan there suggested is analogous to the one we are now asked to give practical effect to in this country. (Hear, hear.) The proposition of the committee was that there should be a Governor General to administer the affairs of the Australian colonies, and that he should convene a body, to be called the General Assembly of Australia, on receiving a request to that effect from two or more of the Australian legislatures; and it was recommended that this General Assembly, so convened, should have the power to make laws respecting the imposition of duties on imports and exports, the post office, the formation of roads, canals and railways, and a variety of other subjects. The advantages of this plan were so manifest, as uniting those colonies together and securing for them a better and more satisfactory form of government than they had before enjoyed, that the report was at once adopted by the Privy Council, embodied in a bill and submitted to Parliament. The bill passed the House of Commons and reached the House of Lords; but while before that body the two clauses which introduced into the government of the Australian colonies the same system that in effect it is proposed to

introduce here were dropped, and why? Not because of any change of opinion on the part of the Government on the question, nor because the House of Lords was opposed to the principle, but because it was found on examination that they were liable to practical objections, to obviate which amendments would have to be introduced which there were no means of arranging without further communications with the colonies. The Imperial Government would not make these changes in the measure without the consent of the colonies, but Earl GREY by no means changed his mind in regard to the advantages to be derived from the plan proposed, as the following extract from one of his despatches, written in 1850, to the Governor of New South Wales, will show:—

I am not, however, the less persuaded that the want of some such central authority to regulate matters of common importance to the Australian colonies will be felt, and probably at a very early period; but when this want is so felt, it will of itself suggest the means by which it may be met. The several legislatures will, it is true, be unable at once to give the necessary authority to a General Assembly, because the legislative power of each is confined of necessity within its territorial limits; but if two or more of these legislatures should find that there are objects of common interest for which it is expedient to create such an authority, they will have it in their power, if they can settle the terms of an arrangement for the purpose, to pass acts for giving effect to it, with clauses suspending their operation until Parliament shall have supplied the authority that is wanting. By such acts the extent and objects of the powers which they are prepared to delegate to such a body might be defined and limited with precision, and there can be little doubt that Parliament, when applied to in order to give effect to an arrangement so agreed upon, would readily consent to do so.

Some may say, Mr. SPEAKER, that this is very true, but that the British Government dropped the plan and did not proceed with it. I think I shall be prepared to meet that argument, and show that it only rested in the plan to learn the wishes of the people of the colonies; for you find it following the very same principle, reported upon favorably by the Committee on Trade and Foreign Plantations, in the Constitution which was subsequently granted to the New Zealand provinces. In 1852, the plan suggested by that committee, in regard to Australia, was carried into effect in New Zealand, and it must be remembered that at that time the population of New Zealand was very small, so small indeed that one cannot help contrasting the position of that

country with that of British North America at the present day; but the statesmen of Great Britain looked into the future of the colony, and they decided that it would be advisable to confer on it powers analogous to those now sought for by us. The New Zealand Constitutional Act created six provinces, with superintendents, provincial councils of nine appointed by the governor, and a general government of three estates. In the debate on that bill, Earl GREY said that this was the only form of government which could be conferred on a colony situated as that one was. He remarked:—

It was impracticable and must for many years continue to be so, for any general legislature to meet all the wants of so many separate settlements at a great distance from each other; hence it seemed absolutely necessary to constitute provincial legislatures on which a great portion of the public business must devolve.

The very difficulty which was met with there is the one we have to overcome here. It was found absolutely necessary to create in every province a Local Legislature, and in addition one central power, to whom matters common to all might be referred. Earl GREY, in the course of the same debate, speaking of the importance of this arrangement, said:—“There were some subjects on which extensive inconvenience would arise, if uniformity of legislation among the several provinces were not insured, which could only be accomplished by a General Legislature.” And that, sir, is what this Government now asks us to adopt. They ask us to invite the Imperial Parliament to create for us provincial legislatures, to whom shall be referred all local matters, and that we shall have a General Legislature for the care of those subjects of a general character which could not be so well looked after by the provincial legislatures. And I say, sir, that finding as we do that this is no new question, we can, therefore, understand why this measure met with such ready approval from the statesmen of Britain and the high commendation of Her Majesty by her advisers. (Hear, hear.) But, Mr. SPEAKER, I will now pass from the consideration of the history of this important movement—and I assure you that I feel the difficulty of addressing the House on this subject, in consequence of the sense I entertain of the gravity of the question itself and the momentous character of the issues it involves. The subject, sir, is one of the very highest importance. The destinies of this great country are bound up in it. (Hear, hear.) The

Upper House has already sanctioned the scheme, and I would take the opportunity of remarking that I do not think that the members of that House can be rightly charged with not having given it that deliberate consideration which its importance demands. I think that they have shown a very proper example in their discussion of the question, and one that we may well follow. They debated with leisure, deliberation, and a thorough appreciation of its gravity, day by day, during four weeks, and I therefore think that the members of the Upper House ought not to have been charged with "indecent haste."

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—Who said so?

MR. MORRIS—The honorable member from Cornwall was one of those who said so.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—I said it was unsuitable haste.

MR. MORRIS—I have somewhat of a recording memory, and I think the words he unfortunately used were "indecent haste." However, I have no intention of disputing with my honorable friend as to the particular words he used. I have only to express my opinion that the time which has been already spent on this question here and elsewhere has not been lost. I think it is our duty to consider this subject in all its aspects, and believing as I do that the scheme will be adopted by this House, I feel the importance of a full and free discussion, in order that its merits may be put before the country. (Hear, hear.) MR. SPEAKER, I desire now to state that I support the proposal at present under our consideration, because in my honest and deliberate judgment I believe that this union, if accomplished, is calculated in its practical effects to bind us more closely to Britain than we could be bound by any other system. (Hear, hear.)

A VOICE—It would put an end to the connection.

MR. MORRIS—An honorable member says "it would put an end to the connection." Well, I would say to that honorable gentleman and this House, that in my opinion there are but two destinies before us. We have either to rise into strength and wealth and power by means of this union, under the sheltering protection of Britain, or we must be absorbed by the great power beside us. (Hear, hear.) I believe that that is the only conclusion we can arrive at.

A VOICE—But the people are against it.

MR. MORRIS—An honorable gentleman says the people are not in favor of a Federal union. But we know on the contrary, that

the people are in favor of the change. When the public mind is excited against any measure, is there not a means open to the people to make known their opposition, and how is it that the table of this House is not covered with petitions against the scheme, if it is so unpopular as honorable gentlemen would have us believe?

AN HON. MEMBER—There are no petitions for it.

MR. MORRIS—An honorable gentleman says "there are no petitions for it." And why is it that there are not? Is it not because the Government was constituted on the basis of union? (Hear, hear.) The people, through a vast majority of their representatives in this House, are in favor of it. If they are opposed to it they have the remedy in their own hands, they have the means of opposing, but they do not oppose it because they feel that a change of some kind is absolutely essential, and they have confidence in the wisdom of those entrusted with the destiny of the country in this crisis of its history. But I say that the great reason why this scheme has taken the hold that it has done upon the public men of the province, is that they see in it an earnest desire to perpetuate British connection.

HON. MR. HOLTON—It will turn out a delusion.

MR. MORRIS—I am not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, but I am willing to place my prediction against that of the honorable gentleman who says it will be a delusion. (Hear, hear.) A fear has been expressed that the Confederation will lead to the severance of those links which bind us to the Mother Country. But I believe it will be our own fault if the ties between us are broken. With entire freedom and the right of self-government in the fullest sense of the word, together with the great advantage of an improved position, and the strength and power of Great Britain to foster and protect us, why should we seek to change our connection, what object could we have to induce us to form other ties? (Hear, hear.) What have we to envy in the position of the neighboring country, burdened as it is with the heavy load of taxation arising from the cruel war raging there, that we should covet that flag? Why then should our coming together for the purpose of union weaken our position or diminish the tie that links us to Britain? It will be for honorable gentlemen who do not believe that the union of these scattered colonies will give them strength, to prove that,

contrary to all precedent, union is not strength. (Hear, hear.) But I will state why this union is calculated to prolong our connection with Britain. It is well known that there has been an entire and radical change of late in the colonial policy of England. That policy has been to extend to us the utmost liberty in our relations to the Empire. What is after all the nature of the bond which links us to Great Britain, apart from our allegiance and loyalty? What is it but a Federative bond? That is what links us to Britain, and I feel quite satisfied, in the words of an English publicist of some eminence, that "the new colonial policy is calculated to prolong the connection of the colonies with the Mother Country." I believe it will raise these provinces as part of the British Empire, and so secure to us the permanency of British institutions, and bind us more closely to the Crown. (Hear, hear.) I believe it will, in the words of that far-seeing statesman, Lord DURHAM, "raise up to the North American colonist a nationality of his own by elevating those small and unimportant communities into a society having some objects of national importance, and give these inhabitants a country which they will be unwilling to see absorbed into that of their powerful neighbors." And, sir, our neighbors so see it. Shortly after the visit of the Duke of NEWCASTLE to this country, attention was directed to the question of the union of the colonies, not only in this country, but in England and in the United States. The *New York Courier and Inquirer*, in an article published at that time, came to the conclusion "that the union would, in fact, be an argument for a continuance of the existing relations between the two countries as a matter of policy and gratitude, and that such a change of government could be met with no objection of any weight." (Hear, hear.) I invite the attention of the honorable member for Chateaugay to that statement. But, Mr. SPEAKER, it is a singular study, looking back over the history of the past, to see how this question has come up in the experience of the various colonies. Before the American revolution, BENJAMIN FRANKLIN suggested a plan for a Federation of the old colonies of Britain on this continent, which, he afterwards said, would, according to his deliberate opinion, have prevented the severance of the connection between the colonies and the Mother Country. I will quote a passage written by him after the revolution, in which he makes allusion to this project. He said:—

I proposed and drew up a plan for the union of

all the colonies under one government, so far as might be necessary for defence and other important general purposes. By my plan, the General Government was to be administered by a President-General, appointed and supported by the Crown, and a General Council, to be chosen by the representatives of the people of the several colonies, met in the respective assemblies. The plan was agreed to in Congress, but the assemblies of the provinces did not adopt it, as they thought there was too much prerogative in it, and in England it was judged to have too much of the democratic. The different and contrary reasons of dislike to my plan made me suspect that it was really the true medium, and I am still of opinion it would have been happy for both sides if it had been adopted. The colonies so united would have been strong enough to have defended themselves; there would then have been no need of troops from England; of course the subsequent pretext for taxing America, and also the bloody contest it occasioned, would have been avoided.

It is singular that nearly a hundred years ago, BENJAMIN FRANKLIN, looking at the difficulties then existing between the colonies, should have suggested a plan of union similar to that now proposed to us, and it is a strong proof of the wisdom of the plan now before this House, that seeing the difficulties under which the other colonies labored for want of a central power, just as we now see them, proposing this Confederation, he should have declared that if such a plan had been adopted then it would have prevented the severance of the British connection.

HON. MR. HOLTON—This scheme is looked upon as equal to independence.

MR. MORRIS—Is that the opinion of the honorable member? I think that far different views prevail in Britain. In 1858, when British Columbia was erected into a colony, it was found then that the Commons of Britain had no intention of surrendering the fair possessions of Britain on this continent, and Her Majesty was advised to say:—

Her Majesty hopes that the new colony in the Pacific may be but one step in the career of steady progress, by which Her Majesty's dominions in North America may ultimately be peopled in an unbroken chain from the Atlantic to the Pacific by a loyal, industrious population of subjects of the British Crown.

(Hear, hear.) I say, sir, that there is no evidence whatever that the statesmen of Britain look upon this great scheme as involving the severance of our connection with the Empire; but these utterances, as read here the other night by the honorable member from Montreal Centre, prove directly the contrary. If breaking off from the Mother

Country were its tendency, then I, for one, would not support it, nor would it be supported by any of those honorable gentlemen who so strongly advocate it. I am not afraid to say that any government which dared to bring down such a measure would be hurled from their places. (Hear, hear.) But, Mr. SPEAKER, I have been led into the discussion of this question of connection with the Mother Country at much greater length than I had intended, by the suggestions of hon. members, and I will take the liberty of calling the attention of the House to a passage from a work I have already referred to, and in which we find an exposition of the policy which governed the administration of Lord JOHN RUSSELL. I find there an elaborate argument to prove that the colonies are an advantage to Britain, and that Britain of course is an advantage to the colonies; and on the mere ground of material interest, if there were no other—if deeper and stronger ties did not exist as they do—I feel satisfied that this country would not be prepared to take the first step towards the severance of our connection with England, and the loss of that prestige and power which go with every British subject to every civilized part of the globe, enabling him to say, like the old Roman, “I am a British citizen.” EARL GREY states that :—

The possession of a number of steady and faithful allies, in various quarters of the globe, will surely be admitted to add greatly to the strength of any nation; while no alliance between independent states can be so close and intimate as the connection which unites the colonies to the United Kingdom as parts of the Great British Empire. Nor ought it to be forgotten, that the power of a nation does not depend merely on the amount of physical force it can command, but rests, in no small degree, upon opinion and moral influence. In this respect British power would be diminished by the loss of our colonies, to a degree which it would be difficult to estimate.

Passing on a little, we find him saying :—

To the latter [*i. e.* the colonists] it is no doubt of far greater importance than to the former, because, while still forming comparatively small and weak communities, they enjoy, in return for their allegiance to the British Crown, all the security and consideration which belongs to them as members of one of the most powerful states in the world. No foreign power ventures to attack or interfere with the smallest of them, while every colonist carries with him to the remotest quarters of the globe which he may visit, in trading or other pursuits, that protection which the character of a British subject everywhere confers.

(Hear, hear.) But to view the subject in another aspect. I believe it will be found that all the conditions are combined in the scheme now before us, that are considered necessary for the formation on a permanent basis of a Federative union. I hold in my hand a book of some note on *Representative Government*, by JOHN STUART MILL, and I find that he lays down three conditions as applicable to the union of independent states, and which, by parity of reasoning, are applicable to provinces which seek to have a closer alliance with each other, and also, thereby, a closer alliance with the Mother Country. The conditions he lays down are first,—

That there should be a sufficient amount of mutual sympathy among the populations.

And he states that the sympathies which they should have in common should be—

Those of race, language, religion, and, above all, of political institutions, as conducing most to a feeling of identity of political interest.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Hear, hear.

MR. MORRIS—We possess that strong tie of mutual sympathy in a high degree. We have the same systems of government, and the same political institutions. We are part of the same great Empire, and that is the real tie which will bind us together in future time. The second condition laid down is :—

That the separate states be not so powerful as to be able to rely for protection against foreign encroachment on their individual strength.

That is a condition which applies most forcibly in our case. (Hear, hear.) The third condition is :—

That there be not a very marked inequality of strength among the several contracting states.

HON. MR. DORION—Hear, hear.

MR. MORRIS—Allow me to proceed with the extract :—

They cannot, indeed, be exactly equal in resources; in all federations there will be a gradation of power among the members; some will be more populous, rich, and civilized than others. There is a wide difference in wealth between New York and Rhode Island.

Just as there is between Canada and Prince Edward Island. I trust I have satisfied my hon. friend from Hochelaga (Hon. Mr. DORION), that Mr. MILL's views are entirely applicable to our position. (Hear, hear.) I now proceed to state my belief that we will find great advantages in the future, in

the possession of a strong Central Government and local or municipal parliaments, such as are proposed for our adoption. I believe the scheme will be found in fact and in practice—by its combination of the better features of the American system with those of the British Constitution—to have very great practical advantages. I shall read an extract from an article in the *London Times*, written in 1858, bearing on this subject, and which brings very clearly into view the distinction between the system which has been proposed for our adoption, and that which has been adopted in the States. The great weakness of the American system has lain in the fact that the several states, on entering the union, claimed independent jurisdiction; that they demitted to the Central Government certain powers, and that they claimed equal and sovereign powers with regard to everything not so delegated and demitted. The weaknesses and difficulties of that system have been avoided in the project now before us, and we have the central power with defined and sovereign powers, and the local parliaments with their defined and delegated powers, but subordinated to the central power. The article says:—

It is quite clear that the Federal Constitution of the United States of America forms a precedent which cannot possibly be followed in its principles or details by the united colonies, so long as they remain part of the dominions of the Imperial Crown. The principle of the American Federation is, that each is a sovereign state, which consents to delegate to a central authority a portion of its sovereign power, leaving the remainder which is not so delegated absolute and intact in its own hands. This is not the position of the colonies, each of which, instead of being an isolated sovereign state, is an integral part of the British Empire. They cannot delegate their sovereign authority to a central government, because they do not possess the sovereign authority to delegate. The only alternative as it seems to us would be to adopt a course exactly the contrary of that which the United States adopted, and instead of taking for their motto *E Pluribus Unum*, to invert it by saying *In Uno Plura*.

(Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—What are you reading from?

MR. MORRIS—From the *London Times*, and I quote the article on account of the force of the remarks themselves, apart from the standing of the journal in which they appear:—

The first steps towards a Federation of the American Colonies would thus be to form them all into one state, to give that state a completely organized government, and then to delegate to each of the colonies out of which that great state is formed, such powers of local government as may be thought necessary, reserving to the Central Government all such powers as are not expressly delegated. The Government of New Zealand forms a precedent well worthy the attention of those who are undertaking this arduous negotiation.

And I cannot doubt that the framers of this Constitution have studied the precedent as well of the proposed Constitution of Australia, as that of the Constitution of New Zealand which has been in use for ten years past.

HON. MR. HOLTON—How does it work?

MR. MORRIS—I have not been there—(laughter)—but I know that from a small population of 26,000 in all the New Zealand provinces when that Constitution was given them, they have risen in ten years to a population of 250,000—indicating certainly growth and progress.

HON. MR. HOLTON—As we have grown in spite of that terribly bad union you wish to do away with.

MR. MORRIS—True, we have grown and progressed under the present union. But the hon. gentleman knows the heart-burnings we have had in the past. I have not been in Parliament so long as that honorable gentleman. But I recollect, when I first took a seat in this House, the state of excitement which then prevailed, and which continued, making government practically impossible. For we had governments maintaining themselves session after session by majorities of one or two—shewing that it was impossible for any government to conduct public affairs with that dignity and success with which a government ought to conduct them. But, as I have stated, I think the Conference has been exceedingly happy in the plan they have submitted for our adoption. A community of British free-men as we are, deliberately surveying our past as well as our present position, and looking forward to our future, we in effect resolve that we will adhere to the protection of the British Crown; that we will tell the GOLDWIN SMITH school—these who are crying out for cutting off the colonies—that we will cling to the old Mother Land—(hear, hear)—we desire to maintain our connection; we have no desire to withdraw

ourselves from that protection we have so long enjoyed; but we desire, while remaining under that protection, to do all that lies in our power for our self-defence, and for the development of all the great interests which Providence has committed to our trust; and we seek at the hands of the British Parliament such legislation as will enable us to accomplish these great ends for the whole of British America. (Hear, hear.) Why, what a domain do we possess! We have over three millions of square miles of territory—large enough, certainly, for the expansion of the races which inhabit this country; and our desire is, in the language of a late colonial minister—language which, I believe, well expresses the views and sentiments of the people of all these provinces—we would approach the British people, the British Government, and our Sovereign, with this language: “We desire, by your aid, with your sanction and permission, to attempt to add another community of Christian freemen to those by which Great Britain confides the records of her Empire, not to pyramids and obelisks, but to states and communities, whose history will be written in her language.” That was the language of the Colonial Secretary, Sir BULWER LYTTON, when he proposed and carried out the setting off of a new colony on the Pacific shore—language certainly which indicated a firm and sure reliance in the power and efficacy of British institutions—that these institutions would be found capable of all the expansion requisite to meet the circumstances of a new country, and of any body of British freemen to whom the care of these institutions may be entrusted. (Hear, hear.) But I fear I have been tempted to forget the excellent example of my honorable friend from Lambton. (Cries of “No, no,” “go on.”) I desire very briefly to notice two or three immediate advantages which, in my judgment, would be derived from the consummation, under one central power with local municipal parliaments, of a union of the Canadas with the Maritime Provinces. Let us glance at what is their position, in relation to the great military power which is rising on the other side of the lines. Let us see what they are thinking of us there. One of their eminent statesmen suggested some years ago, that they should cultivate our acquaintance, while we were still “incurious of our destiny.” But we have passed that state. We have become curious

of our destiny, and are seeking, as far as we can, to place it on a sure and certain basis. (Hear, hear.) Here is the view taken of our position by an American writer:—

They have now no comprehensive power that embraces the interests of all—that acts on the prosperity of the seacoast and interior—of commerce and agriculture where they are seemingly rivals—that gives uniformity in tariffs and taxes, and the encouragement that shall be entrusted to the fishing, mining and other great interests.

That is a view of the position of these provinces to which I commend to the attention of my hon. friends from Chateaugay and Hochelaga. I ask, is it not a correct view? Is not that the position in which we have long been? And I believe the result of this union will be to do away with that state of things. (Hear, hear.) I believe that when these colonies are combined, acting in concert, and quickened and invigorated by a feeling of mutual dependence and interest, the tendency will be to increase their wealth and manufactures, and general strength. And, sir, I am satisfied one of the great advantages of this union will be found in this that we will be raised above our sectionalisms, and come to feel and to act as the citizens of a great country, with destinies committed to us such as may well evoke the energies of a great people. But I desire to point out another practical advantage which, I think, is of no mean or slight moment; and it is this:—Bound as we are to England, by the closest ties, and yet enjoying our own government, England is still compelled to act for us in all matters of an international nature. But, when we have for all these British provinces one General Government, able to take an oversight of the whole, and to attend to all their various interests, we will be able to represent to Britain on behalf of the whole, with a force and power we have never before been able to use, what these interests are; we will be able to press them home on the attention of British statesmen in such a manner as will lead them to appreciate, and seek to protect those interests in their negotiations with foreign powers. I would allude, as an illustration of what I mean, to the Reciprocity Treaty, and I cannot refrain from reading a very striking extract from a report presented to the United States House of Representatives, in 1862, from the Committee of Commerce on the Reciprocity Treaty. I ask the attention

knows or ought to know that it is about \$140. Nevertheless he drew a comparison showing that while the comparatively poor people of Canada would have to pay \$25 per head, the rich people of Great Britain had only \$37 to pay. It is very remarkable, however, that the whole of this portion of the honorable gentleman's speech was omitted from the report given in the papers next morning. I do not propose to go into these figures, but merely to refer to a few facts to place the assertions made by that honorable gentleman in their true light before the House. Our debt is indeed very large, and we could all wish that it was very much less than it is, but we have got to bear it and to pay it, and must do the best we can under the circumstances. The measure of Confederation, in my opinion, will not add to nor yet lessen it, except what may be incurred for the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. It is quite possible, of course, that we may undertake enormous expenditures for public works calculated to open up and develop the resources of the country, and thus soon render our debt much heavier than at present, and it will be a question for the Government that may be established after Confederation, to decide how far it will be wise or prudent to undertake works of great cost until we shall have a good surplus in hand. (Hear, hear.) One of the objections urged by the opponents of the measure is, that it is being hurried through too fast—that in a matter of so much much importance to present and future generations, more time for consideration should be given. We have been discussing this question for many years in Canada West. Since the Toronto Convention of 1859, the question has been continuously before the people. It is now nearly a year since it was proposed in something like its present shape in this House, and since that time the whole of our newspapers have been writing upon it continually. We have nearly 300 newspapers in the country—and they have been carrying on a constant argument for or against the scheme, until I do not think it is possible to say or write much more upon the subject with any advantage. If the question is not now fully understood, I fear it will not be much better understood by any delay that can be now accorded. (Hear, hear.) Another objection raised is, that a measure of such vast importance ought not to be carried through without its first being submitted to the people. I have mixed with the people a good deal, and I have found the opinion all but universal amongst them,

that it was expedient to put the measure into practical operation as soon as possible. The people consider it utterly impossible to carry on the former violent political agitation with any benefit to the country, and the desire is general that we should get rid of the present constitutional difficulties and get settled down to some quiet and permanent way of managing our governmental business and political discussions. (Hear, hear.) The charges that are made against members of this House about inconsistency in advocating this measure, are very easily met. In a country like ours, so full of change, with a constant agitation going on for constitutional changes and for new laws, both local and general, it is utterly impossible that a man can remain long in public life without being open to charges of inconsistency; but if these are caused by a strong effort to settle the difficulties under which the country has been laboring, like the present one, I feel certain that the success of the measure in hand will render the charges of only evanescent existence. I think it exceedingly desirable, even for the sake of those people who might reasonably feel the strongest objections to it—I mean the English minority of Lower Canada, and the Catholic minority of Upper Canada—that it should be settled at once. So long as the question remains in its present state, there will be a constant agitation going on, and much injury may be done by the misrepresentations that will be indulged in, and the misapprehensions which will exist; but if these people can be assured that the scheme provides a perfect remedy for any injustice that they might apprehend, they will immediately concur in it. As regards the people of Lower Canada of French origin, and who are Roman Catholics, I have always heard it said in their favor, that a large degree of liberalism characterizes their conduct toward their Protestant neighbors. (Hear, hear.) Lower Canada, I believe, was the first portion of British territory to give political freedom to the Jew. I believe that a person of this persuasion sat in the Lower Canada Legislature thirty years before the same privileges were accorded in Great Britain. People who charged the French Canadians with intolerance should remember this with some degree of favor. With regard to the people of British origin, over the whole Confederacy, I do not think it is at all necessary to defend them from any charges of this kind. I do not think they will be inclined to persecute the people of Lower Canada if they had it in their power; but I ad-

mit that it is reasonable and just to insert a provision in the scheme that will put it out of the power of any party to act unjustly. If the power that the central authority is to have—of vetoing the doings of the Local Legislature—is used, it will be ample, I think, to prevent anything of that kind. But the veto itself is objected to. It is objected that the elected Legislature will be rendered powerless by the influence of the appointed Upper House exercised over them. Well, sir, under the British Constitution, in all British colonies, and in Great Britain itself, there is a certain elasticity to be presumed. Everything is not provided for, because a great deal is trusted to the common sense of the people. I think it is quite fair and safe to assert that there is not the slightest danger that the Federal Parliament will perpetrate any injustice upon the local legislatures, because it would cause such a reaction as to compass the destruction of the power thus unjustly exercised. The veto power is necessary in order that the General Government may have a control over the proceedings of the local legislatures to a certain extent. The want of this power was the great source of weakness in the United States, and it is a want that will be remedied by an amendment in their Constitution very soon. So long as each state considered itself sovereign, whose acts and laws could not be called in question, it was quite clear that the central authority was destitute of power to compel obedience to general laws. If each province were able to enact such laws as it pleased, everybody would be at the mercy of the local legislatures, and the General Legislature would become of little importance. It is contended that the power of the General Legislature should be held in check by a veto power with reference to its own territory, resident in the local legislatures, respecting the application of general laws to their jurisdiction. All power, they say, comes from the people and ascends through them to their representatives, and through the representatives to the Crown. But it would never do to set the Local above the General Government. The Central Parliament and Government must, of necessity, exercise the supreme power, and the local governments will have the exercise of power corresponding to the duties they have to perform. The system is a new and untried one, and may not work so harmoniously as we now anticipate, but there will always be power in the British Parliament and our own to remedy any defects that may be discovered after

the system is in operation.. Altogether, I regard the scheme as a magnificent one, and I look forward to the future with anticipations of seeing a country and a government possessing great power and respectability, and of being, before I die, a citizen of an immense empire built up on our part of the North American continent, where the folds of the British flag will float in triumph over a people possessing freedom, happiness and prosperity equal to the people of any other nation on the earth. If there is anything that I have always felt anxious about in this country, it is to have the British possessions put in such a position that we could safely repose, without fear of danger from any quarter, under the banner which we believe after all covers the greatest amount of personal freedom and the greatest amount of personal happiness that is to be found in the world. (Hear, hear.) And when we look to the vast territory we have in the North-West; when we know that the great rivers which flow through that territory, flow through immense beds of coal, and that the whole country is rich in mineral deposits of all kinds—petroleum, copper, gold and iron; that the land is teeming with resources of wealth calculated to build up an extensive and valuable commerce, and support a powerful nation; that all this we can touch and seize upon the moment we are prepared to open up a way to reach them and allow the settler to enter; when we remember this, I say, I think we can look forward with hope to a prodigious increase in our population and an immense development of strength and power. (Hear, hear.) So far our people have had to contend with the usual difficulties common to the people of all new countries like ours; but now Canada is beginning to assume a position of commercial importance, and in proportion as that importance increases we will be able to devote ourselves to the opening up and settlement of the interior, and to the development of a new nationality—to use the term that has been so sharply criticised—in that vast western country where there is hardly a white man living to-day. (Hear, hear.) I do not propose, sir, to follow the example that has been set of speaking four or five hours upon this subject. I proposed at the beginning briefly to give my own views in reference to the Confederation of these provinces, and then to leave the ground to other honorable gentlemen. I am exceedingly desirous of seeing the debate proceed as rapidly as possible; and believing it will be necessary for us to

speak briefly upon the question rather than indulge in long set speeches, I determined to give an example in this respect and bring my remarks within reasonable bounds. (Hear, hear.) I believe then, sir, in the first place, that Confederation is desirable; in the second, that it is attainable; and, in the third place, that it is the best thing we can get, and this last is perhaps the strongest reason of all for accepting it. It is quite clear that we must have a settlement of our difficulties in some way, and I think the scheme proposed is a very favorable settlement of them. I think it is more than perhaps some of us expected at the time when the present Government was formed to bring about a settlement; and I do think, sir, that it would be the greatest act of madness that western members of this House could perpetrate to vote against it. (Hear, hear.) I am not, however, afraid that it will be voted against by them. I believe that under it we have obtained representation by population, that we have obtained what we have long contended was justly due to us, that we have obtained our legitimate influence in framing the financial policy of the country, and that beyond this we have obtained the prospect of building up a great British Union on this continent. We should, therefore, I think, in view of these great advantages, overlook those objections which may be regarded as antecedent to the scheme, and endeavor heartily to carry out the work successfully. I shall willingly yield my support to the scheme, and I believe it will be acceptable to the people I represent—not only to the people of the locality, but to those who surround me in Upper Canada. (Cheers.)

MR. MORRIS said—Mr. SPEAKER, the member for Lambton has, I think, set a good example, and I shall endeavor if it be possible to follow it. I desire to state at the outset that this, as has been well observed by many who have spoken upon the subject, is no new question; but that in one phase or another, as was very properly stated in the narrative given to the House by the honorable member for Montreal West, it has been before the people of this country from time to time for many years past. It is not my intention to follow that honorable gentleman in his interesting narrative of the history of this question, but I desire to ask the attention of the House to the fact that this is the third time that this question has been formally brought before Parliament by the Government of this country. The first occasion was, I believe, in 1858, when the then Governor General, in

closing the session of Parliament for that year, used in the Speech from the Throne the following words:—"I propose, in the course of the recess, to communicate with Her Majesty's Government and with the government of the sister colonies, on another matter of very great importance. I am desirous of inviting them to discuss with us the principles on which a bond of a federal character uniting the provinces of British North America may, perhaps, hereafter be practicable." That formal statement was followed by the despatch which has been referred to frequently in this House and during this debate, and which was made the basis of the motion laid before the House last session by the honorable member for South Oxford—which motion has had the effect of causing present and, as I believe, future great results. (Hear, hear.) I believe the appointment of the committee moved for by that honorable gentleman will be looked back to as an era in the history of this country. (Hear, hear.) Now, as to the second occasion on which this question was formally brought before the attention of the House and country, we have heard from those who object to this scheme, that the people of the country have been taken by surprise, that they do not understand it, and that they are not prepared to discuss it. I would ask, sir, in reference to that, if this present Government was not formed on the very basis and understanding that it would bring about a settlement of this question, and if the people of the country did not know this to be the fact? I hold in my hand the basis upon which the Government was formed, in which the following is stated as the result of a long negotiation between the leading members of it:—

The Government are prepared to pledge themselves to bring in a measure next session, for the purpose of removing existing difficulties by introducing the Federal principle into Canada, coupled with such provision as will permit the Maritime Provinces and the North-West territory to be incorporated into the same system of Government.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Hear, hear!

MR. MORRIS—I trust the honorable gentleman will say "Hear, hear," with the same emphasis when I read the next paragraph:—

And the Government will seek, by sending representatives to the Lower Provinces, and to England, to secure the assent of those interests which are beyond the control of our own legislation to such a measure as may enable all British

North America to be united under a general legislature based upon the Federal principle.

This, sir, was the pledge given to this House and country by the present Government on its formation. It was pledged to introduce the Federative system into the Government of Canada, with special provisions for the incorporation into this Federation of the Maritime Provinces, and it was also pledged to send delegates to those provinces and invite them to join us in this Federation. (Hear, hear.) And yet we are told forsooth that these delegates, who were thus appointed in conformity with the pledge of the Government, were "a self-constituted junta,"—we were told that they had no authority for their action in the face of the distinct obligation resting upon the Government to send delegates to those provinces and to England with a view of bringing about this Confederation. No self-constituted junta were those delegates who framed these resolutions; but they met in accordance with a pledge given by this Government, and must be held to have been called together with the sanction of the Parliament of Canada, because Parliament gave the Government, formed to effect the Federation, its confidence. They met also with the sanction of the Imperial Government, as now appears from statements and despatches in possession of this House. (Hear, hear.) But coming now to the present aspect of the matter, I feel that this country has reason to be satisfied with a scheme of so practical a nature as that now under the consideration of the House. I believe that the plan of union proposed will be found to meet the exigencies of our local position, give latitude to local development, and due protection to local interests, and yet secure that general control which is essentially necessary for the proper government of a country placed under the dominion of the British Crown. (Hear, hear.) And while I thus look upon the plan, I desire to state emphatically and clearly that it is no new principle that the people of this country and the members of this House are asked to give their sanction to. The question of colonial union, in one shape or another, is one that has engaged the attention of high intellects and able statesmen in England; and I think I will be able to show to the House that the very principle we are now endeavoring to introduce as a principle of government in these British North American Provinces, is one that has received the sanction of eminent men in England, and more than that, the sanction of a solemn act of the Imperial Parliament.

(Hear, hear.) I will go back a few years, when the condition of the Australian colonies rendered it necessary for the statesmen of Great Britain to endeavor to find a practical solution of the difficulty of governing those great and growing dependencies of the British Crown. What was the practical mode adopted when events made it necessary that they should form a new Constitution for the more perfect government of those colonies? Why, the Imperial Government revived an old committee of the Privy Council, called the "Committee on Trade and Foreign Plantations," and referred the question to it, calling in to its aid, as new members of the committee, Lord CAMPBELL, then Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Sir JAMES STEPHEN and Sir EDWARD RYAN. The result of the deliberations of that committee was a report in which the eminent men who composed it recommended the formation of a general assembly, to which the control of the general affairs of the Australian colonies should be entrusted, with local governments having local jurisdiction and certain defined powers granted to them. I hold in my hands a series of letters on the colonial policy of England, addressed by Earl GREY to Lord JOHN RUSSELL, which contain the report of the committee of the Privy Council that I have referred to, and I find that the plan there suggested is analogous to the one we are now asked to give practical effect to in this country. (Hear, hear.) The proposition of the committee was that there should be a Governor General to administer the affairs of the Australian colonies, and that he should convene a body, to be called the General Assembly of Australia, on receiving a request to that effect from two or more of the Australian legislatures; and it was recommended that this General Assembly, so convened, should have the power to make laws respecting the imposition of duties on imports and exports, the post office, the formation of roads, canals and railways, and a variety of other subjects. The advantages of this plan were so manifest, as uniting those colonies together and securing for them a better and more satisfactory form of government than they had before enjoyed, that the report was at once adopted by the Privy Council, embodied in a bill and submitted to Parliament. The bill passed the House of Commons and reached the House of Lords; but while before that body the two clauses which introduced into the government of the Australian colonies the same system that in effect it is proposed to

introduce here were dropped, and why? Not because of any change of opinion on the part of the Government on the question, nor because the House of Lords was opposed to the principle, but because it was found on examination that they were liable to practical objections, to obviate which amendments would have to be introduced which there were no means of arranging without further communications with the colonies. The Imperial Government would not make these changes in the measure without the consent of the colonies, but Earl GREY by no means changed his mind in regard to the advantages to be derived from the plan proposed, as the following extract from one of his despatches, written in 1850, to the Governor of New South Wales, will show:—

I am not, however, the less persuaded that the want of some such central authority to regulate matters of common importance to the Australian colonies will be felt, and probably at a very early period; but when this want is so felt, it will of itself suggest the means by which it may be met. The several legislatures will, it is true, be unable at once to give the necessary authority to a General Assembly, because the legislative power of each is confined of necessity within its territorial limits; but if two or more of these legislatures should find that there are objects of common interest for which it is expedient to create such an authority, they will have it in their power, if they can settle the terms of an arrangement for the purpose, to pass acts for giving effect to it, with clauses suspending their operation until Parliament shall have supplied the authority that is wanting. By such acts the extent and objects of the powers which they are prepared to delegate to such a body might be defined and limited with precision, and there can be little doubt that Parliament, when applied to in order to give effect to an arrangement so agreed upon, would readily consent to do so.

Some may say, Mr. SPEAKER, that this is very true, but that the British Government dropped the plan and did not proceed with it. I think I shall be prepared to meet that argument, and show that it only rested in the plan to learn the wishes of the people of the colonies; for you find it following the very same principle, reported upon favorably by the Committee on Trade and Foreign Plantations, in the Constitution which was subsequently granted to the New Zealand provinces. In 1852, the plan suggested by that committee, in regard to Australia, was carried into effect in New Zealand, and it must be remembered that at that time the population of New Zealand was very small, so small indeed that one cannot help contrasting the position of that

country with that of British North America at the present day; but the statesmen of Great Britain looked into the future of the colony, and they decided that it would be advisable to confer on it powers analogous to those now sought for by us. The New Zealand Constitutional Act created six provinces, with superintendents, provincial councils of nine appointed by the governor, and a general government of three estates. In the debate on that bill, Earl GREY said that this was the only form of government which could be conferred on a colony situated as that one was. He remarked:—

It was impracticable and must for many years continue to be so, for any general legislature to meet all the wants of so many separate settlements at a great distance from each other; hence it seemed absolutely necessary to constitute provincial legislatures on which a great portion of the public business must devolve.

The very difficulty which was met with there is the one we have to overcome here. It was found absolutely necessary to create in every province a Local Legislature, and in addition one central power, to whom matters common to all might be referred. Earl GREY, in the course of the same debate, speaking of the importance of this arrangement, said:—"There were some subjects on which extensive inconvenience would arise, if uniformity of legislation among the several provinces were not insured, which could only be accomplished by a General Legislature." And that, sir, is what this Government now asks us to adopt. They ask us to invite the Imperial Parliament to create for us provincial legislatures, to whom shall be referred all local matters, and that we shall have a General Legislature for the care of those subjects of a general character which could not be so well looked after by the provincial legislatures. And I say, sir, that finding as we do that this is no new question, we can, therefore, understand why this measure met with such ready approval from the statesmen of Britain and the high commendation of Her Majesty by her advisers. (Hear, hear.) But, Mr. SPEAKER, I will now pass from the consideration of the history of this important movement—and I assure you that I feel the difficulty of addressing the House on this subject, in consequence of the sense I entertain of the gravity of the question itself and the momentous character of the issues it involves. The subject, sir, is one of the very highest importance. The destinies of this great country are bound up in it. (Hear, hear.) The

Upper House has already sanctioned the scheme, and I would take the opportunity of remarking that I do not think that the members of that House can be rightly charged with not having given it that deliberate consideration which its importance demands. I think that they have shown a very proper example in their discussion of the question, and one that we may well follow. They debated with leisure, deliberation, and a thorough appreciation of its gravity, day by day, during four weeks, and I therefore think that the members of the Upper House ought not to have been charged with "indecent haste."

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—Who said so?

MR. MORRIS—The honorable member from Cornwall was one of those who said so.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—I said it was unsuitable haste.

MR. MORRIS—I have somewhat of a recording memory, and I think the words he unfortunately used were "indecent haste." However, I have no intention of disputing with my honorable friend as to the particular words he used. I have only to express my opinion that the time which has been already spent on this question here and elsewhere has not been lost. I think it is our duty to consider this subject in all its aspects, and believing as I do that the scheme will be adopted by this House, I feel the importance of a full and free discussion, in order that its merits may be put before the country. (Hear, hear.) MR. SPEAKER, I desire now to state that I support the proposal at present under our consideration, because in my honest and deliberate judgment I believe that this union, if accomplished, is calculated in its practical effects to bind us more closely to Britain than we could be bound by any other system. (Hear, hear.)

A VOICE—It would put an end to the connection.

MR. MORRIS—An honorable member says "it would put an end to the connection." Well, I would say to that honorable gentleman and this House, that in my opinion there are but two destinies before us. We have either to rise into strength and wealth and power by means of this union, under the sheltering protection of Britain, or we must be absorbed by the great power beside us. (Hear, hear.) I believe that that is the only conclusion we can arrive at.

A VOICE—But the people are against it.

MR. MORRIS—An honorable gentleman says the people are not in favor of a Federal union. But we know on the contrary, that

the people are in favor of the change. When the public mind is excited against any measure, is there not a means open to the people to make known their opposition, and how is it that the table of this House is not covered with petitions against the scheme, if it is so unpopular as honorable gentlemen would have us believe?

AN HON. MEMBR—There are no petitions for it.

MR. MORRIS—An honorable gentleman says "there are no petitions for it." And why is it that there are not? Is it not because the Government was constituted on the basis of union? (Hear, hear.) The people, through a vast majority of their representatives in this House, are in favor of it. If they are opposed to it they have the remedy in their own hands, they have the means of opposing, but they do not oppose it because they feel that a change of some kind is absolutely essential, and they have confidence in the wisdom of those entrusted with the destiny of the country in this crisis of its history. But I say that the great reason why this scheme has taken the hold that it has done upon the public men of the province, is that they see in it an earnest desire to perpetuate British connection.

HON. MR. HOLTON—It will turn out a delusion.

MR. MORRIS—I am not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, but I am willing to place my prediction against that of the honorable gentleman who says it will be a delusion. (Hear, hear.) A fear has been expressed that the Confederation will lead to the severance of those links which bind us to the Mother Country. But I believe it will be our own fault if the ties between us are broken. With entire freedom and the right of self-government in the fullest sense of the word, together with the great advantage of an improved position, and the strength and power of Great Britain to foster and protect us, why should we seek to change our connection, what object could we have to induce us to form other ties? (Hear, hear.) What have we to envy in the position of the neighboring country, burdened as it is with the heavy load of taxation arising from the cruel war raging there, that we should covet that flag? Why then should our coming together for the purpose of union weaken our position or diminish the tie that links us to Britain? It will be for honorable gentlemen who do not believe that the union of these scattered colonies will give them strength, to prove that,

contrary to all precedent, union is not strength. (Hear, hear.) But I will state why this union is calculated to prolong our connection with Britain. It is well known that there has been an entire and radical change of late in the colonial policy of England. That policy has been to extend to us the utmost liberty in our relations to the Empire. What is after all the nature of the bond which links us to Great Britain, apart from our allegiance and loyalty? What is it but a Federative bond? That is what links us to Britain, and I feel quite satisfied, in the words of an English publicist of some eminence, that "the new colonial policy is calculated to prolong the connection of the colonies with the Mother Country." I believe it will raise these provinces as part of the British Empire, and so secure to us the permanency of British institutions, and bind us more closely to the Crown. (Hear, hear.) I believe it will, in the words of that far-seeing statesman, Lord DURHAM, "raise up to the North American colonist a nationality of his own by elevating those small and unimportant communities into a society having some objects of national importance, and give these inhabitants a country which they will be unwilling to see absorbed into that of their powerful neighbors." And, sir, our neighbors so see it. Shortly after the visit of the Duke of NEWCASTLE to this country, attention was directed to the question of the union of the colonies, not only in this country, but in England and in the United States. The *New York Courier and Inquirer*, in an article published at that time, came to the conclusion "that the union would, in fact, be an argument for a continuance of the existing relations between the two countries as a matter of policy and gratitude, and that such a change of government could be met with no objection of any weight." (Hear, hear.) I invite the attention of the honorable member for Chateaugay to that statement. But, Mr. SPEAKER, it is a singular study, looking back over the history of the past, to see how this question has come up in the experience of the various colonies. Before the American revolution, BENJAMIN FRANKLIN suggested a plan for a Federation of the old colonies of Britain on this continent, which, he afterwards said, would, according to his deliberate opinion, have prevented the severance of the connection between the colonies and the Mother Country. I will quote a passage written by him after the revolution, in which he makes allusion to this project. He said:—

I proposed and drew up a plan for the union of

all the colonies under one government, so far as might be necessary for defence and other important general purposes. By my plan, the General Government was to be administered by a President-General, appointed and supported by the Crown, and a General Council, to be chosen by the representatives of the people of the several colonies, met in the respective assemblies. The plan was agreed to in Congress, but the assemblies of the provinces did not adopt it, as they thought there was too much prerogative in it, and in England it was judged to have too much of the democratic. The different and contrary reasons of dislike to my plan made me suspect that it was really the true medium, and I am still of opinion it would have been happy for both sides if it had been adopted. The colonies so united would have been strong enough to have defended themselves; there would then have been no need of troops from England; of course the subsequent pretext for taxing America, and also the bloody contest it occasioned, would have been avoided.

It is singular that nearly a hundred years ago, BENJAMIN FRANKLIN, looking at the difficulties then existing between the colonies, should have suggested a plan of union similar to that now proposed to us, and it is a strong proof of the wisdom of the plan now before this House, that seeing the difficulties under which the other colonies labored for want of a central power, just as we now see them, proposing this Confederation, he should have declared that if such a plan had been adopted then it would have prevented the severance of the British connection.

HON. MR. HOLTON—This scheme is looked upon as equal to independence.

MR. MORRIS—Is that the opinion of the honorable member? I think that far different views prevail in Britain. In 1858, when British Columbia was erected into a colony, it was found then that the Commons of Britain had no intention of surrendering the fair possessions of Britain on this continent, and Her Majesty was advised to say:—

Her Majesty hopes that the new colony in the Pacific may be but one step in the career of steady progress, by which Her Majesty's dominions in North America may ultimately be peopled in an unbroken chain from the Atlantic to the Pacific by a loyal, industrious population of subjects of the British Crown.

(Hear, hear.) I say, sir, that there is no evidence whatever that the statesmen of Britain look upon this great scheme as involving the severance of our connection with the Empire; but these utterances, as read here the other night by the honorable member from Montreal Centre, prove directly the contrary. If breaking off from the Mother

Country were its tendency, then I, for one, would not support it, nor would it be supported by any of those honorable gentlemen who so strongly advocate it. I am not afraid to say that any government which dared to bring down such a measure would be hurled from their places. (Hear, hear.) But, Mr. SPEAKER, I have been led into the discussion of this question of connection with the Mother Country at much greater length than I had intended, by the suggestions of hon members, and I will take the liberty of calling the attention of the House to a passage from a work I have already referred to, and in which we find an exposition of the policy which governed the administration of Lord JOHN RUSSELL. I find there an elaborate argument to prove that the colonies are an advantage to Britain, and that Britain of course is an advantage to the colonies; and on the mere ground of material interest, if there were no other—if deeper and stronger ties did not exist as they do—I feel satisfied that this country would not be prepared to take the first step towards the severance of our connection with England, and the loss of that prestige and power which go with every British subject to every civilized part of the globe, enabling him to say, like the old Roman, "I am a British citizen." EARL GREY states that :—

The possession of a number of steady and faithful allies, in various quarters of the globe, will surely be admitted to add greatly to the strength of any nation; while no alliance between independent states can be so close and intimate as the connection which unites the colonies to the United Kingdom as parts of the Great British Empire. Nor ought it to be forgotten, that the power of a nation does not depend merely on the amount of physical force it can command, but rests, in no small degree, upon opinion and moral influence. In this respect British power would be diminished by the loss of our colonies, to a degree which it would be difficult to estimate.

Passing on a little, we find him saying :—

To the latter [i. e. the colonists] it is no doubt of far greater importance than to the former, because, while still forming comparatively small and weak communities, they enjoy, in return for their allegiance to the British Crown, all the security and consideration which belongs to them as members of one of the most powerful states in the world. No foreign power ventures to attack or interfere with the smallest of them, while every colonist carries with him to the remotest quarters of the globe which he may visit, in trading or other pursuits, that protection which the character of a British subject everywhere confers.

(Hear, hear.) But to view the subject in another aspect. I believe it will be found that all the conditions are combined in the scheme now before us, that are considered necessary for the formation on a permanent basis of a Federative union. I hold in my hand a book of some note on *Representative Government*, by JOHN STUART MILL, and I find that he lays down three conditions as applicable to the union of independent states, and which, by parity of reasoning, are applicable to provinces which seek to have a closer alliance with each other, and also, thereby, a closer alliance with the Mother Country. The conditions he lays down are first,—

That there should be a sufficient amount of mutual sympathy among the populations.

And he states that the sympathies which they should have in common should be—

Those of race, language, religion, and, above all, of political institutions, as conducing most to a feeling of identity of political interest.

HON MR. HOLTON—Hear, hear.

MR. MORRIS—We possess that strong tie of mutual sympathy in a high degree. We have the same systems of government, and the same political institutions. We are part of the same great Empire, and that is the real tie which will bind us together in future time. The second condition laid down is :—

That the separate states be not so powerful as to be able to rely for protection against foreign encroachment on their individual strength.

That is a condition which applies most forcibly in our case. (Hear, hear.) The third condition is :—

That there be not a very marked inequality of strength among the several contracting states.

HON. MR. DORION—Hear, hear.

MR. MORRIS—Allow me to proceed with the extract :—

They cannot, indeed, be exactly equal in resources; in all federations there will be a gradation of power among the members; some will be more populous, rich, and civilized than others. There is a wide difference in wealth between New York and Rhode Island.

Just as there is between Canada and Prince Edward Island. I trust I have satisfied my hon. friend from Hochelaga (Hon. Mr. DORION), that Mr. MILL's views are entirely applicable to our position. (Hear, hear.) I now proceed to state my belief that we will find great advantages in the future, in

the possession of a strong Central Government and local or municipal parliaments, such as are proposed for our adoption. I believe the scheme will be found in fact and in practice—by its combination of the better features of the American system with those of the British Constitution—to have very great practical advantages. I shall read an extract from an article in the *London Times*, written in 1858, bearing on this subject, and which brings very clearly into view the distinction between the system which has been proposed for our adoption, and that which has been adopted in the States. The great weakness of the American system has lain in the fact that the several states, on entering the union, claimed independent jurisdiction; that they demitted to the Central Government certain powers, and that they claimed equal and sovereign powers with regard to everything not so delegated and demitted. The weaknesses and difficulties of that system have been avoided in the project now before us, and we have the central power with defined and sovereign powers, and the local parliaments with their defined and delegated powers, but subordinated to the central power. The article says:—

It is quite clear that the Federal Constitution of the United States of America forms a precedent which cannot possibly be followed in its principles or details by the united colonies, so long as they remain part of the dominions of the Imperial Crown. The principle of the American Federation is, that each is a sovereign state, which consents to delegate to a central authority a portion of its sovereign power, leaving the remainder which is not so delegated absolute and intact in its own hands. This is not the position of the colonies, each of which, instead of being an isolated sovereign state, is an integral part of the British Empire. They cannot delegate their sovereign authority to a central government, because they do not possess the sovereign authority to delegate. The only alternative as it seems to us would be to adopt a course exactly the contrary of that which the United States adopted, and instead of taking for their motto *E Pluribus Unum*, to invert it by saying *In Uno Plura*.

(Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. HOLT—What are you reading from?

MR. MORRIS—From the *London Times*, and I quote the article on account of the force of the remarks themselves, apart from the standing of the journal in which they appear:—

The first steps towards a Federation of the American Colonies would thus be to form them all into one state, to give that state a completely organized government, and then to delegate to each of the colonies out of which that great state is formed, such powers of local government as may be thought necessary, reserving to the Central Government all such powers as are not expressly delegated. The Government of New Zealand forms a precedent well worthy the attention of those who are undertaking this arduous negotiation.

And I cannot doubt that the framers of this Constitution have studied the precedent as well of the proposed Constitution of Australia, as that of the Constitution of New Zealand which has been in use for ten years past.

HON. MR. HOLT—How does it work?

MR. MORRIS—I have not been there—(laughter)—but I know that from a small population of 26,000 in all the New Zealand provinces when that Constitution was given them, they have risen in ten years to a population of 250,000—indicating certainly growth and progress.

HON. MR. HOLT—As we have grown in spite of that terribly bad union you wish to do away with.

MR. MORRIS—True, we have grown and progressed under the present union. But the hon. gentleman knows the heart-burnings we have had in the past. I have not been in Parliament so long as that honorable gentleman. But I recollect, when I first took a seat in this House, the state of excitement which then prevailed, and which continued, making government practically impossible. For we had governments maintaining themselves session after session by majorities of one or two—shewing that it was impossible for any government to conduct public affairs with that dignity and success with which a government ought to conduct them. But, as I have stated, I think the Conference has been exceedingly happy in the plan they have submitted for our adoption. A community of British free-men as we are, deliberately surveying our past as well as our present position, and looking forward to our future, we in effect resolve that we will adhere to the protection of the British Crown; that we will tell the GOLDWIN SMITH school—these who are crying out for cutting off the colonies—that we will cling to the old Mother Land—(hear, hear)—we desire to maintain our connection; we have no desire to withdraw

ourselves from that protection we have so long enjoyed; but we desire, while remaining under that protection, to do all that lies in our power for our self-defence, and for the development of all the great interests which Providence has committed to our trust; and we seek at the hands of the British Parliament such legislation as will enable us to accomplish these great ends for the whole of British America. (Hear, hear.) Why, what a domain do we possess! We have over three millions of square miles of territory—large enough, certainly, for the expansion of the races which inhabit this country; and our desire is, in the language of a late colonial minister—language which, I believe, well expresses the views and sentiments of the people of all these provinces—we would approach the British people, the British Government, and our Sovereign, with this language: "We desire, by your aid, with your sanction and permission, to attempt to add another community of Christian freemen to those by which Great Britain confides the records of her Empire, not to pyramids and obelisks, but to states and communities, whose history will be written in her language." That was the language of the Colonial Secretary, Sir BULWER LYTTON, when he proposed and carried out the setting off of a new colony on the Pacific shore—language certainly which indicated a firm and sure reliance in the power and efficacy of British institutions—that these institutions would be found capable of all the expansion requisite to meet the circumstances of a new country, and of any body of British freemen to whom the care of these institutions may be entrusted. (Hear, hear.) But I fear I have been tempted to forget the excellent example of my honorable friend from Lambton. (Cries of "No, no," "go on.") I desire very briefly to notice two or three immediate advantages which, in my judgment, would be derived from the consummation, under one central power with local municipal parliaments, of a union of the Canadas with the Maritime Provinces. Let us glance at what is their position, in relation to the great military power which is rising on the other side of the lines. Let us see what they are thinking of us there. One of their eminent statesmen suggested some years ago, that they should cultivate our acquaintance, while we were still "incurious of our destiny." But we have passed that state. We have become curious

of our destiny, and are seeking, as far as we can, to place it on a sure and certain basis. (Hear, hear.) Here is the view taken of our position by an American writer:—

They have now no comprehensive power that embraces the interests of all—that acts on the prosperity of the seacoast and interior—of commerce and agriculture where they are seemingly rivals—that gives uniformity in tariffs and taxes, and the encouragement that shall be entrusted to the fishing, mining and other great interests.

That is a view of the position of these provinces to which I commend to the attention of my hon. friends from Chateauguay and Hochelaga. I ask, is it not a correct view? Is not that the position in which we have long been? And I believe the result of this union will be to do away with that state of things. (Hear, hear.) I believe that when these colonies are combined, acting in concert, and quickened and invigorated by a feeling of mutual dependence and interest, the tendency will be to increase their wealth and manufactures, and general strength. And, sir, I am satisfied one of the great advantages of this union will be found in this that we will be raised above our sectionalisms, and come to feel and to act as the citizens of a great country, with destinies committed to us such as may well evoke the energies of a great people. But I desire to point out another practical advantage which, I think, is of no mean or slight moment; and it is this:—Bound as we are to England, by the closest ties, and yet enjoying our own government, England is still compelled to act for us in all matters of an international nature. But, when we have for all these British provinces one General Government, able to take an oversight of the whole, and to attend to all their various interests, we will be able to represent to Britain on behalf of the whole, with a force and power we have never before been able to use, what these interests are; we will be able to press them home on the attention of British statesmen in such a manner as will lead them to appreciate, and seek to protect those interests in their negotiations with foreign powers. I would allude, as an illustration of what I mean, to the Reciprocity Treaty, and I cannot refrain from reading a very striking extract from a report presented to the United States House of Representatives, in 1862, from the Committee of Commerce on the Reciprocity Treaty. I ask the attention

of the House to this extract, as shewing how the United States have been able to take advantage of our isolated condition—our want of central power and authority—to gain for themselves advantages in the negotiation of that treaty, such as they could not have obtained or even sought, had we been in a position to present all the advantages, in negotiations with the United States, which Canada and the Maritime Provinces as a whole could present. Instead of the American statesmen having to negotiate with the separate governments of separate provinces, they would have to negotiate with the combined interests of British North America. I read this extract as a very striking one, and as entitled, on account of the source from which it comes, to some weight. In the report I have referred to, the natural results of the treaty and of its abrogation are thus spoken of:—

“A great and mutually beneficial increase in our commerce with Canada was the natural and primary result of the treaty. Many causes of irritation were removed, and a large accession to our trade was acquired, through the treaty, with the Maritime Provinces. Arguments founded upon the results of the treaty as a whole, with the various provinces, have a valid and incontrovertible application against the unconditional and complete abrogation of the treaty, so far as it refers to provinces against which no complaint is made. The isolated and disconnected condition of the various governments of these provinces to each other, and the absence of their real responsibility to any common centre, are little understood. No fault is found with the acts of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. These separate provinces and that of Canada have each a separate tariff and legislature, and neither of them is accountable to or for any other. An abrogation of the treaty, as a whole, would therefore be a breach of good faith towards the other provinces, even if it were expedient to adopt such a course towards Canada, but no advantages gained by the treaty with the Maritime Provinces can be admitted as offsets in favor of Canada. Each province made its own bargain, and gave and received its separate equivalent.”

(Hear, hear.) This is an instance of some moment, and I believe the same principles will be found to apply to all those questions on which, in the future history of this Confederation, it will be found necessary to confer with foreign governments, through the Mother Country. No longer detached and isolated from each other, we will be able to present a combined front, and to urge the advantages which may

be derived from the exhaustless fisheries of the Lower Provinces, as well as those afforded by Canada. (Hear, hear.) The defence question has been alluded to very frequently in this debate. I think there really cannot be a question that it would be for the advantage, not only of Britain, but of each one of these provinces, that on such subjects as the militia, and on all kindred questions, such as those relating to aliens, the observance of neutrality and like subjects, there should be a general and uniform action; that, seeing the action of any one of the colonies might involve the parent state in war, there should not be separate and distinct action, but one uniform action, on all that class of national and international subjects, throughout the whole of the British Provinces. I cannot help thinking that in practice an immense advantage would be derived from the introduction of such a system. It is not my *forte*, as that of some hon. gentlemen, to speak with regard to the defence question. There are other hon. members who understand that subject thoroughly, and will no doubt deal with it in a satisfactory manner. But I cannot help thinking that a uniform system of militia and marine for British North America would be powerfully felt in the history of this continent.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Are we to have a navy?

MR. MORRIS—The hon. gentleman no doubt listened with interest to the speech of the President of the Council, and he might have learned from that, that we had a navy of which any country might be proud, devoted to the pursuits of honest industry, and which causes us to rank even in our infancy as the third maritime power in the world. And should the time of need come—as I trust it never may—I am satisfied that in the Gulf, on the St. Lawrence, and on the lakes, there would be enough of bold men and brave hearts to man that navy. (Hear, hear.) I would further remark, that under the proposed system, local interests would be much better cared for. I am satisfied the local interests of all the separate provinces would be better cared for, if their legislatures were divested of those large subjects of general interest which now absorb—and necessarily so—so much of our time and attention. (Hear, hear.) I will now only mention briefly one or two incidental advantages which I believe will be found to accrue in the future from our position as

united provinces of the British Empire. I will not at this late hour of the night, as I see the House is wearied—(cries of "No, no," "Go on.")—I will not quote any figures to shew the extent of intercolonial trade that will spring up with the Maritime Provinces and with the West India provinces. Some years ago there was, as mercantile men well know, a large trade conducted with the West India Islands, which, from various circumstances, has almost entirely ceased. I believe that, when the provinces are united, not only will a large trade spring up in those agricultural and other products which are now supplied to the Lower Provinces from the United States, but a trade will also be established with the West India Islands. Some time ago I took the trouble to look into the figures, and I was surprised to find how large a trade was conducted twenty-five years ago with those islands; and I believe that, by carrying out this union, we will have facilities for establishing such commercial relations as will lead to the reopening of that valuable trade.

HON. MR. HOLT—You should bring in the West India Islands also.

MR. MORRIS—The hon. gentleman is very anxious to extend the Confederation. (Laughter.) I have known him for long years as a Federalist, and I believe he is only sorry that we do not go a little faster. I am satisfied that when Confederation is accomplished, he will be one of its most hearty supporters. (Hear, hear.) I would now, Mr. SPEAKER, desire to quote a few words from a lecture delivered some years ago by Principal DAWSON, of Montreal, a well-known Nova Scotian, and who is distinguished for his thorough acquaintance with the Maritime Provinces. He says:—

Their progress in population and wealth is slow, in comparison with that of Western America, though equal to the average of that of the American Union, and more rapid than that of the older states. Their agriculture is rapidly improving, manufacturing and mining enterprises are extending themselves, and railways are being built to connect them with the more inland parts of the continent. Like Great Britain, they possess important minerals in which the neighboring parts of the continent are deficient, and enjoy the utmost facilities for commercial pursuits. Ultimately, therefore, they must have with the United States, Canada and the far countries, the same commercial relations that Britain maintains with western, central, and northern Europe. Above all, they form the great natural oceanic termination of the great valley of the St. Lawrence; and

although its commerce has hitherto, by the skill and industry of its neighbours, been drawn across the natural barrier which Providence has placed between it and the seaports of the United States, it must ultimately take its natural channel; and then not only will the cities on the St. Lawrence be united by the strongest common interests, but they will be bound to Acadia by ties more close than any merely political union. The great thoroughfares to the rich lands and noble scenery of the west, and thence to the sea-breezes and salt-water of the Atlantic, and to the great seats of industry and art in the old world, will pass along the St. Lawrence, and through the Lower Provinces. The surplus agricultural produce of Canada will find its nearest consumers among the miners, shipwrights, mariners, and fishermen of Acadia; and they will send back the treasures of their mines and of their sea. This ultimate fusion of all the populations extending along this great river, valley and estuary, and the establishment throughout its course of one of the principal streams of American commerce, seems in the nature of things inevitable; and there is already a large field for the profitable employment of laborers and capital in accelerating this desirable result.

Such, I believe, Mr. SPEAKER, will be found to be the results of the steps now being taken. (Hear, hear.) In conclusion, I would desire to call attention to the advantages we will enjoy in consequence of our being able to do something to secure the development of the immense tract of country lying beyond us—Central British North America, popularly known as the Great North West. If Canadians are to stand still and allow American energy and enterprise to press on as it is doing towards that country, the inevitable result must be that that great section of territory will be taken possession of by the citizens of the neighboring states. The question is one of great interest to the people of Canada. Years ago Canadian industry pushed its way up the valley of the Ottawa to the Great North West. In 1798 the North-West Company had in its employment not less than 12,000 persons; and there is no reason in the world why the trade which was then carried on should not be re-established between the North-West and Canada. No insuperable obstacles stand in the way. A practicable route exists which can be used by land and by water, and there is no reason why the necessary steps should not be taken to secure the development of the resources of that country and making them tributary to Canada. (Hear, hear.) I think it was a wise foresight on the part of the gentlemen

who prepared the plan now before us, that they laid this down as one of the principal features of the scheme—that they regarded the development of the North-West as necessary for the security and the promotion of the best interests of British North America. (Hear, hear.) If the House will bear with me, Mr. SPEAKER, I would ask hon. members to consider for a moment the extent of the territory there possessed. An American writer, who estimates it at 2,500,000 square miles, puts it in this way:—

How large is that? It is fifteen and a half times larger than the State of California; about thirty-eight times as large as the State of New York; nearly twice as large as the thirty-one States of the Union; and, if we omit the territory of Nebraska, as large as all our states and territories combined.

Between the settled portions of Canada and the Red River country, there are areas of arable land, ranging from 200,000 acres downwards, with facilities for opening up communication by land and water; and I do not wonder that the late Sir GEORGE SIMPSON, while making his celebrated journey round the world, in passing from Montreal to Red River, and thence overland to the Pacific, should be struck with the extraordinary advantages of this country, and that on one occasion, when surveying the magnificent expanse of inland lake and river navigation, in the midst of a fertile country, he should exclaim—

Is it too much for the eye of philanthropy to discern through the vista of futurity this noble stream, connecting, as it does, the fertile shores of two spacious lakes, with crowded steamboats on its bosom, and populous towns on its borders?

(Applause.) Sir GEORGE SIMPSON was not a man likely to be carried away by mere impulse; but viewing the prospect before him, he could not refrain from breaking forth in the glowing language I have quoted. Then glance for a moment at the Saskatchewan, the Assiniboine and the Red River country, with the Red River settlement of 10,000 people, forming the nucleus for a future province—a nucleus around which immigration could be drawn so as to build up in that distant region a powerful section of the Confederation. It is a country which embraces 360,000 square miles, and the Red River, Lake Winnipeg, and the Saskatchewan afford a navigable

water line of 1,400 miles. And what is the character of the country? On this point I would quote Professor HIND, who describes the valley of the Red River and a large portion of the country on its affluent, the Assiniboine, as “a paradise of fertility.” He could speak of it in no other terms “than of astonishment and admiration.” He adds that as an agricultural country the character of the soil could not be surpassed, affirming in proof of this assertion:—

That all kinds of farm produce common in Canada succeed admirably in the District of Assiniboia, and that as an agricultural country it will one day rank among the most distinguished.

Nor are there any difficulties of climate. If any hon. member will take the trouble to examine that excellent work in our library, *Blodgett's Climatology*, he will find it stated as having been “demonstrated that the climate of the North-West coast, and of the interior towards Lake Winnipeg, is quite the reverse of that experienced in the same latitude on the Atlantic, and is highly favorable to occupation and settlement.” (Hear, hear.) Mr. SPEAKER, I desire now to place before the House the extent of the territory we possess in the Atlantic and Pacific Provinces. The Atlantic Provinces comprise Canada East, with an area of 201,989 square miles; Canada West, 148,832; New Brunswick, 27,700; Nova Scotia, 18,746; Prince Edward Island, 2,134; Newfoundland, 35,913—together 435,314 square miles, to which add the territory of Labrador, 5,000 miles, making a grand total of 440,314 square miles, embracing a population of something like 4,000,000 of souls. The Pacific Provinces are British Columbia, containing 200,000 square miles, and Vancouver's Island, with 12,000 square miles; and there is the territory of Hudson's Bay (including Central British North America), with 2,700,000 square miles. (Hear, hear.) I desire now, sir, to thank the House for the patience with which hon. members have listened to my remarks. I rose at a late hour in the evening, and seeing that the House was wearied when I commenced, I did not wish to prolong the debate. I have thus shortened very much the remarks I intended to offer, and have treated only hurriedly and casually on many points which might have engaged further attention under other circumstances. I desire to express my confident opinion, before closing, that

this great scheme is not one which ought to be factiously met. For if ever there was a plan submitted to any legislature which deserved to be treated with an avoidance of party feeling, it is this. (Hear, hear.) It is evident that in the House there are a large majority in favor of the plan, and while it is their duty to concede to the minority—what is the right of the minority—the opportunity of stating their objections to it, it is, on the other hand, an evidence of the strongest kind that the majority, in supporting this measure, believe they are doing the best for their country, and that it is a measure which meets the popular sanction and approval, when they avow by their own act their readiness to return to the people for their approval of the steps they have thought proper to take. (Hear, hear.) It is the duty of those who are in favor of the scheme—and I believe there are a very large majority who see in it advantages of the most substantial kind—I am firmly persuaded that it is a duty they owe to those who sent them to this House, it is a duty they owe to the country, it is a duty they owe to the great empire of which we form a part, to bring this scheme to a speedy consummation. I am glad, sir, in taking a retrospect of the three eventful years during which I have had a seat in this House, to reflect that on the first occasion I had the honor of addressing the House, in 1861, I declared myself in favor of an analogous scheme to that we are now discussing; that I then expressed myself in favor of a general government of the British North American Provinces, with separate local legislatures, in the following terms, when speaking of the question of representation by population:—

He had confidence that men would be found able to meet the question fairly and to come down with a measure satisfactory to the country. It might be that that measure would be one which would bring together the different provinces of British North America into a union, formed on such a basis as would give to the people of each province the right to manage their own internal affairs, while at the same time the whole should provide for the management of matters of common concern, so as to secure the consolidation of the Britannic power on this continent.

I have held this opinion ever since I have had the capacity of thinking of the destiny of this country, and I would beg to be allowed further to quote language I used in 1859. Reviewing at that time, as I have

done hurriedly to-night, the extent of our possessions, and the great advantages we would be able to obtain by the union now proposed to be carried into effect, I spoke as follows, in a lecture on the Hudson Bay and Pacific territory, delivered in Montreal:

With two powerful colonies on the Pacific, with another or more in the region between Canada and the Rocky Mountains, with a railway and a telegraph linking the Atlantic with the Pacific, and our inland and ocean channels of trade becoming a great thoroughfare of travel and of commerce, who can doubt of the reality and the accuracy of the vision which rises distinctly and clearly defined before us, as the great Britannic Empire of the North stands out in all its grandeur, and in all the brilliancy of its magnificent future! Some hard matter-of-fact thinker, some keen utilitarian, some plodding man of business, may point the finger of scorn at us and deem all this but an empty shadow—but the fleeting fantasy of a dreamer. Be it so. Time is a worker of miracles—ay, and of sober realities, too; but when we look east and west and north; when we cause the goodly band of the north-men from Acadia, and Canada, and the North-West, and the Columbia, and the Britain of the Pacific, to defile before us, who are the masters of so vast a territory, of a heritage of such surpassing value; and when we remember the rapid rise into greatness, as one of the powers of the earth, of the former American colonies, and look back over their progress, who can doubt of the future of these British Provinces, or of the entire and palpable reality of that vision which rises so grandly before us of this Great British Empire of the North—of that new English-speaking nation which will at one and no distant day people all this northern continent—a Russia, as has been well said, it may be, but yet an English Russia, with free institutions, with high civilization, and entire freedom of speech and thought—with its face to the south and its back to the pole, with its right and left resting on the Atlantic and the Pacific, and with the telegraph and the iron road connecting the two oceans?

(Applause.) Such, Mr. SPEAKER, is the vision which is present to myself and to many others who, like myself, whether in Upper or Lower Canada, are “to the manor born,” and whose all and whose destiny is here. I know and feel, and am assured that if the people of these British Provinces are but true to themselves, and if the statesmen of Britain now act aright their part in this great crisis of our national history, this vision will be realized. We will have the pride to belong to a great country still attached to the Crown of Great Britain, but in which, notwithstanding, we shall have entire freedom of action and the blessings of responsible

self-government; and I am satisfied we will see as the results of this union all that we could possibly imagine as its fruits. (Hear, hear.) Thanking the House for their kind attention, I have only to say further, that I believe the plan under which we seek to ask the Parliament of Great Britain to legislate for us is a wise and judicious one, and which not only deserves, but which I am confident will receive, the hearty support of the representatives and of the people of this province, and to which I, for one, shall feel it my duty to give my warmest and most cordial sanction. (Loud cheers.)

MR. M. C. CAMERON moved the adjournment of the debate, which was agreed to.

—o—
FRIDAY, *February 24, 1865.*

MR. BURWELL, in resuming the debate upon Confederation, said—MR. SPEAKER, before allowing a measure of this importance to go through the House, I feel it my duty to offer a few words upon it. The question of Federation is not a new one to my constituents. Ever since the Reform Convention in Toronto, in 1859, they have been quite familiar with it. At the general election in 1861, in an address to my constituents, I stated that in case we should not be able to get representation by population, I would be in favor of Federation of the two provinces of Canada, with a Local Government in each province and a Central Government to administer matters common to both, provision to be made to admit the Eastern Provinces and the North-West territory, should they see fit to enter the union, of course with the sanction of Great Britain. And at the last general election in 1863, I addressed them in precisely the same language. (Hear, hear.) The agitation for constitutional changes had been so general and persistent for a length of time in Upper Canada, that it was impossible to all appearance to stave off much longer some action in reference to the difficulty. Efforts were made at different times to secure representation by population as a remedy, but without success. The nearest approach to a remedy for the difficulty under which Upper Canada labors, is, in my opinion, the resolutions of the Quebec Conference now before the House, and the question for consideration is whether they are acceptable to us and our people, or

not. The principle of Federation, in my view, has been a great success on this continent. I think that, if we look to the history of the United States, it cannot be denied that there, as a principle of free government, it has been successful; and I doubt whether history records a like example, under ordinary circumstances, of such great success and prosperity. The present trouble in that country—the war now raging there—is not in my opinion attributable to the federative form of government adopted there. I attribute it to different causes altogether, which might have existed, had it been a monarchical or a despotic government that prevailed. Slavery existed there and was the cause of the war. It was opposed to the spirit of the age, and had to be eradicated. (Hear, hear.) There were, no doubt, other causes which had some influence in bringing it about; such, for instance, as the desire of the North for a high protective tariff to encourage its domestic manufactures, and the opposing interest of the South in favor of free trade, so that, manufacturing nothing itself, it might have all the benefit of cheap importations. These, sir, I conceive were the two great causes of the difficulty in the United States. Now, in forming a Federal Government in these provinces, I think we should look for an example to a people who are similar to us in situation, habits and customs. I find that example in the people of the United States. (Hear, hear.) My honorable friend from Lambton cited the example of a great many other countries, but they were not not perhaps accustomed so much to free government as the United States; for it was not Federation that first gave them liberty, the old colonies of New England enjoying a large share of liberty long before the adoption of Federal Government by them. (Hear, hear.) The plan proposed by the Conference at Quebec is, in my opinion, too restrictive, as regards the power of the Local Legislatures. It gives too much power to the General Government. I am one of those, sir, who believe that the appointment of the deputy or lieutenant governors should not be in the gift of the General Government, but that they should be elected by the people. (Hear, hear.) I believe, too, that the members of the Legislative Council should be elected by the people. (Hear, hear.) There is no element in this country—no class in this country, nor do I think it possible to create a class—the counterpart of

the class that composes the House of Lords in England. The British Government is undoubtedly the best-balanced government in the world; but we cannot exactly copy the system here, because of the absence of the class to which I have referred. The nearest approach that we can have to the House of Lords is, in my opinion, an elective Legislative Council, the members of which shall hold office for an extended period. My hon. friend from Lambton, in the very excellent speech he made to the House yesterday, said that if both Houses were made elective their circumstances and powers would be so similar that neither would be a check upon the other; but I contend that if we had an elective Upper House, with the members representing larger constituencies and elected for a longer period than the members of the Lower House, it would be less liable to be influenced by every change of public opinion, and conservative enough in its character to be a wholesome check upon rash and hasty legislation. (Hear, hear.) But although the scheme now proposed does not make these provisions, there are many things in it that I can approve of. That the General Government should have control over many matters committed to it by the scheme is, I think, quite right. The customs is a branch of the administration that has ramifications throughout the whole country, and it and the appointments connected with it should be in the hands of the General Government. So, too, with regard to the post office, which affects the whole country, and should be under the same control. The militia and all matters connected with the defence of the country should also be placed under the control of the Central Government; and the scheme would be defective if it were otherwise. I think there is no question more important now to us than that of defence. A military spirit seems to have seized the people all over the continent, and promises to control their action for a long time. I think it wise, therefore, that provision should be made by which the General Government can put the country into a state of preparation for whatever may occur. It is well also, in my opinion, that the judges should be appointed by that government. I like to see an independent judiciary, and believe that this will be secured to us by the mode proposed in these resolutions. (Hear, hear.) It is hardly necessary for me to make allusion to the local governments; there

are so many propositions connected with them, and so little is known of what their constitution will be, that it is hardly possible indeed for me to refer to them. I would like to be informed as to their character and authority before speaking of them. My opinion is, that they should have certain powers defined in written constitutions, so that beyond these powers they would have no right to legislate, and if they did, that their legislation should be set aside and rendered null and void by the superior courts. I believe that the British Constitution is of that elastic character that the institutions which exist under it can be made most popular and still work well. I think history has proved this to be the case. Under it we have kept sacred the great principle of responsible government which we now enjoy, and under which ministers of the Crown hold seats in and are responsible to the Legislature. Well, we want no change in that principle; for I think it is the greatest safeguard to liberty, not only in England, but the world. (Hear, hear.) With regard to the executive head of the General Government, appointment by the Crown as at present is the only mode that is desirable. It will not do to tamper with or change this provision of our government; for if we become detached from and cease to be a dependency of the British Crown, what do we become? We must necessarily become independent, and when that state of political existence is reached, we know not what will follow. (Hear, hear.) The question may be asked, is the Constitution foreshadowed in these resolutions such as can be accepted by the people of this country? Is there a possibility, if it be defective, of bettering or amending it? I think that in many of its details it has a great deal that is good; and if, in portions where it is desirable, it cannot be amended, I think, nevertheless, that the people of this country would hardly be justified in rejecting it. (Hear, hear.) There is no doubt that all history shows that nothing in the way of government is ever considered a finality. Changes are continually going on in all forms of government. The political history of our own country even is proof of this fact. At the time of the union of these provinces, the members of the Legislative Council were appointed by the Crown, but since then there has been a change, and they are now elected by the people. At that time, too, the wardens of

our district councils were appointed by the Crown; that principle was subsequently changed, and they are now elected by the popular vote. It is impossible, sir, to take this question of Confederation into consideration, without also taking into account the question of the Intercolonial Railway. I have on several occasions spoken against the construction of that road at the expense of Canada. I never could see that any advantage would be derived from it, unless in a military point of view; and as a military work I did not think it worth the large sum it would cost. But if commercial advantages could be pointed out equivalent to the cost of it, then I admit its construction might become a subject of consideration. (Hear, hear.) I think that free intercourse and free trade with 800,000 of our fellow-subjects in the Lower Provinces are not light and unimportant considerations. They are, in my opinion, something like an equivalent for the expenditure—(hear, hear)—and if there are no graver difficulties than the building of this road in the scheme of the Quebec Conference, then they may all be easily surmounted. (Hear, hear.) That there will be great expense in the construction of the road, and in connection with Confederation, admits scarcely of a doubt. But we have come to a period in our history when, for various reasons, expense has become necessary. We must have some change in our Constitution, and whether it be attended by additional expense or not, it is indispensable in order to remove the evils under which the country has so long labored. (Hear, hear.)

MR. M. C. CAMERON said—MR. SPEAKER, I approach the discussion of this subject in no degree of diffidence or temerity, because I apprehend that it signifies very little what I or any other hon. member may say, it will receive but little attention, so far as tending to change in the slightest degree the opinions that hon. members may have in reference to the project of Confederation. (Hear, hear.) Nevertheless, though no weight may attach to anything that I may say, I feel it my duty to the constituency that I represent, and to the province at large, to enter my protest against the passage of this resolution in its present shape. (Hear, hear.) I am in favor of a union of the provinces, but it must be such a union as will benefit and protect the interests of the provinces at large; and I feel that those interests cannot be protected and benefited

if we are going into the extravagances that must necessarily follow such a union as is now contemplated. (Hear, hear.) The question has been considered in its political, in its commercial, in its defensive or military aspects, and in its sectional aspects, and very little that can be said by any hon. gentleman now will be considered new; and he who speaks at this stage of the discussion will speak at a disadvantage, because he can say very little that is new. He may speak on those matters that have been discussed in new language, and so make some little change, but as for the material positions, they have been already discussed, and by honorable gentlemen very ably discussed. I understand that the position which the Government of this country assumes, in introducing this measure with the haste in which they are doing it, declining to allow the people to have anything to say upon it, except through their representatives, who were not sent here to vote on any such measure as this, is that this country had arrived at such a stage that it was impossible for the affairs of the Government to be carried on, unless some change took place, and that of a radical character. In that assertion I do not agree. I dissent from it entirely, and I feel that it was not the necessities of this country that have brought about these resolutions, but that it was the factious conduct of honorable gentlemen on the floor of this House. If that factious conduct had not been persevered in, there would have been no necessity for the consideration that we are now undertaking. (Hear, hear.) I feel that I am making a statement the correctness of which cannot be denied; and I shall refer to the language of the Hon. President of the Council, even since this matter has been under consideration, to establish it. (Hear, hear.) It has been stated by him that the affairs of this country had come to a dead-lock. It has been stated that we were drifting into inevitable ruin; that our debt was so fast increasing, that it was absolutely impossible to stem the torrent, or close the flood-gates of the treasury that had been opened by the mismanagement of hon. gentlemen sitting alongside of the President of the Council at the present time. Understand me: I am not charging those hon. gentlemen with extravagance; I am simply referring to the language used by the Honorable President of the Council. But on a recent occasion he spoke of this union as a matter to be proud of, and

said that every one of the provinces that was entering into the union would enter it with a surplus of revenue, and were, therefore, not obliged to go into it from necessity; that they did not enter into the partnership as a bankrupt concern, but, on the contrary, would commence business in a most prosperous condition. Now, if that were the case, what is the necessity for this change—a change that will render so much more extravagance necessary to carry on the government, even under the guidance of the Hon. the President of the Council? It was said that the people of the section of the province to which I belong had become satisfied that there was extravagance in the Government, that the people of Lower Canada were absorbing too large a proportion of the revenue that was paid by the people of Upper Canada. It was asserted that the people of Upper Canada were paying seven-tenths of the whole revenue of the country; that we had not sufficient representation in Parliament; and that there was ruin staring us in the face, because we had not our proper voice in the Legislature, by means of which we might resist the extravagance of Lower Canadians. It was said that for every appropriation made for Upper Canada, a corresponding one had to be made for Lower Canada, and thereby the people of Upper Canada were paying more than their fair share into the common purse of the country. Taking that view of the case, I would ask the Honorable President of the Council, who is so warm in advocating these resolutions, how much the people of Upper Canada will be called upon to pay more than Lower Canada in the new scheme? I understand that Lower is to receive \$888,531 from the Federal Government. As Upper Canada has been paying two-thirds, nay, as much as seven-tenths into the general revenue, how much are we granting to Lower Canada out of the pockets of the people of Upper Canada towards paying the expenses of managing their local affairs—affairs of which we in the Upper Province will have not one word to say? By the arrangement that is to be entered into, suppose that the Lower Provinces constitute about one-fifth of the whole—which, I presume, is all that they will contribute. This would make \$177,706. Upper Canada, on the principle of paying two-thirds, would contribute \$473,884, and Lower Canada only \$286,941. For the support of the Local Government of Lower Canada

from the Federal exchequer, Upper Canada would, therefore, have to pay no less a sum than \$473,884, which is nearly double the amount that Lower Canada itself will pay for the same purpose. The amount that Upper Canada will have to pay in excess of Lower Canada, for exclusively Lower Canada purposes, is \$175,859. (Hear, hear.) Now that is the position in which that branch of the question stands; but it is said that we are to become a great people, third, I think, in rank of the nations of the earth. It is said that, because we unite with a people who have less than a million of inhabitants, while we have nearly two and a half millions, we are to become this vast nation, and to hold a position in the world above that of all nations except three on the face of the globe. Well, it does not strike me that the mere fact of our joining the Lower Provinces to this province by the Intercolonial Railway is going to give us that position. We need a vast population as well as a vast country to acquire that greatness. It is said that we will be stronger by this union; that we will be better able to protect ourselves in the event of hostilities breaking out between this country and the United States. But is that true? (Cries of "Yes, yes," and "No, no.") Are we to become at once an independent nation that will make treaties with foreign nations, or are we still to be dependent on the British Crown—a dependency that I hope will never be done away with? (Hear, hear.) Let it be understood that I am not to be dazzled by those ideas of greatness that are being held out to us. We can never be so great in any way as we can by remaining a dependency of the British Crown. Every one of these provinces is true and faithful in its allegiance to the British Crown, and if that power makes war, each will do all that lies in its power to defend its own territory and assist the Mother Country. But how do we gain strength from the scheme? We obtain many hundreds of miles of additional frontier, and we do not get men in proportion. (Hear, hear.) We shall build a railway that cannot possibly be of much use to us, but that will be subject to destruction by the enemy, and will be indefensible and difficult to keep open. The armies that will be brought against us by the United States will be too great to be resisted along the entire frontier, and no ordinary force will be sufficient to protect so long a line of communication. I therefore argue that the

Confederation will not make us a stronger or a greater people than before. Then it is said that in our present exigencies we must look out for other markets for our produce than those we have been depending upon; that we must endeavor to become a manufacturing country, obtaining minerals from the Lower Provinces and sending them our produce in return. That is all very fine, but it can be accomplished without entering into an extravagantly expensive arrangement such as this is. We could have a legislative union with one Legislature or Central Government, that would manage all our affairs on a scale as economical as the affairs of the province of Canada have been conducted; but when you provide for a General Government, and then for a Local Government in each province besides, it stands to reason that the expenditure must be far in excess of that which would result from having a single legislature. The Hon. President of the Council has said that he is not, although all his other colleagues who have spoken on the floor of the House have admitted that they are, in favor of a legislative union, if this union could be accomplished. The Hon. President of the Council thinks, perhaps, that this would be too damaging an admission, so he says: "I would not have a legislative union if I could. There is nothing but a Federal union for me, because our country is so extensive that it would be impossible to control it with a Legislature sitting at Ottawa." Now, is this so? Would four or five hundred additional miles of territory make all the difference?

HON. MR. BROWN—The hon. gentleman is mistaken. I never used any such expression.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—Of course it is very unpleasant to have to say it, but my ears must have deceived me very grossly indeed, if the hon. gentleman did not assert in the hearing of persons in this House, when delivering his address on these resolutions, that he preferred a Federal union, and assigned as a reason for his preference the extent of the country.

HON. MR. BROWN—The hon. gentleman will see that this is a very different thing from the statement he previously made. What I did say was this, that it would be exceedingly inconvenient to manage the local affairs of so widely extended a country. I did not say that we could not

exercise a general control over the country. I said that it was impossible to attend to the mere parish affairs of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and the North-West. That is what I said.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—Well, one reason assigned by the hon. gentleman for a Federal union was that in attending to the private business of the Lower Provinces, under a legislative union, we would be kept sitting at Ottawa for nine months of the year. It is, however, the case that the affairs of United Canada can be transacted in a period of three or four months, while according to the Hon. the President of the Council, the affairs of the federated provinces would not be attended to in less than nine months in consequence of the private business which would be added to the legislation from a people numbering only seven or eight hundred thousand. (Hear, hear.) The business of two and a half millions can be disposed of in three months, whilst it is alleged that the business brought by the addition of seven or eight hundred thousand more would prolong the sessions of Parliament by six months. (Hear, hear.) I think that the position which the hon. gentleman took in reference to that, is just as untenable as his position that a Legislative union in itself would not be better than a Federal union. Now, it is said that our commercial affairs will be very much advanced by this arrangement. It is said that the Reciprocity treaty is going to be abrogated. No doubt we have received notice of it. It is also said that it is possible—although the Hon. President of the Council does not think it is so—that the bonded system is to be done away with between Canada and the United States, and that, therefore, we would have no means of reaching the Atlantic except during the summer months of the year, in consequence of which it is very desirable that this great work of the Intercolonial Railway should be accomplished, and that this union of the provinces should take place. I presume it is a well understood fact that a people will always find some channel into which to direct their energies—that there will be a channel for their commerce—that there will be a channel for their produce. Now, if the Reciprocity treaty is abrogated, and if the bonded system is put an end to, it will be done long before the Intercolonial Railway can be established, and we must then remain suffering for a number of years until

that work is accomplished and before we get communication with the Lower Provinces, except through the medium of the St. Lawrence, which is only accessible during the summer time. Then it would be absolutely necessary for us to resort to some other means, to devise some other scheme, by which we might not allow the affairs of these provinces, in the meantime, to be injured, to lag and to suffer; and when our commerce flows in such new channel, it will not be easy to divert it. But is it not the fact that we have been in existence a number of years as a colony here? Is it not the fact, too, that we have been far removed from the sea? Is it not the fact, that when Upper Canada was subject to duties to Lower Canada, and when we had no connection with the United States except by paying high restrictive duties, Upper Canada progressed rapidly and became a large and prosperous province? Did we then complain with all these restrictions weighing upon us? For my part, I have yet to see, if the reciprocity treaty is put an end to and if the bonding system is discontinued, that we would be unable to find means by which the energies of the people of this country would find development. We would still go on in material prosperity, if we found hon. gentlemen forgetting their faction, and allowing the wheels of government to progress without being unnecessarily impeded. (Hear, hear.) In one view of the case, if I were satisfied that the people of this country fully approved of the scheme, I would give it my support, although I disapprove of it in its present shape. But I cannot understand why those hon. gentlemen who have professed, at all events heretofore, to be the advocates of the rights and liberties of the people, should so far forget those rights and liberties as to set them aside, and allow half a dozen gentlemen in this province to combine with a number of gentlemen from the Lower Provinces to completely ignore and set aside the views of those they profess to represent. (Hear, hear.) It has been said that the people of this country have fully endorsed and approved of this measure. But where is the evidence of it? It has been asserted that this is a matter which was under consideration in the year 1858, and that it has been mooted at different times since. But this very fact shews that it has never taken a deep hold on the people, and certain it is

that it has never been made a question up to this time at the polls. (Hear, hear.) Therefore, the people have not pronounced an opinion upon it. And I mean to say this, that if the people understood it was going to cost so much more than the present form of government, they would not be inclined to approve and to accept it as readily as hon. gentlemen seem to think. I hold that, if the hon. gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches were really sincere in their views of the benefits to result from this measure, they would allow the question to go to the people for the fullest consideration. In 1841 the people of this country obtained responsible government, and it was declared to them then that they should have a controlling voice in the affairs of the country—that no important change, in fact, should take place without their having an opportunity of pronouncing upon it. And yet hon. gentlemen now disclaim the right of appeal to the people, and arrogate to themselves an amount of wisdom to suppose that the tens of thousands of people of this province have not the capacity to understand the meaning or the magnitude of this question. They exclude from these men the right of pronouncing an opinion; and is it not singular that it is the people of the province of Canada who are treated in this way? It is not so in the Lower Provinces. New Brunswick, for instance, dissolves its House, and goes to the people. And why should New Brunswick do that which is denied to Canada? Why should the people of New Brunswick be treated as more able and more capable of understanding and pronouncing an intelligent opinion than the people of Canada? (Hear, hear.) The people of Canada, I apprehend, are just as capable of comprehending a measure of this importance as the people of New Brunswick, and they ought to have the same opportunity of pronouncing upon it. (Hear, hear.) The Honorable President of the Council has said that a hostile feeling had arisen between both sections of the province to such a degree, that the government and legislation of the country had almost come to a dead stand. Now, was there such a feeling of hostility existing between the people of the different provinces? Was such the fact? Did honorable gentlemen of French extraction meet honorable gentlemen of British extraction upon the floor of this House with any feeling of hostility whatever? Did we not meet as

friends? They considered that they had peculiar interests to serve, and we considered that we had a larger population than they, and which population had not a sufficient representation on the floor of this House, and we sought a change in order to give them the representation to which they were entitled. The President of the Council claims that he has accomplished a great work in gaining for the people of Upper Canada that representation on the floor of Parliament. Now, I beg to join issue with him on that point. I assert that, instead of having gained for the Upper Province that boon, he has arrayed thirty additional votes against Upper Canada. He makes Upper Canada stand not as she is now, but with thirty additional voices to contend against. (Hear, hear.) We shall pay in the same proportion, in fact, that we paid before to the whole revenue of the country. Let us see if I am singular in this view—let us see whether the gentlemen who compose the governments in the Lower Provinces do not entertain the same opinion. Hon. Mr. TILLEY made this representation in a speech which he delivered on the 17th November last:—

So close is the contest between parties in the Canadian Legislature, that even the five Prince Edward Island members by their vote could turn victory on whatever side they chose, and have the game entirely in their own hands. Suppose that Upper Canada should attempt to carry out schemes for her own aggrandizement in the west, could she, with her eighty-two representatives, successfully oppose the sixty-five of Lower Canada and the forty-seven of the Lower Provinces, whose interests would be identical? Certainly not; and she would not attempt it.

MR. H. MACKENZIE—What has that to do with representation by population?

MR. M. C. CAMERON—"What has that to do with representation by population?" asks the hon. gentleman. Representation by population was agitated, so far as Upper Canada is concerned, because we are paying so large a proportion of the revenue of the country; and should the Lower Provinces have a corresponding voice, we should still pay the same proportion of revenue—instead, in fact, of standing on an equality, we would have thirty voices more to contend against. (Hear, hear.) Now, let us see whether, in another point of view, it is going to benefit us. It is represented by this same gentleman in the Lower Provinces that, when this change takes place, they will be relieved from the burdens they now bear; because,

as asserted in the speech to which I have referred, they have paid \$3.20 per head of taxes; and, when the change was brought about, they would only pay \$2.75—that is, they would be gainers by the arrangement by 45 cents a head. Is that so, or is it not so? If not, then there is dishonesty at the bottom of this scheme, when it requires arguments of that kind to further it. If it is so, then these gentlemen who assert that they are looking out for the interest and the advantage of Canada, are proving traitors to the trust reposed in them, are doing a wrong to their country, and are doing that for the sake of their own self-aggrandizement.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—Allow me to make a remark. A little while ago the honorable gentleman quoted from a speech of Hon. Mr. TILLEY, in which that gentleman supposed the case, that on some evil day Upper Canada, actuated by selfish motives, would endeavor to obtain the passing of some measure that would be conducive to her exclusive aggrandizement. "In that event," said Hon. Mr. TILLEY, addressing himself to his people below, with the view of meeting that hypothetical case, "you will have the sixty-five members from Lower Canada and the forty-seven from below, to unite in resisting any attempt of the kind." On that account the honorable member for North Ontario has stated that he is opposed to this scheme of Federation. He prefers a legislative union; but of course with a legislative union there would be the same ratio of representation, and his opposition, on this particular ground, ought to apply to the one system as much as to the other.

MR. CAMERON—I will give you a practical illustration of how this may affect our interest. It is a part of this scheme, or ought to have been a part of it, that the opening up of the North-West should be included in it; that improvements should be made in that direction so that we might have the advantage of the vast mineral wealth which exists there, and of the great stretch of territory available for agricultural purposes as well. But this is not given to us now. The Intercolonial Railway is made a portion of this scheme. It is made, so to speak, a part of the Constitution—a necessity without which the scheme cannot go on. Now, suppose we ask in the Federal Legislature for the improvement of the North-West, because we consider it for our interest to have that territory opened up and improved,

shall we not find a verification of the language of this gentleman—sixty-five members from Lower Canada and forty-seven from the Lower Provinces, whose interests are identical, will be united against us, and we will not be able to accomplish a work of that kind. (Hear, hear.) In considering a question of this nature—in considering a change of the Constitution—I presume every man ought to have the interest of the whole at heart, and not the interests merely of individual parts—that every man from the Lower Provinces who seeks this union should desire it, not because it is going to advantage the Lower Provinces merely, but because it is going to advantage Canada as well. The argument should be, that it is to be for the advantage of the whole. It should not be an argument that \$2.75 is the sum that will be paid by the Lower Provinces under the arrangement, when they are paying now \$3.20 a head to the public revenue. Arguments of that kind should not be used to show that an advantage is gained by one portion of the proposed Confederation at the expense of another; for example, that the subsidy obtained by the Lower Provinces from the Federal Government will be so great, that it will meet all their expenditures, and leave them \$34,000 the gainers. (Hear, hear.) Now, I ask, are we contributing to that in the same proportion that we are contributing to the subsidy to Lower Canada—and is that honorable gentleman who has taken the advocacy of Upper Canadian interests so peculiarly under his own control, acting for the interests of Upper Canada when he consents to an arrangement of this kind? (Hear, hear.) The President of the Council has used this language with reference to the matter. He says:—"It is not a question of interest, or mere commercial advantage; no, it is an effort to establish a new empire in British North America." That is the honorable gentleman's statement. But, for my own part, I think it would be better to get out of the debt which now burdens us,—to reduce the expenses the people are suffering from,—to lighten the taxation we are laboring under—than to endeavor to establish an empire such as my honorable friend the President of the Council speaks of. It would be much better for us to endeavor to reduce our expenditure, and live within our means, than to attempt to establish a new empire; because, unless he means by that that we are going to establish our independence, we are

already, as subjects of the British Crown, sharers in all the glories of the British nation. (Hear, hear.) The hon. gentleman also said—and this was the argument he addressed to the House as a reason why his friends from Upper Canada should unite with him in supporting this scheme—"We complained, that immense sums were taken from the public chest and applied to local purposes, in Lower Canada, from which we of Upper Canada derived no advantage." Now I ask, have we ever seen an attempt made by Lower Canada to obtain so great a subsidy as \$175,000 a year in perpetuity? And yet, that is what the hon. gentleman, by this scheme, actually concedes to them, apart from the greater expenditure we will have to pay in connection with the administration of the general affairs of the whole Confederation. Let us see what the seventeen additional representatives we of Upper Canada are to obtain, will cost us. I make it that for each representative we will have to pay only \$16,397 per annum. I make that out in this way. The contribution by the Lower Provinces to the General Government is \$1,929,272. The contribution of Lower Canada is \$2,208,035. The contribution of Upper Canada is \$4,416,072. I am speaking now of the contributions that go to meet the expenditure of the Federal Government. The contribution of Upper Canada is thus in excess of the Lower Provinces, \$2,486,800; in excess of Lower Canada, \$2,208,037; and in excess of both, \$278,765, which, divided by 17, will give \$16,397 as the cost of each additional member we are getting.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—Hear, hear.

MR. CAMERON—Well, this matter is not left to us either, as the representatives of the people, to pronounce an opinion upon it. We are to take the scheme as a whole. We are not to be allowed to amend it in any particular. But the Government come down and tell us, that in consequence of the union of political parties which has taken place, they feel themselves so strong that they can say to the representatives of the people: "Just take this, or you shall have nothing, and revert back to inevitable ruin." That is the position in which they put us. Yet, if the statement made by the Hon. Finance Minister is correct, our revenue has increased, so that we have a surplus of \$872,000, after making up the deficiency of the previous year. He tells us the revenue of Canada has increased by a million and a half of dollars; and that the revenues of New Brunswick and Nova

Scotia have increased \$100,000 each—being an increase for the whole provinces of \$1,700,000. Would we then revert back to ruin, if these statements be correct? If our income has really increased so much as has been represented, would we, if we remain as we are, go back to ruin? (Hear, hear.) It has been said that there has been a dead-lock in the affairs of the country for a considerable length of time; but I think the province has not been going to ruin, if it has been getting an increase of revenue to the extent of a million and a half, notwithstanding that dead-lock. I am not sure but the province would do better if this House were closed up for ten years and hon. members sent about their business. (Ironical ministerial cheers.) Then it has been said that we are bound to accept this scheme, if we cannot show some better means of getting out of our difficulties. With reference to that, I would say that if any of those hon. gentlemen were really the patriots they represent themselves to be, let them exemplify the virtue of resignation—let them leave their places in the front ranks of the ministerial benches, and let new men be introduced to take their places—let them do this, and I have no hesitation in saying that parties in this country are not so bitterly hostile but a government or any number of governments could be formed to carry on the affairs of the country. (Hear, hear.) Hon. gentlemen who have been in the front of the political affairs of this country for years back, have fancied that the whole of the political wisdom of the country was centred in them, and that this country must of necessity go to ruin, if they were not at the helm of affairs. This, I think, is claiming too much. However, I do not mean to say that they are not exceedingly able men. But I would say that the Attorney General East, and his colleague the Attorney General for Upper Canada, who have been so much opposed and vilified by the honorable gentlemen who are now associated with them in the Government, must have felt exceedingly gratified when they found that after all the charges of corruption which had been brought against them, these pure patriots from our section of the country were willing to place themselves side by side with them to carry on the affairs of the country. (Hear, hear.) It was represented by the Honorable Provincial Secretary in a political contest that he and I had together—and which?—when we were

in the field, we carried on pretty pleasantly, notwithstanding there had been some rather sharp passages at arms on the floor of this House between us—that honorable gentleman, in excusing himself before the electors for the change he had made in his views on the question of representation by population, said the financial crisis of the country had become so much more imminent than the constitutional, that it was absolutely necessary to take office—in fact, to join the gentlemen of Lower Canada, who made representation by population a close question. We must look after the purse-strings, he said, or the country will go to ruin. It is very gratifying now to find that honorable gentleman now in a position in which he is going to create so much larger a debt than before. It is quite gratifying to find him now seated on the Treasury benches advocating the additional burdens, to the extent of millions of dollars, that will be cast upon us by this union and the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. At one time, and it was not long since, this country was agitated from one end to the other with the statement that the public debt was so great as to amount to a mortgage of \$25 upon every cleared acre of land in the province, and now those who made this statement wish to add millions more to the debt by this railway, and to add as it were \$5 more to the debt per head of every man in the land. (Hear, hear.) Now, if the Honorable Provincial Secretary was sincere in his argument that retrenchment was necessary to save us from ruin, how can he reconcile it with his sense of duty and propriety that he should be found advocating this vast extravagance at this time, when there is no imminent danger to call for it, but, on the contrary, a degree of prosperity that should make us exceedingly careful how we adopt experimental changes. I find honorable gentlemen complaining of the incapacity of our railways to meet the commercial requirements made upon them—to do the business of the country properly. It is true the crops are not so abundant as they were; no foresight or management will ensure us a plentiful harvest, but still, even according to these honorable gentlemen, the trade of the province is growing, and their statements altogether in this respect do not show that we are going to ruin. A people who are increasing in population as we are increasing, who are growing in wealth as we are, and who, over and above all our expenditure, have a million and a half surplus revenue, are not rushing to ruin in the manner that has

been represented by some honorable gentlemen. I say, then, that we ought not to hasten on a change that may prove injurious to us, without asking the people themselves whether they approve of it or not. (Hear, hear.) So anxious are the honorable gentlemen on the Treasury benches to have it carried, that they even quarrel amongst themselves as to the parentage of the scheme; and the House was amused the other day when the Hon. President of the Council took the Hon. Attorney General West to task because that honorable gentleman presumed to say that it was his Government that had first brought the matter up. (Laughter.) They appear to take great pride in the child, but this country of ours, the mother of the bantling, is travelling in agony from fear of the burdens that these honorable gentlemen are endeavoring to put upon it. (Hear, hear.) The Honorable Minister of Agriculture the other evening called our attention to the affairs that are occurring in the United States, and spoke of the army of contractors and tax-gatherers that was springing up there. He said that the cry of "Tax, tax, tax!" came up perpetually from the tax-gatherers, and the cry of "Money, money, money!" from the hordes of contractors who are fattening upon the miseries of the people; and while he was talking of the message conveyed to us in the sound of every gun fired in the United States, he may have thought perhaps that in the formation of this union and the building of this Intercolonial Railway, we too shall hear the cries of "Tax, tax, tax! money, money, money!" in the same way. (Hear, hear.) It is said again, in reference to this scheme, that every line of it shows a compromise. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture, if I remember right, used an expression of that kind. But I would ask the President of the Council and those who with him have been advocating the interests of Upper Canada, where is there any concession to Upper Canada in it? If they can point out one solitary instance, with the exception of the seventeen additional members given to the west, where anything has been conceded to that section, then I will say the scheme is deserving of my support. But I hold that the additional number of representatives given to Upper Canada is no boon or concession. The differences between the two provinces of Canada were not merely national differences, but were of a sectional character. It was the West arrayed against the east, rather than nationality against nationality, for was it not a fact that the sixteen

English-speaking members from Lower Canada united themselves with the French-Canadian majority, and not with the majority of their own race in Upper Canada? The English members from Central Canada did the same; and I contend, therefore, that the differences we had were sectional in their nature, and that we had no national differences that rendered a change at this time necessary. Are we going to get rid of these sectional differences by this scheme? Will not the thirty additional members called into this legislature from the east unite with the Lower Canadian majority, and will not the same preponderance of influence be cast against Upper Canada as before? (Hear, hear.) Now, if a union of free people is to be brought about, it should be because the people desire it and feel that it is advantageous on the whole; and I am quite satisfied that if, in these provinces, we are to have a union that will confer any advantage upon us, it ought to be a Legislative and not a Federal union. We should feel that if we are to be united, it ought to be in fact as well as in name; that we ought to be one people, and not separated from each other by sections; that if we go into a union, it ought to be such a union as would make us one people; and that when a state of things arises favorable to such a union, we will have an opportunity of forming a union that will give us strength and protect our interests in all time to come. The Honorable President of the Council thinks that we should enter the union proposed for the purpose of protecting and defending ourselves. I would like to know of that honorable gentleman if he thinks that we, with a population of two millions and a half, can create a sufficient armament, and raise a sufficient number of men to repel the millions of the United States, should they choose to attack us? (Hear, hear.) I do not suppose, Mr. SPEAKER, that there would be any more ready to defend the honor and integrity of Great Britain in this country than those who feel as I do in reference to this matter; and I am satisfied that, even with the knowledge of certain destruction before us, if attacked by the United States, we would have defenders springing up at any moment—defenders to sell their lives as dearly as possible, and to fight inch by inch before they would be compelled to surrender the honor of the British Crown. But still, sir, we cannot help feeling the vast disparity of numbers between us and the United States; we can form no armament that could repel them from every portion of our territory, and spending millions now

in that direction is but crippling our resources and weakening us for the time of need. If these moneys we now propose to spend in that way were carefully husbanded, we will have them when the necessity arises, and be able to use them to better purpose than in defending ourselves. (Hear, hear.) Some say that Canada is defensible, and others say that it is entirely defenceless; but I apprehend that there are certain points in the country which could be so fortified that they could be held against any foe. While so held, the rest of the country would probably be under the control of the enemy, and would remain so until the fate of war decided whether we were to remain as we were or be absorbed in the neighboring union. Now, it was said by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture that we are to have fortifications at St. John, New Brunswick; and if this union is to be brought about in order that we may be taxed for the purpose of constructing fortifications in New Brunswick, it will certainly be of little service to the people of Canada in preventing their country being invaded and overrun by an enemy. Fortifications in St. John, New Brunswick, would not protect us from the foe, if the foe were to come here. They, of course, would be an advantage to the country at large and aid in sustaining the British dominion in this part of the continent, and so far we would not object to contribute to a reasonable extent to an expenditure of that kind; but I do say that it would be quite impossible by fortifications to make the country so defensible that we could resist aggression on the part of the United States at every point. To endeavor to make it so would be a waste of money.

MR. McKELLAR.—What would you do then? Surrender to the enemy?

MR. CAMERON.—No, I would not.

MR. McKELLAR.—What would you do if you neither spent money nor surrendered?

MR. CAMERON.—We would do as many brave people have done before when they were attacked; and the country from which the honorable gentleman comes is a marked example of what a small nation can do against overwhelming numbers, without fortifications, such as it is here proposed to put up. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. BROWN.—It is something new that a country can be defended without fortifications. (Hear, hear.)

MR. CAMERON.—I do not know whether honorable gentlemen mean that this country is capable of undertaking the expenses that would be necessary to put it in such a state of

defence as to enable it to resist the aggression of the United States. I want to know whether with two and a half millions of people, we could cope with an army of millions—because the United States have shown that they are capable of raising such an army—or make fortifications that could resist it. (Hear, hear.) The Hon. Provincial Secretary has spoken on the floor of Parliament as well as to the electors in the country, to the effect that it was retrenchment we needed more than constitutional changes; and yet now he says that the people are not to have one word to say in reference to these vital changes that are proposed, and the vastly increased expenditure that is to take place. In addressing this House in 1862, he said—"The finances of the country are growing worse and worse, and a check must be applied. It was chiefly for this cause that the people of Upper Canada desired a change in the representation." Now, I should like to understand how a union with 800,000 people, with immense expenditure, is going to improve our finances, which, according to the honorable gentleman, are "growing worse and worse." (Hear, hear.) I have not heard in what has been yet said on the subject of these resolutions, anything to show me how this great increase and improvement is going to take place by a union with less than a million of people; but arguments for the union, when directed merely to the material interests that will be served by it, are arguments ten-fold stronger in favor of union with the United States. (Hear, hear.) The arguments of honorable gentlemen all point that way, because they say it is to our interest to be joined with the 800,000 people of the provinces, who will furnish us with a market for our produce, when we have on the other side of the line thirty millions of people to furnish us a market. Arguments of this kind, urging the measure because our material interests will be promoted by it, are, therefore, arguments for union with the United States rather than with the Lower Provinces; but union with the United States, I hope, will never take place. (Hear, hear.) Still I cannot help believing that this is the tendency of the measure; for when we have a legislature in each province, with powers coördinate with those of the Federal Legislature—or if not possessing coördinate powers, having the same right at least to legislate upon some subjects as the General Legislature—there are certain to arise disagreements between the Local and the General Legislature, which will lead the people to demand changes that may destroy our connection

with the Mother Country. The Federal character of the United States Government has been referred to to prove that it has increased the prosperity of the people living under it; but in point of fact the great and relentless war that is now raging there—that fratricidal war in which brother is arrayed against brother, filled with hatred toward each other, and which has plunged the country into all the horrors of the deadliest strife—is the strongest comment upon the working of the Federal principle—the strongest argument against its application to these provinces. (Hear, hear.) The French element in Lower Canada will be separated from us in its Local Legislature and become less united with us than it is now; and therefore there is likely to be disagreement between us. Still more likely is there to be disagreement when the people of Upper Canada find that this scheme will not relieve them of the burdens cast upon them, but, on the contrary, will subject them to a legislature that will have the power of imposing direct taxation in addition to the burdens imposed by the General Government. When they find that this power is exercised, and they are called upon to contribute as much as before to the General Government, while taxed to maintain a separate Local Legislature—when they find that the material question is to weigh with them, they will look to the other side of the line for union. I feel that we are going to do that which will weaken our connection with the Mother Country, because if you give power to legislate upon the same subjects to both the local and the federal legislatures, and allow both to impose taxation upon the people, disagreements will spring up which must necessarily have that effect. (Hear, hear.) Then again, by this scheme that is laid before us, certain things are to be legislated upon by both the general and the local legislatures, and yet the local legislation is to be subordinate to the legislation of the Federal Parliament. For instance, emigration and agriculture are to be subject to the control of both bodies. Now suppose that the Federal Legislature chooses to decide in favor of having emigration flow to a particular locality, so as to benefit one province alone—I do not mean this expression to be understood in its entire sense, because I think that emigration in any one portion will benefit the whole, but it will benefit the particular locality much more at the time—and if provision is made by the General Legislature for emigration of that kind, and grants are made from the public

funds to carry it out, it will cause much complaint, as the people who are paying the greatest proportion of the revenue will be subject to the drafts upon them as before. Suppose again, for instance, that arrangements are made for emigration to a particular part of Lower Canada or New Brunswick, and a grant is made for the purpose, who is to say whether it is for the local or general good? It is the Federal Legislature that has to pronounce upon it. The expenditure and the benefit would be received by a portion of the province lying remote from that which pays the largest proportion of the money, and so we would not be relieved from the difficulties that have existed between Upper and Lower Canada. This being the case, the reasoning on which this whole scheme is based falls to the ground. (Hear, hear.) But this question has been of some service. It has enabled us to ascertain what our debt is. This we have never previously been enabled with certainty to find out. Our highest authorities have widely differed in footing it up. I recollect the Hon. President of the Council asserting that our debt was eighty-five millions of dollars.

HON. MR. BROWN—When did you hear that?

MR. M. C. CAMERON—I heard it in one of the speeches which you made on the floor of this House. You remarked that you had gone to the Auditor that very morning and found the debt to be eighty-five millions.

HON. MR. BROWN—The honorable gentleman is mistaken in the first figure. It was seventy-five millions that I stated.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—I think the honorable gentleman has made a mistake. I will show him that his memory is short on this occasion.

HON. MR. BROWN—Very good.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—You said the debt was \$85,000,000, but that there was the Sinking fund and the Municipal Loan indebtedness which together would amount to some fourteen or fifteen millions of dollars, which would reduce the amount to about \$70,000,000 of direct debt.

HON. MR. BROWN—(Hear, hear.) Why did you not say that at first?

MR. M. C. CAMERON—Well, I did not design to catch the Hon. President of the Council in the trap that he had laid for himself. (Hear, hear.) We have now found that our debt is not so much as that honorable gentleman led us to suppose it was. The fourteen or fifteen millions did not belong to us at all. But the honorable gentleman, since

he has been so closely connected with those old corruptionists, has discovered that it is only sixty-seven and a half millions. Well, the Hon. President of the Council has also said, and has acknowledged it too, that he was very much opposed to the Intercolonial Railway, and when the Hon. Attorney General West made the observation that he learned from a brief paragraph in a paper called the *Globe*, that Messrs. SICOTTE and HOWLAND were about to return, having accomplished the object of their mission, viz: to throw overboard the Intercolonial Railway, the Hon. President of the Council remarked, that that was "a very sensible thing—the most sensible thing they ever did." But now the honorable gentleman goes so heartily into this matter, that he will build this vast railway which it was so sensible to throw overboard at that time, and I think he went so far as to say he would build five intercolonial railways rather than that the scheme should fail.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS—Six; he said six.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—Well, we will give him the benefit of one, and yet I have not been able to hear him express in pounds, shillings and pence the practical benefit there is to be derived by this country as compensation for the expense of building that useless thing that it was so sensible to throw overboard two years ago; sensible even though the persons who went home were charged with acting falsely by the people of the Lower Provinces, and the honorable gentleman commended their throwing it overboard at the risk of our being charged with a breach of good faith. (Hear, hear.) Now, looking at this scheme politically, I do not see that we gain any advantage from it. I do not see that it secures to us peace for the future. I do not think that it secures us against the Honorable President of the Council coming forward again as the member for South Oxford or for some other constituency, and shaking our whole political fabric by his violent agitations. I do not think it prevents our having political firebrands in this country such as we have had. I do not think it prevents our having the same difficulties on the floor of the Federal Legislature as we have had on the floor of this House. (Hear, hear.) We may have, with all the additional expense we shall have gone to in order to obviate it, the same thing enacted over again. (Hear, hear.) Commercially, it does not promise to give us an advantage that will warrant the expenditure.

We are only to supply 800,000 people with our products. But it is said the Lower Provinces will have lands of a fertile character, and that when the railway is built they will be able to grow enough produce to support themselves, and we must find a market far beyond the market that the Lower Provinces could possibly give us. And it is said that it would be desirable to create a trade with the West Indies; but that may be done just as well without going to the expense of a union with the Lower Provinces and a double set of parliaments. Let us have a union in which we are each looking out for the common interest, and not each for his own individual benefit. Commercially, then, it does not hold out such inducements that we need to have all this haste in pushing it through and preventing the people from pronouncing upon it. In a military sense it does not hold out the inducement that we will get by it from the Lower Provinces either such assistance in men or money as to make it an object to unite with them. (Hear, hear.) In a sectional point of view the people of Lower Canada can see what they are to get. I cannot see that the people of Lower Canada are to be any better protected from the means that honorable gentleman has made use of to create all the difficulty between Upper and Lower Canada that has existed so long, and to get rid of which this expensive scheme is proposed. Upper Canada, it is said, will have the control of the expenditure, because they will have seventeen members more in the Federal Legislature than Lower Canada; but how easily their influence can be checked and completely swamped by the addition of forty-seven members from the Lower Provinces! (Hear, hear.) Looking at it in all these aspects, I am at a loss to understand what great benefit there is in the Confederation scheme to call for its being put through in such a hurried manner. Hon. Mr. GREY said in the Lower Provinces that it might be years before the change would come into effect; that it would take years to think about it. He said, "It is not intended to hurry the proposed scheme into actual life and operation; it is not to be carried out to-day, but years may roll by before it is carried into effect." This quotation occurs in a speech made by Hon. Mr. GREY at St. John, on the 17th November last. Now that honorable gentleman also takes a very different view of what is being boasted of here, the imposing of direct taxation for the support of the local governments, of which he disapproved. Honorable gentle-

men here, however, have said that they were in favor of direct taxation for the support of the local governments, because it would lead those who have to pay the taxes to look more closely into what was going on, and the manner in which their money was expended. (Hear, hear.) There seems also to have been a feeling in the Lower Provinces in favor of a legislative union, and the Hon. Mr. GREY seems to be combatting that idea. He says that with a legislative union, municipal institutions, and direct taxation in every province, would be the only means of getting along. He expressed himself as opposed to that and in favor of a Federal union, which he thought would afford them all the advantage that could be attained, commercially, by union, and would allow each province to retain control over its own local affairs. The local legislatures, he said, were to be deprived of no power over their own affairs that they formerly possessed. But in Canada it was represented that the local legislatures were to be only the shadow of the General Legislature—that they were to have merely a shadow of power, as all their proceedings were to be controlled by the Federal Government. That is the position taken by the advocates of the measure on this floor. So it seems that those gentlemen who have represented to us that they acted in great harmony, and came to a common decision when they were in conference, take a widely different view of the questions supposed to have been agreed upon, and give very different accounts of what were the views of parties to the conference on the various subjects. (Hear, hear.) In the Lower Provinces they were strongly opposed to direct taxation, while here it was presented as one of the advantages to accrue from the Federation. (Cries of No, no.) Well, Mr. SPEAKER, I say yes. That view of the case has been taken. If the amount allowed for the expenses of local legislation—the 80 cents per head—was found insufficient, the local parliaments must resort to direct taxation to make up the deficiency, while in the Lower Provinces, it seems, nothing of that kind was to follow. Now, all the gentlemen who have spoken on the Government side of the House have declared that this scheme was a great scheme; but they have declined to allow us to understand what sort of a local legislature we are to have. They will not tell us how our Executive is to be formed. They will not tell us whether we are to have legislative councils in Upper and Lower Canada, and whether or not they will be

elected councils. They will not tell us what number of members will constitute the Executive Council of the Confederation, nor what influence each individual province will have in that government. They will not bring down the scheme for the local legislatures. They tell us that it is better to withhold those details—that we are dealing with Federation alone, and have no business discussing local governments. What is the object of all this vagueness? Is it politic or statesmanlike to tell us that we, the representatives of a free people, are not to know anything about these things, but vote with our eyes shut? I hold that we ought to have the whole scheme before us, but they say we shall know nothing about it. And yet they continue to say it is a great scheme. Well, if it is a great scheme, and they continue to deal with it and with this House in this way, are not they, the architects and fabricators of this great scheme, fairly entitled to be called great schemers? (Laughter.) Are they not treating us as a lot of school-boys? As an evidence of the excellence and popularity of their scheme, they point to the circumstance that they have formed a strong government upon the question, with a majority of seventy in this House, while two governments preceding them could each only muster a majority of two. And because they are so strong they feel themselves at liberty to deny to the people's representatives the right to have information on a most important matter of this kind—information they would not have dared to withhold if they were weak. (Hear, hear.) When a motion is placed on the notice paper of this House for several days, requiring a statement of the portion of the debt which Lower Canada and Upper Canada respectively will have to pay, they tell us that they cannot submit to the House any information of that kind. Is it possible that the hon. gentlemen composing the Government have not determined that question at this stage of the proceeding, and that they have not yet made up their minds respecting it? If they have not, it shows that they have been trifling with their position, and have not been discharging the duties devolving upon them. It has also been represented that this matter has been so fully before the country for a great length of time, that it is not necessary to submit it to a vote. I would ask in what way has it been before the country? Why, it was declared, in the first instance, by the

press, that it was not possible the measure could be passed until it had been submitted to the people; it was looked upon as a thing which was quite impossible. There is no doubt the organ of the Ministry in Toronto—the organ more particularly of the President of the Council—did declare from the first, as if throwing out a feeler, that it would not be necessary to submit it to the people. But the press generally took a different view of the question, when out came that remarkable circular from the Provincial Secretary's office—(hear, hear)—which had such a magical effect, that at once the story was changed, and the advocacy was begun of disposing of the question without submitting it to the people, although the people themselves never dreamt that it could be carried through this House and become a fixed fact until that step was taken. I do not see how any man, who does not desire to make himself amenable to the charge of a breach of the trust reposed in him, can come here, and without consulting those who sent him, change a Constitution affecting the well-being of millions. (Hear, hear.) Those who have to pay for all this—who provide the revenue for carrying on the affairs of the country—are not at liberty to express their views on the subject in the legitimate way known to the Constitution. It is argued that there have been no petitions presented against Confederation; but where, I ask, has there been any agitation in reference to the question? Where has it been contested at the polls? I stand here an elected member, who ran against the Provincial Secretary, when, as a member of the government formed for the purpose of carrying out this scheme, he returned to his constituents for reelection, and I succeeded in defeating him. So far, therefore, as the people of North Ontario have spoken at all, their pronouncing, in one way, has been against it.

HON. MR. BROWN—Hear! hear!

MR. M. C. CAMERON—I do not mean to say, Mr. SPEAKER, that they did pronounce definitely against it—

HON. MR. BROWN—Hear! hear!

MR. M. C. CAMERON—For when it was being discussed, I told them I was not prepared to pronounce against it myself—

HON. MR. BROWN—Hear! hear!

MR. M. C. CAMERON—I said that I must know what the scheme was before I could say whether I would vote for it or against it.

HON. MR. BROWN—Hear! hear!

MR. M. C. CAMERON—But this much is certain, that the President of the Council who took the trouble to go into the riding, to stump it, to hold meetings there, and to speak against me at every meeting he held, took the opportunity of declaring that unless the Provincial Secretary was returned, it would seriously damage and endanger the scheme. And notwithstanding all these warnings, the people thought fit to return me. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. MACDOUGALL—Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt him? Does the hon. gentleman mean to convey to this House the impression that he did not declare himself in favor of the policy of the Government on the subject of Federation?

MR. M. C. CAMERON—I mean very distinctly to say that I did not declare myself in favor of the policy of the Government. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. BROWN—Oh! oh!

MR. M. C. CAMERON—I declared there as I declare here, that I was in favor of a union of the provinces. But whether the union contemplated was a union which could be approved of, or whether it would be to the advantage of the country, I was unable to say until I more fully understood the scheme, and the hon. gentleman was not in a position at that time to explain the scheme, or to say what it was.

AN HON. MEMBER—How about the elections to the Upper House?

MR. M. C. CAMERON—I think there were two elections only for the Upper House in which the question was a test one.

AN HON. MEMBER—Which were they?

MR. M. C. CAMERON—I think Saugeen was one.

MR. THOMAS FERGUSON—Oh, but Saugeen would have been carried by us, no matter whether there was Confederation or no Confederation. (Laughter.) Everybody knows that.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—Be that as it may, I am quite satisfied the people were under the impression, and that the candidates who appeared before them were also under the impression, that this thing would never become law—that this Constitution of ours would never be changed, without the constituencies having an opportunity of pronouncing upon it. It was never supposed that the people's representatives, sent here for an entirely different purpose, would presume or assume to set aside the Constitution, to make a complete revolution in the affairs

of the country, to involve them in a much larger expenditure, to change the constitution of the Upper House completely, to bring in an additional number of representatives from Upper Canada, and to add a new element of forty-seven members altogether to the Lower House. I say I am persuaded the people did not understand that this was to be done without their having an opportunity of speaking upon it, and of saying whether they approved of it or not. (Hear, hear.) And I scarcely can believe that we will be able to find, at this late day of the world's history, in a free country such as Canada, among a people who understand what are their rights and liberties, a government prepared to act in so unconstitutional a manner—a government ready to tyrannize and to assume the part of an oligarchy. (Hear, hear.) But this Government is prepared to act thus. They tell their followers that they are at their peril to accept the scheme just as it is, that they are not at liberty to change a single word of it, and if they do so they will defeat the whole project. That, however, is not the way in which hon. gentlemen in the Lower Provinces deal with this question. Hon. Mr. TILLEY, in Nova Scotia, only two or three days ago, made the declaration that if the people's representatives choose to alter the resolutions, they were at liberty to do so. (Hear, hear.) And yet we in Canada are gravely told that we are not to be allowed to exercise any judgment or to pronounce any opinion upon it. (Hear, hear.) I regard the scheme itself as having been got up hastily, for it bears upon its face the evidence of haste and of compromise. Indeed, it is a complete piece of patchwork, and as we are all aware, it is a piece of patchwork in which we are not to be at liberty to change the patches in any respect so as to make it look better to the eye or more enduring to those who will have to wear it. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) On the subject of the Legislative Council, it does strike me that the language is not such as to convey the idea that hon. members of this House have said it ought to convey. The 14th section reads thus :—

The first selection of the members of the Legislative Council shall be made, except as regards Prince Edward Island, from the legislative councils of the various provinces.

You will observe the language—"From the legislative councils of the various provinces." That is, from the legislative councils

now in existence. "So far," the clause goes on to say, "as a sufficient number be found qualified and willing to serve; such members shall be appointed by the Crown at the recommendation of the General Executive Government, upon the nomination of the respective local governments." Honorable gentlemen say that means, upon the nomination, so far as Canada is concerned, of the present Government. I presume that in the nature of things, the hon. gentlemen who are at present administering our affairs anticipate that they will be the controllers of our destiny, for some time at all events, in the Federal Government. So that they are going themselves to nominate to themselves. Is that the object of the clause? In point of fact, would it be such in its operation, because before these nominations can take place, I assume that the Executive Government must be in existence, and that when the Federal Government comes into existence, the present Government will cease *co-incident*. I take it that so soon as the Imperial Act passed, there would be an end to the present arrangements, and that the local legislatures and the General Legislature would be brought into existence at the same moment. The present Government of United Canada would cease to exist. And how then would the nominations to the Legislative Council take place, from this Government to the Executive Government of the Confederation? (Hear, hear.) In one way, these resolutions may be considered as only an outline of the Constitution. But they seem to have descended to very small details. For instance, they say that a member who is absent from the Council for two sessions shall vacate his seat. This is a very small piece of detail, and I regard it also as a very unjust piece of detail, because the cause of a member's absence may be sickness, and it may be the case that a member would be sick during the period of two sittings of Parliament and well immediately afterwards.

AN HON. MEMBER—In that case he might be excused.

Another HON. MEMBER—Or he could be re-appointed.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—There is no provision for any such thing; and I hold that when they went into detail such as this, the details ought to be full enough to prove what is meant. But if it is not detail—if it is mere skeleton—why did they introduce this at all? Why not simply say that the

Legislative Council should be nominated for life? We are also told that we are to have under the control of the federal and local governments the sea-coast and inland fisheries. Of course it is impossible for me to say what they mean to do with these things, but this is a clause out of which, at all events, disagreements might arise. To shew what little care has been exercised in the wording of these resolutions, in one place they speak of the seal of the General Government, and in another place they speak of the seal of the "Federated Provinces." I presume there is no such thing as a seal of a general government. It is the seal of the nation—of the country in its entirety; the same as we speak of our own seal as the Great Seal of the province. There may not be much in this; but it shews, at any rate, a want of care in the compilation of this document; it shews that they have not studied each resolution with a desire to make it a perfect thing. Then it is said:—"The Local Government and Legislature of each province shall be constructed in such manner as the existing legislature of each such province shall provide." I do not understand from this whether it is competent or not for us in this Legislature, before there is a Federal union, to make provision for the Local Government and Legislature, or whether we are to await the action upon the subject of Federation of the Imperial Government. Our action, one should suppose, ought to be taken after the Imperial Government has pronounced. Perhaps this is the intention. Mr. SPEAKER, they refuse to tell us anything about it. It may be that, as soon as these resolutions are carried, we will be sent about our business; that the Imperial Legislature will be invited to pass an act, and that they will convene us again, provision being made for that course, and so in point of fact, having once affirmed the principle of Federation, we will have to accept such local legislatures as they choose to give us. (Hear, hear.) I find the Finance Minister, in speaking of the construction of the local legislatures, saying: "It was known, at all events in the Lower Canada section of the province, that there would a Legislative Council as well as a Legislative Assembly," constituting thereby a very expensive machinery of government for the local administration. I do not understand that this is the view Upper Canadians take of this matter. If we are really to have a Local Legislature, we

want it to be as inexpensive in its character as possible—we want to construct it as much as possible with a view to economy, in order to the public burdens being lessened to the lowest practical point. (Hear.) Giving this question the best attention in my power, desirous if possible of seeing something accomplished by which the semblance of a cause for faction may be done away with, I would have been willing to support this scheme had I seen that the Government in forming it had an eye to the true interests of the country, and not an eye to the creating of a number of legislatures, and the carrying on of works most expensive and burdensome in their character—works which will be of but little value as a commercial undertaking, and of very little value for military purposes, but which, no doubt, are absolutely necessary for bringing us into contact with the people of the Lower Provinces. It seems to me that it would be much better had this Intercolonial Railway been built without forming this union at all. (Opposition cheers.) Had we gone on building the railway without a union, it would have been less expensive in its character to us; we would have gained more by it, and we would have had the control of our affairs, without being swamped, so far as Upper Canada is concerned. (Hear, hear.) As it is, we shall get no more benefit from it, commercially, than if it had been built without a union of the provinces.

MR. WALLBRIDGE—We should have had the railway, without bringing in those who may limit our western extension.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—I do not know what will be done under the new arrangement. But under the old arrangement we were to have paid five-twelfths of the cost, and the charge upon us now will be at least double that sum. So that in whatever way this matter is looked at, it will be seen that there has been no design for the purpose of advantaging Upper Canada, whose people are to find the means by which all this extravagance is to be carried on. In the formation of this scheme, it has been truly admitted that compromises have been made. The Lower Provinces have laws which are not in accordance with our own in Upper Canada, and it has been thought very desirable that they should be brought into unison and, if possible, consolidated. Well, provision has been made for the consolidation of these laws; but observe how religiously the laws of Lower Canada are guarded from interference. The

33rd sub-section gives to the General Government the power of "rendering uniform all or any of the laws relative to property and civil rights in Upper Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, and Prince Edward Island, and rendering uniform the procedure of all or any of the courts in these provinces; but any statute for this purpose shall have no force or authority in any province until sanctioned by the legislature thereof." So that in reality no such law will be binding until it has the sanction of the Local Legislature of the province particularly affected thereby. Such being the guarded terms of the resolution, why is it not made applicable to Lower Canada as well as to the other provinces? Nothing could be done respecting its peculiar laws without the consent of its Local Legislature, and it is quite possible to my mind, that there are some laws which it would be advantageous to all parts of the Confederation to assimilate. But they emphatically declare in these resolutions that there shall be no interference with the laws of Lower Canada. So that while it is proposed to assimilate the laws of the other provinces, there is a large section of intervening country which is to have, for all time to come, laws separate and distinct from the rest. (Hear, hear.) There is a great deal of difference in making a provision of this kind, which is to give the people the option, and which is not to be binding for all time to come unless sanctioned by them, and declaring that a law shall be forced upon the people whether they liked it or not. (Hear.) I can easily understand the feeling of the French people, and can admire it—that they do not want to have anything forced upon them whether they will or not. But that they will not allow you to contemplate even the possibility of any change taking place for the general weal, and with their own consent, in their laws—that they will not allow anything to be introduced into this measure by which, under any circumstances whatever, we can meddle with the laws of this particular section of the country—I do not understand. And having feelings of this kind, and manifesting them so strongly as they do in this document, it appears to me that in going into this union, we do not go into it with the proper elements. We go into it with elements of strife and dissension, rather than of union and strength. (Hear, hear.) That is to be regretted; for if a change is to be made affecting the destinies of the people of this country, it is lamentable that we do

not find patriotism enough among the representatives of the people to be willing to give and take, so that we may have such a union as will be beneficial to the whole, and not one burdensome to the whole, because one portion of the country says, "We have peculiar institutions which we dare not entrust to the care of you, gentlemen, who are to be united with us." Having given this whole matter the best attention I could, with the most earnest desire that any man could have to come to a just conclusion, I have not been able to satisfy myself that there are not the elements of ruin rather than of safety and strength in this scheme; that there are not the elements of the dismemberment of this country from the Empire to which we belong, and have pride in belonging; that there is not the means here of causing us to drift right into the vortex of annexation to the United States, whether we will or not. So far as I am concerned, I should sooner see perish root and branch everything belonging to me, than I would become a party to a union with that power. Feeling no hostility to the people there—feeling as friendly to them as to any other people, still I have that attachment to British institutions—I have within me that feeling of allegiance to the British Crown, which would not allow me to throw off British connection under any circumstances whatever, or even to accept the disruption of that connection, if it were offered to us by Great Britain. I feel it would be a curse to this country, if we were forced into that union—forced to adopt the licentiousness of conduct which we find there, and habits and manners totally distasteful to us. To be brought into that union would seem to me the greatest injury which by possibility could happen to us. In adopting the scheme before us, I feel we would be sowing the seeds of discord and strife, which would destroy our union, instead of its being cemented by this measure. I am therefore opposed to the scheme, because I believe that politically, commercially, and defensively, as a matter of economy or of sectional benefit, it will not be one tittle of service to this country, but on the contrary will inflict on it a vast and lasting injury. (Cheers.)

MR. DUNKIN said he desired to take part in the debate, but did not wish to commence at this late hour, and if no other honorable gentleman was disposed to speak, he would move that the debate be adjourned.

MR. MCGIVERIN—As I know the honorable member for Brome (Mr. DUNKIN) is unwell, I am willing to relieve him by taking the floor. At the same time, I rise with much diffidence to make the few remarks I intend to offer on this occasion, after the able and eloquent speech to which we have just listened. But, although I may not be able, perhaps, to place before this House any views on this subject which have not already been ably placed before the House and the country by honorable gentlemen who have preceded me, still I feel I would be wanting in my duty to my constituents were I not to explain the reasons which induce me to take the course which I propose to take with reference to this question. The subject is certainly a very important one, and, from the momentous character of the interests involved in this proposed change of our Constitution, deserves the earnest attention of every true Canadian. (Hear, hear.) In the first place, I feel some explanation should be given of the reasons which have induced myself, in common with a large number of the liberal members of Upper Canada, to take the course we have seen fit to take with reference to the present Government, and the policy they have laid before the country. In Upper Canada—I believe in almost every constituency—there has long been an agitation having reference to the sectional difficulties between Upper and Lower Canada. This agitation, instead of diminishing, has continued to gather strength. Ever since the union of 1841, Western Canada has felt—and I think justly felt—that it did not receive that justice to which its wealth and population entitled it. On the other hand, the French population of Lower Canada believed, or professed to believe, that an increased representation of Upper Canada in the Legislature would tend to destroy their language, their laws, and their religion. The difficult position into which we were brought by this antagonism was such, that when the proposition came from the Government that the Honorable the President of the Council (Hon. Mr. BROWN) should unite with them to see if some means could not be devised by which these unfortunate sectional difficulties might be arranged, I felt it my duty—however unpleasant, however strange it may have seemed that we should alienate ourselves from the liberal section of Lower Canada—yet, satisfied that some change was necessary in the management of the public affairs of this country, I felt it my duty, as an Upper Canadian—I may say as a Canadian—to do, as

far as I possibly could, what might tend to remove from our country the unfortunate difficulties under which we have labored. (Hear, hear.) I believe that the people of Upper Canada at least—I may say of Canada generally—have become tired of the strife in which we have been involved for many years, and which has put a stop to that practical and useful legislation which the country required for the development of its resources. I believe the people of this country, in consequence of the position in which we found ourselves, had become earnestly desirous of a change; but the change they looked to was not in the direction of a union with the United States. (Hear, hear.) The change they looked for was in the direction of a union with the other British provinces; one which should embrace—I hope at no distant day—the British colonies on the far Pacific coast, as well as those to the east of us, bordering on the Atlantic. (Hear, hear.) I believe that this scheme of union now proposed—though I feel that it has many imperfections—is still a step in the right direction. It is perfectly impossible that the people of this country should be satisfied to remain in the agitated state, politically, in which they have hitherto been, and which might ultimately land them in difficulties, for which no other solution could be found than that to which our neighbors on the other side of the line have unfortunately been compelled to resort. (Hear, hear.) The honorable member for Hochelaga (Hon. Mr. DORION) truly said, so long ago as 1858, that the country was then almost verging on revolution, and that a change was necessary. The necessity for such a change, instead of diminishing since, has increased. (Hear, hear.) As far as I have been able to ascertain the feelings of the members of this House, I have not as yet understood one honorable gentleman to state that he was opposed to a union with the other provinces. Even the honorable gentleman who has preceded me has stated that he advocates such a union, and believes it would be beneficial to this country; only he did not like the manner and the details of the present scheme. But, while he and other honorable gentlemen have condemned that scheme of union which is now submitted to the House, while professing to be in favor of union in the abstract, I have as yet failed to find one of them offering anything as an improvement upon it. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—We have a right to amend this scheme.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—You had better print your amendments.

MR. MCGIVERIN—The honorable member for North Ontario (Mr. M. C. CAMERON) has stated, that while he is an advocate of union, he believed that a Legislative would be preferable to a Federal union. It is easy for honorable members to make that assertion. There are few, at least, of the English-speaking of this country who would not also be favorable to the principle of a legislative union. But can we get it? We have tried year after year to obtain representation by population, with a view to bettering our condition in the western section of the province, by getting a fair and equal distribution of the public moneys of the country, according to our wealth and population, and the measure in which we contribute to the public revenue. Few, I think, will deny that the western section—for whatever reason, whether because of its being more favorably situated, and having a better climate and more fertile soil, or from whatever other cause—the fact is indisputable that the western section of this province produces more and consumes more than the eastern section. And this formed the ground of complaint, the reason of the agitation, that notwithstanding this fact, we of Upper Canada were not placed on an equal footing with the Lower Canadians in the legislature of the country, and in the administration of its affairs. Hence it is that popular opinion in Upper Canada has declared so emphatically that a change is necessary. (Hear, hear.) The honorable member for North Ontario favors a kind of union which, though desirable in many respects, most people believe to be impracticable. Are the French population, who are entitled to claim just and equal rights, willing to concede it? I believe not. Even the liberal section of Lower Canada refused to concede to us a fair legislative union. The honorable member for Hochelaga—a gentleman for whom I entertain the highest respect—I believe a more liberal or high-minded man does not sit in this House—even he, whilst we were acting with him politically, when appealed to time after time to join with the Liberal section of Upper Canada in some policy that would remove these unfortunate difficulties, constantly refused to do so, and told us it was impossible for him and his friends to meet us on that ground. Therefore, when at the close of last session, the people of Upper Canada were met, as they were met, by the other political party of Lower Canada, telling us—“Here, we are

willing to yield you what you desire, only instead of conceding representation by population pure and simple, we believe a Confederation of the whole British American Provinces, with that principle recognised in the General Government, would be preferable; or, failing that, we are willing to have a Federation of the two provinces of Canada,”—when that was offered us, would we have been justified in rejecting it, simply because in accepting it we were compelled for the time to allow party feelings to remain in abeyance, or because we had to work in harmony for a time with the men to whom we had been opposed politically, whom perhaps in time past we had strongly denounced? Should we, when offered that for which we, as a party and as a people, had worked and agitated year after year, have refused it, simply because it was not offered by those with whom we had hitherto acted politically? (Hear, hear.) I for one felt—whatever opinions any might entertain of my conduct—I felt that, as an Upper Canadian and in justice to my country, I was bound to set aside party feeling and take that course which was for the best interests of our common country. (Hear, hear.) The honorable member for North Ontario has stated with reference to this Confederation—and similar language was held by the honorable member for Hochelaga—that commercially, politically and defensively the union of these provinces, constituted in the way proposed, would be a failure. It was also stated by the honorable member for North Ontario, that instead of our preparing ourselves for the contingency of difficulties arising with our neighbors, we should remain quiet; we should, in other words, lie down and allow them to ride over us and trample us in the dust. (Hear, hear.) Mr. SPEAKER, that was not the sentiment, those were not the feelings which actuated the noble veterans of 1812—(hear, hear)—who, though few in number, with a country sparsely settled and an immense extent of frontier, bravely did all that lay in their power to resist the foe; and they not only resisted but repelled him. (Hear, hear.) Though we are still comparatively few in number, we have nevertheless increased since that period in wealth and in population in an equal ratio with the United States. And though this war has developed great military resources on their part, I think I shall be able to show that with the resources we have—with the force we can bring into the field of at least six hundred thousand armed men if needed—(hear, hear)—and with the aid

Great Britain will always extend to us, if we show that we on our part are prepared to do our duty—I believe that we are in quite as good a position to hold our own as those who successfully resisted the invader in the war of 1812. (Hear, hear.) On this point we can take an encouraging lesson from history. When the American colonies which now form the United States rebelled against Great Britain, their population was not over one or two hundred thousand in excess of the population of the five colonies that are to form our proposed Confederation. (Hear, hear.) At that time they had certainly fewer resources in every respect than the people of this country now possess, and yet they resisted, and successfully resisted, one of the greatest powers in the world, and wrested from it their independence. Here, in the event of an attack, we are placed in a precisely similar position. One man in this country is equal to three invaders. (Hear, hear.) It has been demonstrated in the struggle now pending between the North and the South, that on account of the difficulties the country attacked presents to the enemy, and the advantages it gives to those defending it, one man is equal to three in resisting an invading army. The South—although they have been blockaded on the sea-coast—although they have had an immense extent of frontier to defend—although they have had the internal weakness of four millions of slaves to contend with—and although the white population is little more than that now possessed by the provinces which are to form this Confederation; have nevertheless resisted for four years—I may say successfully—all the power and influence and available resources which the United States have been able to bring against them. (Hear, hear.) I sincerely trust and pray, and it should be the desire of every true Canadian, that we may continue in peace; but to say that it is impossible for us to contend against a force that may be brought against us, is to say that from which I for one must dissent. (Hear, hear.) Now, sir, I believe that in a commercial, agricultural, and defensive point of view, the union would be desirable. Placed as we are now, with the abrogation of the Reciprocity treaty threatened, does it not become our duty, I ask, to make some effort to change and improve our condition? As I stated, sir, the subject has been so ably placed before this House by honorable gentlemen who have preceded me, and who are so much more capable of dealing with it than I am, that I will not attempt to re-

peat the arguments in favor of this scheme, commercially, financially, and politically, which have already been adduced. But there are one or two points as to the resources of the whole of British North America, to which I would for a moment invite the attention of the House. The union is desirable with a view to the development of our mineral resources. In British Columbia and Vancouver's Island the gold fields equal, if they do not exceed in value, those of any other part of the world. Iron we have in that vast extent of country lying between the Rocky Mountains and Lake Superior, a country equal if not superior, for the purposes of settlement and cultivation to any we have in Canada, and whose area is estimated at from eighty to one hundred million acres. Then, again, we have magnificent iron and copper mines in Canada, while the Lower Provinces possess vast mineral resources, extensive coal fields, and valuable fisheries. We have all the natural wealth to make us a great people if we pursue a course to develop it. (Hear, hear.) To illustrate my argument, I will mention some of the figures showing the resources of the different countries adjacent to and forming part of that great district, with an identity of interest. (Hear, hear.) In Nevada, in 1860, the population was 6,857, and in 1863, 60,000. About eleven millions of dollars have been invested in the opening up of roads and in other improvements, and the resources of the country in 1863 amounted to \$15,000,000. Victoria, in Australia, in 1861, had a population of 540,322, and they have constructed 350 miles of railway. The revenue was \$15,000,000, and they have their magnificent cities and splendid homesteads, with every comfort and luxury. In Utah, where perhaps there are many difficulties to retard the growth of the country, we find that in 1860 the population was 41,000—an increase in ten years of 254 per cent. The value of property in 1850 was \$986,000, and ten years afterwards, in 1860, it was five and a half millions—an increase in this period of 468 per cent. Iron and copper mines have been more developed in that territory than gold, although they possess gold as well. In 1864 the population was estimated at 75,000. Colorado has a population of 60,000, and the production of gold in 1864 was fifteen millions of dollars. Agriculture also is being rapidly developed. I wished to mention these facts to show what we may look forward to if we carry out this union honestly, and fairly, as I believe the Gov

ernment intend to carry it out; not simply a union with the Maritime Provinces, but a union of all the British colonies in America from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast. (Hear, hear.) If I felt that honorable gentlemen who have now the control of the public affairs of this country did not intend honestly and faithfully to carry out the union in this sense, and to take measures for the opening-up of the great North-West territory, for the enlargement of our canals, and for the general improvement of our internal water communications, I for one would not hesitate to give my voice, and whatever influence I possess, to oppose them. (Hear, hear.) I wish to be understood that I mention these gold-bearing countries, and countries possessing mineral wealth, to illustrate that we have all that wealth in our own possession if we only develop it. The gold produced from Australia, British Columbia and California during the last six years has been estimated at nearly two thousand millions of dollars. The political divisions of British North America are as follows: Upper Canada, Lower Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland, Vancouver's Island, British Columbia, Red River Settlement, and the Hudson Bay Territory. The combined territory is equal to a square of 1,770 miles, or more than three millions of square miles. This vast area is peopled by about four millions of inhabitants, of whom nearly three millions are contained in the Canadas. That, Mr. SPEAKER, is what I understand to be the contemplated union; that is the union which I understand the Government are pledged to this House and to the country to carry out, and I say that if I did not believe it was their honest intention to carry that union into effect, I would not have the slightest hesitation in giving my vote against them. (Hear, hear.) Now, sir, I would allude to British Columbia and its resources. British Columbia embraces an area of 213,500 square miles. Its exports in 1862 amounted to \$9,257,875, chiefly in gold and furs, and its imports were valued at \$2,200,000. Vancouver's Island embraces an area of 16,000 square miles, with a population of 11,463. In 1862 its imports amounted to \$3,555,000. The Hudson Bay Territory embraces an area of 1,800,000 square miles, with a population of 200,000. Now we come to the Lake Superior region, which has been entirely or almost entirely neglected by the people of Canada, whilst our neighbors on the American side, more energetic and more enterprising I must confess than we have been,

have built up an immense trade. In 1863 the amount of capital employed to work the mines on the American side was \$6,000,000. The amount of copper produced in 1863 was nine thousand tons, and of iron a hundred and eighty-five thousand tons. The total exports were \$10,000,000, and the imports \$12,000,000. But whilst this vast trade has been produced on the American side, little or no attention has been given by the people of Canada to the mineral section on our side, and I mention these figures to show what wealth we possess still in an undeveloped state. (Hear, hear.) Mr. SPEAKER, I regret that I am not able to place my views so clearly before the House as other honorable gentlemen who have addressed it. I regret that on this occasion, not having intended to speak to-night, I have not been able to interest the House more than I have done. (Cries of "Go on.") But I think that what should occupy the attention of this House, and of the people of the country, is the practical consideration of the question now under discussion. (Hear, hear.) Sir, the resources of Canada it is unnecessary for me to allude to. They are well known to every member of this House. But it has been said, in reference to those of the Lower Provinces, that the people will not bring into the union a reasonable proportion of wealth. Mr. SPEAKER, it has been stated that they have nothing to bring us but fish and coal. I believe that their resources will compare favorably with those of this province or of the United States. (Hear, hear.) The revenue of New Brunswick in 1850 was \$416,348; in 1860, \$833,324; and in 1862, \$692,230. Now, sir, I think that these figures will show that New Brunswick was increasing in an equal, if not greater, ratio than this country. Being isolated from this province, being almost entire strangers, and having little or no intercourse with each other, we find that nearly all the trade has gone to a foreign country. The trade in 1862 was, with Canada—imports, \$191,522; exports, \$48,090. Nova Scotia—imports, \$861,652; exports, \$341,027. Prince Edward Island—imports, \$82,240; exports, \$80,932. Newfoundland—exports, \$11,855. United States—imports, \$2,960,703; exports, \$889,416. Under the union, Canada might expect to get the trade of all these provinces. The trade with Canada is almost entirely in flour, shipped through the United States to these provinces. The agricultural products of New Brunswick in 1851 and 1861 were as fol-

lows:—Wheat, 1851, 206,635; 1861, 279,778. Barley, 1851, 74,300; 1861, 94,679. Oats, 1851, 1,411,164; 1861, 2,656,883. Buckwheat, 1851, 689,004; 1861, 904,321. Maize, 1851, 62,225; 1861, 17,420. Peas, 1851, 42,663; 1861, 5,228. Hay, 1851, 225,083 tons; 1861, 324,160 tons. Turnips, 1851, 539,803; 1861, 634,860. Potatoes, 1851, 2,792,394; 1861, 4,041,339. Butter, 1851, 3,050,939 lbs.; 1861, 4,591,477 lbs. Horses, 1851, 22,044; 1861, 35,830. Meat Cattle, 1851, 157,218; 1861, 92,025. Sheep, 1851, 168,038; 1861, 214,096. Swine, 1851, 47,932; 1861, 74,057. The area of New Brunswick is 27,710 square miles, or 17,600,000 acres, of which 14,000,000 acres are fit for profitable cultivation. Prince Edward Island embraces an area of 2,131 square miles, or 1,365,400 acres. Its population has been increasing steadily. In 1798 it was 5,000; in 1833, 32,292; in 1841, 47,034; in 1851, 55,000; in 1861, 80,552. In 1860, its imports amounted to \$1,150,270; in 1861, \$1,049,675; and in 1862, \$1,056,200. The exports in 1860 amounted to \$1,272,220; 1861, \$1,085,750; 1862, \$1,162,215. The agricultural products in 1860 were—Wheat, 346,125 minots; barley, 223,195; oats, 2,218,578; buckwheat, 50,127; potatoes, 2,972,235; turnips, 348,784; hay, 31,100 tons; horses, 18,765; meat cattle, 60,015; sheep, 107,242; hogs, 71,535. The area of Newfoundland is 10,200 square miles, or 25,728,000 acres. In 1857 the total number of inhabitants was 119,304. In 1862 its trade was as follows: With Canada, imports, \$50,448, exports, \$19,001; Nova Scotia, imports, \$90,596, exports, \$37,019; New Brunswick, imports, \$2,351; Prince Edward Island, imports, \$11,720, exports, \$909; United States, imports, \$345,797, exports, \$47,729. The total imports in 1857 amounted to £1,413,432; in 1858, £1,177,862; in 1859, £1,324,136; in 1860, £1,254,123; in 1861, £1,152,857; in 1862, £1,007,082. The total exports were, in 1857, £1,651,171; in 1858, £1,318,836; in 1859, £1,357,113; in 1860, £1,271,712; in 1861, £1,092,551; and in 1862, £1,171,723. The principal export is fish. Nova Scotia is 350 miles in length by 100 miles in breadth. Its population in 1838 was 199,028; in 1851, 276,117; and in 1861, 330,857. The revenue in 1852 was \$483,522; expenditure, \$483,895; imports, \$5,970,877, exports, \$4,853,903. In 1862, the revenue was \$1,127,298; expenditure, \$1,009,701; imports, \$6,198,553; exports,

\$5,646,961. The agricultural products of 1851 and 1861 were as follows:—Wheat, 1851, 297,159; 1861, 312,081. Barley, 1851, 196,007; 1861, 269,578. Oats, 1851, 1,384,487; 1861, 1,978,137. Buckwheat, 1851, 170,301; 1861, 195,340. Maize, 1851, 37,475; 1861, 15,592. Peas, 1851, 21,638; 1861, 21,335. Rye, 1851, 61,438; 1861, 59,706. Hay, 1851, 287,837 tons; 1861, 334,287. Turnips, 1851, 467,125; 1861, 554,318. Potatoes, 1851, 1,986,789; 1861, 3,824,864. Butter, 1851, 3,613,890 lbs.; 1861, 4,532,711. Cheese, 1851, 652,069 lbs.; 1861, 901,296. Horses, 1851, 8,789; 1861, 41,927. Meat cattle, 1851, 243,713; 1861, 151,793. Sheep, 1851, 282,180; 1861, 332,653. Swine, 1851, 51,533; 1861, 53,217. Coal, 1851, 83,421 tons; 1861, 326,429. I merely allude to these figures to show hon. gentlemen that these colonies have other and very valuable resources besides those which have been stated by some members, namely, fish and coal. (Hear, hear.) It was stated by the honorable member for North Ontario (Mr. M. O. CAMERON)—and I think ingeniously stated—that this union would produce an enormous increase of taxation on the people of Canada; that the partnership would be a very unprofitable one to us. Now I think he failed to make a point on that. It has been shown that we enter into this union with a debt of twenty-five dollars a head, and that the Lower Provinces, instead of bringing a load upon us by coming into the partnership, occupy a decidedly favorable position with regard to this country. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member for North Ontario also stated that the union of the provinces would involve this country in a great local debt, a statement which I think is also erroneous. He is favorable to a union, but would prefer a legislative one. But does he pretend to say that such a union would tend less to the swamping of Upper Canada, which he fears under the Confederation? His financial argument, that our debt and our taxation would increase, has failed, except thus far, that the machinery of the Government may be too expensive. If the present Government fail to discharge their duty and adopt an unduly expensive machinery, it is by that means alone that an increased expenditure can arise. It does not depend on the fact of the union; it rests entirely on this, whether this union is carried out fairly and properly. (Hear, hear.) The next point is the construc-

tion of the Intercolonial Railway, and to that the hon. member for North Ontario is favorable, except that he would rather see it built without the union than with it, because the union will add so much to the expenses of the country. In reference to that, the increase of the expenditure will depend entirely on the hon. gentlemen who have now the charge of the government of the country. If they are extravagant; if they have a governor with a retinue, and for each of the provinces an expensive staff, and all the appliances of royalty, then I believe that the union would add greatly to the expenses of the country. But I do not understand that such is their opinion. I believe their desire is—and I am satisfied that if they have not this desire the people will require it of them—that it shall be conducted on principles of economy, and in such a manner that increased taxation will not necessarily be the result. (Hear, hear.) Now, sir, in reference to this great country which I have briefly adverted to, I wish it to be distinctly understood by the members of the Government that I for one support them on this understanding, and on this understanding only—that the union of the provinces and the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, the opening up of the North-West and the enlargement of our canals, shall be considered part of this scheme, with a view to developing our great natural resources and placing this country in a prominent position, not only as a colony but as a community, that will command the respect of nations. (Hear, hear.) We must have these promises respecting the North-West and the canals fairly carried out, and not be placed in such a position that after the Intercolonial Railway shall have been constructed, there will be a combination of eastern interests to prevent the accomplishment of these other works and swamp the great North-West. If there is to be a doubt upon that point, I for one, without any hesitation, will state that I will not support a scheme that will admit of it. (Hear, hear.) I am most decidedly opposed to the Intercolonial Railway as a commercial undertaking. I believe it never can be made a profitable commercial work. But this I do believe, that situated as we are, with the probability of being shut out from the markets of the United States by the abrogation of the Reciprocity treaty—of being restricted in our commercial intercourse with the world by the repeal of the bonding system—of being crippled by every step the Americans may

take with the view of forcing us into closer political relations with them, it is our duty for purposes of self-defence, and with a view of placing ourselves in an independent position and having our resources developed, fairly, properly and honestly to carry out this scheme with the construction of the Intercolonial Railway as part of it. As a commercial work, I have looked into it in all its bearings, and have failed to see the advantages it will confer. The farmers of the grain-producing districts of Upper Canada have the same market to sell their surplus products as the farmers of the States, that is, the English market. Now, I think it is impossible to show that the produce of Upper Canada can be conveyed by this Intercolonial Railway to the seaboard, and thence to Liverpool, as profitably as the Americans can carry it to the seaboard at New York and thence to the English market. If by the one route the grain cannot be carried as cheaply as by the other, it is impossible for the Canadian farmer or merchant to be placed in as good a position as the American. But if, having constructed the Intercolonial Railway, our Government says, "We will compete with the Americans; we will put the rates of transportation so low as to offer our farmers as cheap a route by it as by the States," then the cost of this will have to be borne by the people in another way, for the road failing to pay even expenses, the excess of expenditure will become a charge upon the country for years. View it then in any light, and the proposed road cannot be made profitable. But for purposes of defence, and as a means of communication, if we desire to be united with the Lower Provinces and retain our connection with Great Britain, the construction of the road is a necessity. (Hear, hear.) I desire, Mr. SPEAKER, to state what in my opinion will be some of the commercial results of this union. If the North-West contains land, as I believe it does, equal to almost any on this continent, it should be placed in precisely the same position as regards Canada that the Western States occupy in relation to the Eastern. I believe we should endeavor to develop a great grain producing district; for whatever may be said, there is not any appreciable quantity of grain-producing land in the hands of the Government not now under cultivation in Canada, for the benefit of our increasing population. It is a melancholy fact that for the want of

such a country, our youth seek homes in a foreign land, who would remain under the British flag if homes were open to them there. (Hear, hear.) If we had that country open to them, to say nothing of the foreign immigration it would attract, it would afford homes for a large population from amongst ourselves now absorbed in the Western States. Again, we shall have the trade of that country carried through our midst, and profit by the transportation to the seaboard of the produce of a land which I look upon as one of the greatest grain-producing countries on the continent, equal in this respect to any of the fertile states of the west. (Hear, hear.) If we look at the marvellous growth of those states, we may form some idea of what our North-West territory may become, if properly developed. In 1830 the whole of that vast country was a wilderness. Now we find its exportation of grain, in addition to the quantities consumed, amounting to 120,000,000 annually. The population within a short period has increased from 1,500,000 to upwards of 9,000,000. We find it now, in fact, an empire of itself, possessing all the resources of wealth that any country could desire. What then may we not expect our great North-West to become? If we had it opened up, Canada would be the carriers of its produce, as the Middle States are the carriers of the Western States, and the manufacturers of its goods as the Eastern States are now the manufacturers of the goods consumed by the west. We would occupy towards it precisely the same position as the Eastern States occupy towards the Western; the produce of the North-West would find a profitable market amongst us, while our manufactories would increase and prosper, and we would be placed entirely independent of the United States in our commercial relations. (Hear, hear.) As we are now situated, the United States afford us a market, especially for our coarser grains, which will not bear the expense of long transportation. They have taken of our produce twenty millions annually since the Reciprocity treaty was negotiated. That trade must necessarily seek other channels. If we can open up the North-West; if we enlarge and improve our inland water communication—if we can build up a fleet of vessels to ply on our inland waters and owned by this great empire of provinces, then, instead of being dependent upon the United States, we would be in a position of

entire independence; we would then have in ourselves the substantial elements of progress; and we would have the advantage of loading our vessels at any of our own ports, and sending them direct to the Lower Provinces, the West Indies, and Europe. Then the Lower Provinces would have a profitable trade with us in oil, fish and other products, and a large fleet of vessels which would be employed in valuable commerce and increase the common prosperity of the whole country. (Hear, hear.) The union, if based on correct principles and carried out in honesty of purpose, will be for the advantage of all; and if our statesmen approach and finally consummate the work as enlightened and patriotic statesmen should do, their names will be handed down in the history of the Confederation with honor. (Hear, hear.) If, on the other hand, they fail to carry it out in this spirit; if by the union they entail an enormously increased expenditure, with extravagance and wild speculation, then they will do much to injure the country and check its prosperity. There is doubtless room for extravagance and speculation in connection with this scheme. The history of our railways shews beyond a doubt, that a large portion of the immense sum expended was spent in a very unsatisfactory manner—(hear, hear)—and that they might have been constructed without entailing such a large indebtedness upon the country; and if, guided by the experience of the past, the work now proposed is carried out in a proper manner, they will deserve the gratitude of the people. (Hear, hear.) In looking over the life of FRANKLIN, I found this passage, which occurs to me as illustrating a position very similar to that in which we are now placed:—

No sooner had it become clear to FRANKLIN that the French meant war, than his mind darted to the best means of resisting the attack. The French power in North America was wielded by a single hand, and all their measures were part of one scheme. The power of England, on the contrary, was dissipated among many governments, always independent of one another, often a little jealous, and never too cordial or neighborly. "We must unite or be overcome," said FRANKLIN, in May, 1754. Just before leaving home to attend Congress at Albany, he published an article to this effect, and appended to it one of those allegorical wood-cuts. It was a picture of a snake cut into as many pieces as there were colonies; each piece having upon it the first letter of the name of a colony, and under the whole, in large letters—"Join or die."

Mr. SPEAKER, I believe that our position

is similar at the present time. I believe that it is really the desire, the object and the aim of our neighbors ultimately, whether by force of arms or by the course they have recently adopted, to bring us into the American union. By crippling our resources, by destroying our trade and by threatening us with invasion, they hope to bring about, sooner or later, a feeling of dissatisfaction among the people of Canada and a desire for union. There is no question that, unless we take proper steps, the people of Canada will become dissatisfied. By union with the Lower Provinces, it is evident that we will be enabled to increase our trade to the amount of five or six millions of dollars, which is of itself a very strong inducement, aside from the other considerations that I have alluded to. I believe there are many members of this House in favor of the scheme, but who look upon it as so large a question that it ought, they say, to be submitted to a vote of the people. (Hear, hear.) It has been said by several members, and by the honorable gentleman who preceded me—"Shall we take away the rights of the people? Shall we enter upon a scheme of this importance without allowing them a voice? Have there been any petitions in favor of this scheme?" (Hear, hear.) That would certainly appear an argument that had great force; but if we take into consideration the effect of the agitation of any question in this House upon which the people feel strongly, we have a right to ask why has not a single petition been presented against it? We have the effect of this question well illustrated in the introduction, by the honorable member for West Brant, of a railway bill. That question the people of Western Canada have very strong feelings upon, and I think they have good reasons for it. We scarcely find that measure placed on the records of this House before we have petitions from all sections of the west, denouncing the bill as an attack upon the liberties of the people. They fear the power that it proposes to place in the hands of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Now, if the people of Canada object to this great scheme—and it has been placed before them in almost every light—the resolutions have been printed in almost every paper in Canada—months have been given for their consideration, and the whole subject has been placed before them in an eloquent manner by several of the honorable members of the Government—why have they not petitioned against it? The fact that they have not done so shows that they almost

unanimously acquiesce in what is being done. Since the Government pledged themselves to bring down a scheme for Confederation, the subject has been brought before nearly fifty constituencies in Canada, either by elections or by its being submitted to the consideration of the people by honorable members of this House, and the people of Upper Canada, at least, have in no instance voted disapproval of it. (Cries of "No, no.")

MR. A. MACKENZIE—At a large and popular meeting held in Toronto, a few evenings ago, only one man could be found to vote against it.

HON. MR. BROWN—Since the present Government was formed, and its policy announced, there has not been one election contest in which more or less importance was not attached by one candidate or another to this question. There have been no fewer than fifty-one constituencies, or portions of constituencies, appealed to since our policy was placed before the country, and in every instance that policy has been sustained. (Hear, hear, and cheers.)

MR. MCGIVERIN—I feel that I am at perfect liberty to support this measure. Perhaps I was the first to agitate and to lay the question before the people of the west in my own county. I stated to the people that I was in favor of representation according to population as a principle of justice, but that I believed that that question could be settled, and with it all our difficulties could be arranged by means of the larger project of the union of all the provinces. Many honorable gentlemen who oppose this scheme freely admit the importance of some change, but they have not proposed any substitute that would improve the scheme. I am satisfied that if the question were brought before the people of Canada, side issues, political and personal feeling and party questions would enter more largely into its consideration than Federation itself, and that therefore a correct verdict might not be obtained. I have endeavored to inform myself as to the precedents for submitting such a question to the people, and I have failed to find one precedent in its favor, while I have found several in favor of the method of dealing with it as proposed by the Government. The first I shall take the liberty of reading is from HANSARD, volume 85, as follows:—

At the time Sir R. PEEL proposed the change in the repeal of the corn laws to a House of Commons which had been elected in the interests of their maintenance, it was urged that he should have

advised a dissolution of Parliament before submitting this proposition, and that it was unprecedented and dangerous for the existing House to deal with the question. Sir R. PEELE took high grounds against the doctrine, declaring that whatever may have been the circumstances that may have taken place at the election, he never would sanction the view that any House of Commons is incompetent to entertain a measure which is necessary for the well-being of the country. He cited in proof of the soundness of this principle Mr. PITT's observations when a similar doctrine was proposed at the time of the union of England and Ireland, as it had been at the time of the union with Scotland. This view had been maintained in Ireland very vehemently, but it was not held by Mr. FOX, and only slightly hinted at by SHERIDAN, in reply to whom Mr. PITT defended the constitutional system that Parliament, without any previous appeal to the people, had a right to alter the succession to the throne, to disfranchise its constituents or associate others with them. "There could not," observed Sir R. PEELE, "be a more dangerous example, a more purely democratic precedent, if I may so say, than that this Parliament should be dissolved on the ground of its incompetency to decide on any question of this nature."

I think, sir, that that is a very strong argument; and here is another, from volume 35, page 857, of the *Parliamentary History of England*:—

The Parliament of Great Britain that had agreed to the legislative union with Ireland, incorporated with itself the members for Ireland, and then commenced the first session of the Parliament of the United Kingdom by electing a new Speaker and observing all the formalities usual upon the commencement of a new parliament without any previous dissolution."

Next, Mr. SPEAKER, I will take a quotation from an eminent authority of one of the most democratic countries in the world—a country whose people boast that nothing can be done without their sanction. I refer to the United States of America, and the work I now cite is SEDGWICK on *Constitutional Law*. Speaking of "cases where the Legislature has sought to divest itself of its real powers," he says:—

Efforts have been made in several cases, by state legislatures, to divest themselves of the responsibility of their functions by submitting statutes to the people; but these proceedings have been held, and very rightly, to be entirely unconstitutional and invalid. The government of the state is democratic, but it is a representative democracy in the legislature.

I shall make another extract from the *Constitutional History of England*, page 316, on the same subject:—

Upon this prevalent disaffection, and the gen-

eral dangers of the established government, was founded that measure so frequently arraigned in later times, the substitution of septennial for triennial parliaments. The ministry deemed it too perilous for their master, certainly for themselves, to encounter a general election in 1717; but the arguments adduced for the alteration, as it was meant to be permanent, were drawn from its permanent expediency. Nothing can be more extravagant than what is sometimes confidently pretended by the ignorant, that the legislature exceeded its rights by this enactment; or, if that cannot be legally advanced, that it at least violated the trust of the people, and broke in upon the ancient Constitution.

Sir, I think that these are pretty strong precedents on the subject, especially as I find not one precedent for submitting the question to the people. I do think that we owe and ought to pay to the wishes of the people every deference; and if I believed that any large portion of the people of Western Canada, or of the constituency which I represent, were in favor of having it submitted to the electors, I would feel it my duty to bow to their will and vote for its submission. But I am safe in saying that I have not conversed with one prominent individual in my county who was not strongly in favor of the proposed union. I will admit that the political ties that bind men together are strong ties, and approach to a great extent to the feeling of friendship, and perhaps there is no one values them more than I do; but when I aided, at the meeting of the Liberal party, a year ago, in bringing about the present movement, I did so believing that it was for the best interests of the country, and if properly carried out many of us will live to see this country become one of the greatest, happiest and freest on earth, because it possesses all the resources and all the material for wealth and prosperity that is found in any country. Nature has bountifully given us all she could well give towards making us a great and prosperous people. (Hear, hear.) Honorable gentlemen must admit that it is time a change should be brought about by some means, for it was a most melancholy sight to see the two sides of this House so evenly balanced against each other as they were during the two last sessions, the members spending night after night in useless discussion on personal grounds, instead of promoting useful legislation. Mr. SPEAKER, I fear if this course were continued for any length of time it would lead to serious results. There are certain bounds and limits, both to individuals, communities and nations, beyond which they cannot go with safety. I believe we had al-

most arrived at that point in this country. Who would have thought, a month before the attack on Fort Sumter, that a devastating civil war would have resulted from the angry discussions which took place in the Congress of the United States? Up to that time everyone professed to believe that the hard words bandied to and fro between the representatives of the North and South were mere characteristics of the people. And who knows but that the fearful scourge which has overtaken them might not have befallen us, had our sectional discussions continued with increasing bitterness and acrimony? These dreadful consequences are happily averted by the scheme now before us for reconciling our differences. (Hear, hear.) I am one of those alluded to by the honorable member for Hochelaga (Hon. Mr. DORION) as being an Upper Canada liberal who joined in supporting the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Government, and who, in so doing, gave up the demand for representation by population, which had for years agitated the western section of the province. For my part the feeling I had at the time was this: the MACDONALD-CARTIER and the CARTIER-MACDONALD Governments, which had for years, in different forms, ruled the country, had refused to give us representation by population. Our natural allies also, the Liberal party in Lower Canada—who, I believe, desired, and honestly desired, to do the best they could to meet our wishes—in like manner declared the impossibility of conceding to us this principle. Meanwhile the Liberal party from Upper Canada felt that the country was in a state of financial embarrassment, and that an amelioration of her condition was urgently needed. A change was absolutely necessary. It was wisely thought that it was better to have half a loaf than no bread. But I have failed to see, and I yet fail to see, that the Liberal party of Upper Canada have ever given up the advocacy of representation by population. We found all parties in Lower Canada—both the English-speaking population and French-speaking population—refusing to concede to us what we conceived to be this just and proper principle; and when the opportunity was offered to us of relieving the country from its difficulties, we felt that no party considerations or party ties should be allowed to interfere with what we conceived to be our sacred duty to our constituents and our country. (Hear, hear.) Notwithstanding the high personal feeling I entertain for the liberal members from Lower Canada, I cannot help saying that I think it

was wrong of them to have refused us the concession of the principle for which we had so long contended, and I feel now that we have higher aims and motives than those of a mere partisan character, that we owe a duty to our constituents and the country which should carry greater weight with it than party ties and party feelings. (Hear, hear.) The honorable member for North Ontario (Mr. M. C. CAMERON) has made an attack on the President of the Council for having hitherto denounced the construction of the Intercolonial Railway; and there is no doubt, Mr. SPEAKER, that if honorable members now in opposition were desirous of entertaining this House for a few hours, they could do so with a good deal of effect by reading the past speeches of that honorable gentleman and the articles that have appeared from time to time in his influential paper, the *Globe*, not only upon this question, but upon many others which have engaged the attention of the public mind. But I believe there is no man who felt more strongly than he did on account of the difficulties with which the country was surrounded, and all honorable gentlemen will agree with me when I say that I am persuaded that the Hon. President of the Council did not feign the feeling he manifested in this House when he arose and avowed his intention, for the good of his country, of joining with the men whom he had previously denounced. (Hear, hear.) But did he so act without a purpose, without receiving anything in return? No. The principle advocated by him and his party for years was conceded; and in addition to that, in my opinion, whatever may be the opinion of others—and it is an opinion I have held for years—by adopting the larger scheme we attain the same result. I ask, then, should the Hon. President of the Council be denounced now for the position he has felt it his duty to take; and, especially, should he be denounced by the Liberal party—by those with whom he has worked all his political life—both in Upper Canada and in Lower Canada, for taking the course he has taken in common with others, when by so doing he has attained that for which he has been struggling for years? (Hear, hear.) I believe that no man can leave his political party,—can leave that party with which all his political sympathies are identified and with which he has been working for years,—and step across to the other side of the House without deep feeling. And I do believe that the President of the Council experienced

acutely the position he felt it his duty to take at that time. And I can safely say for myself that such is my own feeling in regard to the question now before the House. If this were a question which could have been carried by the Liberal party of Upper and Lower Canada without their coalescing with the conservatives, I should feel more happy in my position than I do now. But to revive the old feeling and associations, to return to the criminations and recriminations, to revert once more to the bitter attacks we have heard in this chamber, could not be justified for a moment. And the Liberal party wisely came to the understanding that, pending the settlement of this question, they would let by-gones be by-gones. I earnestly hope that this scheme will be carried out without political acrimony or personal feeling. Whatever may be its result hereafter, time alone will determine. But as a Canadian, I feel—and the views I have entertained for many years only strengthen that feeling—that whatever my personal feelings may be, it is my duty to aid to the extent of my ability in the consummation of this great project. (Cheers.) It has been said that information will be brought down relative to the constitution of the local legislatures. Well, perhaps, that may accord with the views of this House. But it would have been more satisfactory to me could the scheme have been brought down while we are discussing the resolutions now before the House. If, however, the Government have not matured that scheme, or if they feel it is to the public interest that it should not be submitted at this time, on them must rest the responsibility. In voting for these resolutions, I am simply voting to affirm the principle of Confederation of the provinces; and if the propositions which shall hereafter be brought down for the formation of the local governments and Legislatures are not satisfactory to me; if I conceive them to be unjust in principle or opposed to public interest and policy, I shall feel myself at perfect liberty to vote against them. (Hear, hear.) I look upon the two as distinct propositions.

HON. MR. BROWN—Hear, hear.

MR. MCGIVERIN—There are many things in these resolutions I would like to see eliminated; but where there were so many parties to the contract or partnership, and where there were so many contending views to harmonise and interests to serve, I believe it was utterly impossible for each province to get just what it wanted. We have the best

evidence of this fact from the peculiar views taken by the non-contents in the Lower Provinces at this time. They say they are going into this union with Canada, which is a bankrupt province, and that they will be ruined by the connection. And we heard only a day or two ago the strange idea expressed that the Intercolonial Railway was opposed to the true interests of Lower Canada, but from an Upper Canadian stand point it was just the thing that is wanted. (Laughter.) We find a section of the people in Lower Canada opposing the work on the ground that it will tend to destroy their language and nationality; and we find also the British element in Lower Canada complain that in the arrangement for the Local Legislature their rights and privileges will be swept away. (Hear, hear.) On the other hand, Upper Canadians are opposing the scheme as injurious to their true interests, and asserting that the financial difficulties likely to arise under it will be detrimental to the welfare of the west; so that where there is such great diversity of opinion, it was impossible to mature a scheme which should be in all respects perfect and satisfactory. No doubt Upper Canada has some cause to complain. For instance, the eighty cents per head for carrying on the local governments appears unfair in principle to Upper Canada, and as such they have reason to feel dissatisfied. This apportionment is on the present basis of population, and whatever may be the increase in numbers of the western section of the province, if even we increase during the next ten years in the same ratio that we have been increasing for the past ten years; if we double our population we shall still only get the eighty cents per head for the present population. There is no doubt this is an objectionable feature.

HON. MR. BROWN—Will my honorable friend allow me to assure him that he is slightly in error, and to show him how he is so? Supposing we increase in population, the other provinces will increase also, and the only unfairness that could possibly exist in the case supposed would be in so far as the population of Upper Canada was relatively greater than that of the other provinces.

HON. MR. HOLTON—It is a matter of ratio.

HON. MR. BROWN—Yes, it is simply a question of ratio. My honorable friend will see how the principle works. At the rate we are proceeding now, some 2½, 3, or 4 per cent., it would take a great many years before

any injustice to Upper Canada could arise. And then my honorable friend will see how it is to be distributed afterwards in the way of population, so that although there might be a little loss in the first instance, there would be an immense gain in the end.

MR. MCGIVERIN—I am glad to hear all these explanations. As I said before, I wish for the fullest and freest discussion. I may not have made myself acquainted with all the details of the scheme, and a question of this importance ought to be discussed in all its bearings. This is a point, however, which did occur to me as objectionable. Then the imposition of an export duty in regard to the productions of some of the provinces, appears to me to be contrary to the true principles of government. But it is said that this has been imposed simply in the way of a stumpage. (Hear, hear.) There are, no doubt, various objections which may be brought against these resolutions. There are grounds enough for honorable gentlemen in the opposition to make excellent speeches against them. But what I would wish to impress upon the House is this, that we should approach this subject in a spirit of candor, honestly desiring to meet the question fairly in all its bearings. The question is simply this, Shall we vote for these resolutions, notwithstanding their imperfections? I freely admit that, in my view, there are imperfections in the scheme. But shall we, on that account, take the responsibility of throwing out the resolutions? That, I think, is the question we have to consider. Honorable gentlemen may differ from me, but I feel that the advantages of the contemplated union are such, that notwithstanding the objectionable features in the scheme, I would not be doing my duty to my constituents, I would not be discharging the duty I owe to my country, were I to vote against it, and thus lend my influence to prevent the consummation of that union. (Hear, hear.) I thank the House for the indulgence accorded to me, and I only add this, in conclusion, that I would ask every honorable gentleman, in considering this scheme, to look at it in all its possible bearings, free from personal or party prejudices; to look at the position we occupy and have occupied for years past in this country; to look at the wretched spectacle we presented here, night after night, when placed in antagonism to each other by our sectional feelings and jealousies; and to say whether it is possible that we can be placed in a worse or more humiliating position than that which we have

occupied hitherto on account of those sectional antagonisms. Let honorable gentlemen consider the matter in a proper spirit, desiring to take that course which is for the best interests of the country. If the principle of this union is wrong, the scheme should be rejected; if, on the other hand, it is right, it deserves our support. And as yet I have not heard one honorable member of this House declare himself opposed to the principle of union. The objections have been only to details. And I do say that when honorable gentlemen oppose a scheme of this sort, while admitting that they are favorable to a union of all the provinces, they ought to propose their own scheme, and submit it to the House for its approval or rejection. (Cheers.)

MR. DUNKIN then moved that the debate be adjourned.

HON. MR. HOLTON, in seconding the motion for the adjournment of the debate, said—I am sure the House has listened with very great pleasure to the speech of my honorable friend the member for Lincoln (Mr. MCGIVERIN). I certainly did. It is true that, towards its conclusion, he halted somewhat in his logic. Still, on the whole, it was an able and spirited speech. (Hear, hear.) But there is one point to which I desire to call the attention of honorable gentlemen opposite, as arising out of the speech of my honorable friend, and, as bearing on the future course of this debate, it is a matter of very great importance. He said that he should oppose this scheme—that he should vote against this proposition—unless he had the distinct assurance of the Government that the enlargement of our canals and the opening of the North-West territory should proceed *pari passu* with the construction of the Inter-colonial Railroad. I ask him whether I have stated his position correctly.

MR. MCGIVERIN—I will explain—

HON. MR. HOLTON—I want no explanations. I want him merely to say whether I have rendered him correctly or not. If I have incorrectly represented him, he will say so. I am quite sure I have not. While he was making that statement I emphasized it in the usual parliamentary way, and the President of the Council (Hon. Mr. BROWN) emphasized it also, giving his assent to it, as I understood. Now, I think it is of the last importance that we should understand distinctly whether the Government do really take that view of the matter; whether my honorable friend correctly stated the position of the Government in that respect; and whether the

"Hear, hear" of my honorable friend the President of the Council was to be understood as implying the assent of the Government to that proposition.

MR. MCGIVERIN—If my hon. friend will allow me a moment to answer his question, it may save a good deal of discussion. What I said was this—that if I believed that the Government would not honestly and faithfully carry out their pledges with regard to the opening of the North-West and the enlargement of the canals, the improvement of our internal and water communications; if I believed they did not honestly and sincerely intend to carry out those measures, I would oppose them.

HON. MR. HOLT—"Hand in hand" was the expression used. (Cries of "No, no!" "Yes, yes!")

HON. MR. BROWN—I apprehend my honorable friend from Lincoln perfectly understood what he was speaking about. What he said was this—that he understood the Government were pledged, as a portion of their policy, to the enlargement of the canals and the opening up of the North-West, as well as the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, and that he believed we were sincere in the earnest determination to go on with all those works at the earliest possible moment. He was perfectly correct in making that statement. The Government are pledged to that. If my honorable friend has any doubt about it, he will find it there in the conditions of agreement come to by the Conference. And I apprehend it will be found that my honorable friend is not in the slightest degree more earnest in his desire to promote those improvements than are my colleagues who sit beside me, from Lower as well as Upper Canada. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. HOLT and MR. BELLEROSE rising almost simultaneously,

MR. SPEAKER stated that Mr. BELLEROSE had first caught his eye.

MR. BELLEROSE—MR. SPEAKER, before I give my vote on the great question which now engages the attention of this honorable House, I consider it a duty to my constituents and also to myself that I should say a few words on this important measure, and reply to some of the arguments put forth by the honorable members of the opposition—arguments specious in appearance, but in reality futile and unworthy of consideration. Were I to particularize all the difficulties which have threatened for some years past to bring the wheels of government to a dead-

lock, to relate the history of all the crises through which the various administrations which have succeeded each other have passed, to recall to your minds the state of anarchy which has for some time threatened to render all legislation impossible, it would be a waste of time and trouble, as on all sides there is but one opinion, acknowledging the lamentable position of the province, and the urgent necessity of finding a remedy for the evils which beset the future of our country. It was, MR. SPEAKER, in obedience to the voices of a whole people calling on the patriotism of their statesmen, conjuring them to seek out some remedy for the cruel distemper which pervades the body politic and threatens it with dissolution, that the members of the administration, forgetting the past, burying in oblivion all former disagreements, united together to search for the grand remedy, the value of which we are now to discuss. Those honorable gentlemen have deserved well of their country, and I am glad that I can avail myself of the present occasion to offer them my thanks and my congratulations for the admirable and noble sentiments of patriotism of which they have given proofs—proofs well understood by the people, and certain to be repaid by their applause. I have already taken occasion, at the commencement of the session, to express my views of the general scheme of Confederation which the Government has presented for the consideration of this House. I declared, MR. SPEAKER, that I felt not the least hesitation in declaring myself favorable to the union, but that I could have wished, were it practicable, that certain of the resolutions might be amended. It would be useless, therefore, to repeat what I said on this head, and I proceed to examine the arguments of the opponents of the plan. It has been said—the honorable member for Hochelaga has said, I believe—that the people had had no opportunity of expressing their opinions on this important measure. If we look back at the occurrences of the last six months, when we look at all that has been said and done in that time, and recollect all the falsehoods and deceptions uttered and attempted to be imposed on the people by the enemies of the measure, we must arrive at a very different conclusion from that of the honorable member for Hochelaga and his friends. The last session was hardly well concluded when the opponents of the present Government took the field, not to discuss in a frank and loyal spirit the promise made by the Administration that they intended to seek in the Federation of the

Canadas, or of all the provinces of British North America, a remedy for all our sectional difficulties, but, on the contrary, with a steadfast resolution to labor with all their might to crush the Coalition. Such was their design, and their works have been consistent. What indeed have we since beheld? Men who for years past have devoted their pen to the unhallowed work of undermining the Catholic religion and vilifying its ministers, who have long aimed at destroying in the minds of French-Canadians all love for their peculiar institutions—the safeguards of our nationality; men who more recently promulgated dissertations on rationalism which our prelates have condemned; these men we have seen, professing to be suddenly struck and animated with flowing zeal in favor of our institutions, our religion and our clergy, take the field, and, uninvited by any, canvass the country, descending to entreat all who loved their nationality to join them in their crusade, and representing to them that those who gave in to the plans of the Government would be accessories to the annihilation of their religion, the murder of their good pastors, and the ruin of the people themselves by the load of taxes which would be laid on them. They conjured them to lose no time in protesting against this dreadful scheme of Confederation, which was sure to ruin and destroy them. Have we not seen, moreover, a press, conducted by a spirit of unbridled license, calling itself the protector of the people, scattering insults and abuse on the heads of the members of the existing Government, calumniating some and holding up all as objects of contempt, representing the Lower Canadian members of it as ready to sell their country for filthy lucre, for the fruits of office, publishing violent diatribes condemnatory of Confederation, falsely purporting to be written by members of the clergy, &c., employing, in short, all means to excite the prejudices of the people against the scheme of the Government; and what has been the result? The people listened to them, but were so far from answering to the appeal made to them, that up to this time hardly any petitions have been presented to this House against the plan of Confederation. Now, if the Opposition have not been able to convince the people that these constitutional changes are prejudicial to Lower Canada, when they discussed the subject without contradiction in their own way, will they find better success when the friends of the cause are at hand to refute their arguments and to shew up what kind of patriot-

ism is theirs? I think not. I may then safely assume that the people have had the opportunity of pronouncing against the project, but have refused to do so; and the honorable member for Hochelaga is mistaken when he declares that an appeal to the country is necessary in order to ascertain the opinion of the public concerning it. Year by year that honorable gentleman complains that our election laws are defective; that money prevails to the prejudice of merit in our election contests. How can he then demand that so momentous a question as this of the union of the provinces should undergo the ordeal of a popular vote, without any other view than that of involving the country in trouble and expense to the extent of several hundred thousand dollars? I, for my part, Mr. SPEAKER, am opposed to an appeal to the people. Every member has had time to consult the opinion of his constituents at leisure, and aloof from the turmoil and agitation incidental to an election. In this way, when the project submitted by the Government shall have undergone the ordeal of a vote of this Honorable House, we shall have the satisfaction of saying with truth—"So would public opinion have it to be." It is true the honorable member for Hochelaga tells us that in all the counties in which meetings have been held, the people have given their voices against Confederation. To this assertion I have no need to make any answer. All the honorable members of this House are well aware of the means used by the opponents of Confederation to procure the passing of resolutions to their liking at meetings generally representing small, nay very small, minorities of the electors; and to cite only one example, I shall take the case of the county of Hochelaga, in which the votes are about 2,400 in number. The friends of the honorable member for that county, without any previous notice, proceeded on a certain Sunday in the month of January last to one of the parishes of that county, being that of Sault-au-Récollet, which contains about three hundred voters. There they thundered out their anathemas against Confederation, as being subversive of religion, intended to crush the clergy, and ruin the people, finishing with an appeal to the patriotism of their audience and entreaties that they would raise their voices against so objectionable a measure. Next day we read in the opposition papers: "In the county of Hochelaga, Confederation was unanimously condemned by both parties on Sunday last, at Sault-au-Récollet." The honorable gen-

tleman (Hon. Mr. DORION) has told us that the meeting of the county of Laval, which was held before the session, had been scarcely advertised, and that I had not ventured to put the question of Confederation on its trial. I beg to remark, sir, that the honorable member is not candid in making this assertion, and is ignorant of what did really occur. The meeting of the county of Laval was announced at the doors of the several churches in the county; afterwards an influential person in each parish, after mass on the feast of the Epiphany, urged the electors, one and all, to attend the important meeting at which the question of Confederation was to be taken into consideration. The opponents of the measure were invited to meet me, as I can sufficiently prove in due time and place, but their hearts failed them—none came. At that meeting, composed of a majority of my constituents, I stated at great length all that the opponents of the project had to say against it, and the reasons which its friends and advocates had to advance in its favor. I then asked to be informed of the views of the electors. They desired me to give my own on the subject. I declared that unless the sense of the county was opposed to the measure, I was inclined to give it my support. This declaration was followed by an unanimous vote, approving of my conduct in Parliament, and declaring that having full confidence in me, they left me at full liberty to vote according to my conscience on this great measure. Let the hon. member deny this if he can. The hon. member (Hon. Mr. DORION) has stated "that it was not right to change the Constitution without an appeal to the decision of the people." As a complete answer to that assertion, I shall quote the words spoken by the honorable gentleman on the 2nd February, 1859—"If he (Hon. Mr. DORION) had remained in power, he would have proposed a measure for the settlement of the representation question, and would have submitted it to the decision of the House," &c., &c. Has not the honorable member changed his opinions? When a member of the Government in 1858, he did not admit that the people had the right to be consulted on the constitutional changes he wished to propose; but as a Leader of the Opposition, in 1865, he refuses to the Legislature the right of effecting such changes without an appeal to the people: *Tempora mutantur et nos mutamur in illis*. What a contradiction! Such is the effect of party spirit. The honorable member for Hochelaga says, "that he had been accused of having

been in favor of a Confederation of all the provinces of British North America, but he peremptorily denied the truth of that statement; on the contrary, he had always opposed that union as a measure calculated to bring us into trouble and to create embarrassment." Mr. SPEAKER, either the honorable gentleman's logic or else his sincerity is at fault. Let us examine. On reading over the speeches cited by himself in support of his denial, what do I find? "A time will perhaps come when the Confederation of all the provinces will be necessary, but I am not in favor of it at this moment." Further on I find: "I trust the time will come when it will be desirable for the Canadas to unite federatively with the Lower Provinces, but the time has not yet arrived for such a measure."—(Speech of 3rd May, 1860.) Now what is the conclusion, the only logical conclusion to be deduced from the honorable member's words? None other than the following: that in all these instances he declared himself in favor of a Confederation of all the provinces, sooner or later. The honorable member therefore deceived his electors when he said to them in his manifesto of the 7th November last: "Every time I have had an opportunity I have invariably expressed myself opposed to any union, whether Legislative or Federal, with the Maritime Provinces." He wished, therefore, to mislead this House, when in his speech at the commencement of this debate he attempted to show that he had been wrongfully accused on that point, and that the expressions he had used had been tortured into every shape in order to establish the attacks made upon him. In the political letter of the honorable member to his constituents, to which I alluded a moment ago, I find the following words: "The proposed union appears to me to be premature." If the words have any meaning at all, do they not prove that the honorable member admitted the necessity of such a union sooner or later? The honorable member was therefore not sincere when he wrote to his electors that he was always opposed to the Confederation of the provinces of British North America. (Hear.) The honorable gentleman stated "that he could not understand how Confederation could increase our means of defence, * * * * * that if the union brought any advantage in that respect, the Maritime Provinces and not Canada would reap the benefit." If the honorable member had taken the trouble to study the question, I think he would have arrived at a different

conclusion. Suppose that peace were established amongst our neighbors, and that the government of the United States decided to effect the conquest of the British colonies, does the honorable member think it would be difficult for the armies of the great republic to enter the Province of New Brunswick and conquer it, and to continue their triumphal march through Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland? And what would the honorable member think of our position if, in order to find means of communicating with the rest of the world, we were compelled to solicit the permission of our powerful neighbors? I ask him whether, if these conquests were made, Canada would not find herself in a more critical position than she is to-day? Our position would no longer be tenable, and despite our repugnance for a union with the neighboring States, we should find ourselves so placed that there would remain to us no alternative but union with the United States. To defend the Maritime Provinces, therefore, is to defend Canada; to protect them against invasion is, therefore, to protect Canada, to increase our own power and strength, and to augment our means of defence; viewing things in this light, what matters it that in proportion to our population the greater share of the expenditure to be undergone by the Federal Government for general defence must be met by Canada, since all that expenditure will benefit us, and since it is essentially necessary for our defence. (Applause.) The honorable member will, perhaps, reply that all the provinces might come to an understanding and bind themselves towards one another for these critical times, and that there would then be no necessity for the proposed union. Mr. SPEAKER, the honorable member knows, and every one acquainted, I do not say with the art of defence, but with the mere elements of that art which common sense itself suggests, knows that the first principle, the fundamental principle of that art is unity of authority, unity of action; and if any honorable member doubt the necessity of this, let him peruse the history of the neighboring republic and he will there see the sad evils resulting from want of unity. "The proposed changes are not at all necessary," says the honorable member for Hochelaga. I admit that it was with no little surprise I heard the honorable member express himself thus, remembering as I did that in every instance he had expressed the contrary opinion, as I shall now prove. In 1858, on the 7th July, he said:—

Ere long it will become impossible to resist the demand of Upper Canada; if representation by population is not granted now, it will infallibly be carried hereafter, but then without guarantees for the protection of the French Canadians. The repeal of the union, Federal union, representation by population, or some other great change must absolutely be carried out, and for my part I am prepared to examine the question of representation by population, &c. I am ready, in like manner, to take into consideration the project of a Confederation of the provinces, which would leave to each section the administration of its local affairs, &c., and to the General Government the administration of the public lands.

On the 10th August, 1858, addressing the citizens of Montreal, he said: "We (the BROWN-DORION Government) found that these difficulties might be smoothed away either by adopting a Federal union or some other modification of our Constitution based upon representation by population." In his election address of the 13th August of the same year, he adds: "There was no room for hesitation and the discussion soon suggested that by means of constitutional changes, accompanied by proper checks and guarantees, &c., or by the application of the Federal principle, it was possible to prepare a measure which would meet the approval of the majority of Upper and of Lower Canada, while adopting population as the basis of representation." On the 2nd February, 1859, in his speech on the address, &c., the honorable gentleman said: "That if he had remained in power he would have proposed a measure for the settlement of the representation question, &c., admitting the principle of representation by numbers." On the 3rd May, 1860, the honorable member declared in the House: "A year ago the whole Cabinet admitted that constitutional changes were absolutely necessary, &c. But if Upper Canada desires representation by population, I am ready to grant it, for I am convinced that an ever-increasing number of representatives of the people will come here to claim it after each election, as a measure of justice. I am convinced that there will be a collision between Upper and Lower Canada." These extracts prove undeniably the truth of the statement I advanced a moment ago. How then is the conduct of the honorable gentleman to be explained? How can any one put faith in the sincerity of the opposition he now offers to the project under consideration? Clearly, Mr. SPEAKER, party spirit is the motive of his opposition to the measure. When a minister, the Hon. Mr. DORION admitted the diffi-

culty of the position; he acknowledged that a speedy remedy was required in order to prevent a collision between Upper and Lower Canada; he was prepared to seek out means of remedying these evils; but now that he is in opposition he no longer sees the difficulties; the position is a good one, the proposed changes are no longer necessary; and, in order to oppose them, to what length is he not prepared to go? The honorable member uses his influences over a respectable old man, who heretofore had remained apart from political struggles; he persuades him that his country is on the brink of an abyss; he tells him how necessary and what an imperative duty it is for all good citizens to unite for the defence of our institutions, our language, our usages, in fact our very national existence. And the good old gentleman tears himself from his beloved retirement and becomes the willing instrument of a factious opposition. I might have believed in the sincerity of the honorable gentleman (Hon. Mr. DORION) if I had heard him admit that he had changed his opinions and say that he had formerly entertained certain views on the difficulty of our position and the necessity of providing a remedy. But no, he comes to us with the assurance to declare that he has never changed his opinions, and yet the journals and debates of the House are before him to convince him of the contrary. What a position. (Hear, hear.) The honorable gentleman added—"The people are satisfied with their present position." Since last session more than twenty counties have been called upon to elect new representatives, and they have all, one perhaps excepted, elected supporters of the Government and of the scheme which is now under discussion. And yet the honorable member tells us, with an appearance of good faith which I shall not animadvert on now, that the people are satisfied with their position; and lastly, the honorable member for Hochelaga says—"Confederation is direct taxation." The honorable gentleman is the very last who ought to have raised this objection. Does he forget that, in 1863, one of the members of his Government, the Honorable Minister of Finance, when he brought down his budget, declared to this House that the time had arrived when it had become necessary to accustom the people to direct taxation. What possible effect, then, can this objection have in the mouth of the honorable gentleman, other than to afford a still further proof of the absence of good faith which he has displayed in the discussion of this important measure of the Federal union?

Besides, the present Honorable Minister of Finance, in his learned speech on this question, has given a most lucid explanation of the question of the finances, and has made it clear to us that the local governments will receive more than they will require to meet their expenditure. Lower Canada, whose expenditure, including the interest on her share of the debt remaining charged to Canada, will amount to \$1,237,000, will receive from the Central Government eighty cents a-head, making \$900,000, which, added to its other revenues, will make its annual receipts amount to \$1,440,000, shewing an annual excess of revenue over expenditure amounting to \$200,000. The objection of the honorable member is only a pretext, which ought not to shake the confidence of the most timid. The honorable gentleman denies the correctness of the calculations of the honorable member for Sherbrooke, it is true, but in a matter of such vast importance, the House and the country have a right to something more than a mere denial. Let honorable gentlemen on the other side of the House prove the error of the Honorable Minister of Finance, and then, and not before, they may hope to bring conviction home to the friends of the scheme. I now come to the arguments of the honorable member for Lotbinière. Since I first took my seat in Parliament, I had learned to esteem that honorable gentleman; his conduct, always so honorable, and the good faith which appeared to govern his whole conduct as a legislator, had inspired me with the highest respect for him. But what was my surprise to see him condescend to the part which we have seen him play on the occasion of his speech on the great question now before the House! To act a comic part, to make a buffoon of one's self, and, at the same time, discussing a scheme for a new Constitution which, it is alleged, will obliterate a whole people, and reciting from history all the evils which democratic doctrines have brought upon the human race. What a contrast! How courageous! And the *Montagne* applauded the recital by the honorable gentleman of all the scenes of horror, discord, revolution and civil war which democratic principles had brought about in all those parts of the world in which these notions had prevailed. What impudence? May the people, Mr. SPEAKER, profit by the lesson. The honorable member for Lotbinière has told us that the Federal system carried in itself a principle fatal to its existence, and that all confederations died of consumption. Then

opening the volume of history, the honorable gentleman has depicted to us all the republics of ancient and modern times gradually succumbing under the pressure of the discord, civil wars and revolutions to which that form of government had given birth. The argument was specious. It is only to be regretted, as regards the honorable gentleman, that the honorable members of the Quebec Conference, convinced that, to make sure of the future, it was advisable to consult and to study the past, adopted monarchical principles as the basis of the new Confederation, instead of founding it on those democratic doctrines which proved so fatal to all the confederacies referred to by the honorable gentleman. Confederation is the obliteration of Lower Canada, the honorable member for Lotbinière has further told us. I am far from being of that opinion. Lower Canada has since the union beheld, for a period of twenty-four years, her institutions at the mercy of a majority different in origin, in religion, and in language. Under Confederation, on the other hand, Lower Canada will have the administration of all she holds most dear—her nationality, and I am rejoiced to find in the speech of the honorable member for Hochelaga some few words which abundantly prove my proposition. "It will be impossible," says that honorable gentleman, "for the Federal Government ever to interfere in any legislation relating to the institutions or laws of Lower Canada. If they attempted, the fifty or sixty members of French origin, uniting as one man, would very soon put a stop to any legislation, thus compelling the majority to afford them justice." (Hear, hear.) Lower Canada, it is true, will be in a minority in the Central Legislature, but we must not lose sight of the fact that the interests of the Lower Provinces are less identical with the interests of Upper Canada than they are with those of Lower Canada; and, moreover, our position in the centre of the state also adds to our influence. On the other hand, responsible government is essentially a government of parties; the national French-Canadian representation will have all that influence which fifty or sixty votes given to one side of the House or the other can exercise; the one party or the other will count upon the votes of the French-Canadian section, just as in England the Protestant majority in Parliament is not made up without the votes of the Catholic minority. Thus the position of Lower Canada will be a strong one, and much to be preferred to that which it holds under the existing union. Other

honorable members have assigned as reasons of their opposition "the increased expenditure entailed by the proposed union." To this objection I have only, Mr. SPEAKER, to make the same reply which I have already given on another occasion. Will not Confederation, whilst remedying our sectional difficulties, contribute to the progress and advancement of these colonies? Will it not increase our means of defence, securing at the same time to Lower Canada the exclusive control of its institutions, its laws and its nationality? If to this proposition we are compelled, after careful consideration, to reply in the negative, then, undoubtedly, we ought to reject the scheme; but if, on the contrary, our answer is in the affirmative, we ought to accept it, even although our expenditure should be increased, for it becomes the means of safety—*Salus populi suprema lex*. Certain other members object "that the Legislative Council is to be subject to the nomination of the Crown." For my part, I see no ground of objection in this; on the contrary, I look upon it as an argument in favor of the scheme. I have always been opposed to the elective system in that branch of our Legislature. We have but one class in our society, we have no aristocracy. Why, then, should we have two popular chambers? In my opinion, it would have been wiser to abolish the Council than to make it elective. In the spirit of the English Constitution, the Legislative Council is a tribunal for purifying the legislation of the Commons, for weighing in the balance of experience the probable consequences of their legislation. These advantages, Mr. SPEAKER, will soon disappear under the elective system, which will cause the members of that body to lose that perfect independence requisite for the proper fulfilment of the high mission entrusted to them by the Constitution. In addition to this, the trouble of elections, the expenses which they entail, and the other difficulties inseparable from those great struggles, will very often prevent the entrance into that honorable body of the most competent men, whom the disgust inspired by all the difficulties I have just referred to, will induce to avoid public life and to remain in private life. For these reasons and in the public interest, I rejoice to see the return to the nominative principle. (Hear, hear.) I should have liked to have replied to some of the other arguments urged by honorable members of the Opposition, but I perceive, Mr. SPEAKER, that I have already taken up a good deal of time, and I consider that in view of the lateness of the

hour, it is my duty to conclude. In conclusion I may be permitted to add that I am now more strongly in favor of the scheme of Confederation that we are now considering, than I was at the time of the debate on the resolutions in reply to the Speech from the Throne. Then I had some doubts, but the position taken by the opponents of the measure has sufficed to dissipate them. A cause must indeed be a bad one, Mr. SPEAKER, when such men as those whom I see on the other side cannot find arguments to support their views, which are worthy of being discussed, and who, in order to maintain their position, are obliged to resort to such means as honorable gentlemen opposite, with their friends, have been compelled to have recourse to since it has been under consideration to establish a Federal union of the British North American Provinces. (Cheers.)

On motion of Mr. DUNKIN, the debate was then adjourned.

—○—
MONDAY, February 27, 1865.

MR. DUNKIN said—Mr. SPEAKER, almost every one who has yet spoken in this debate has begun with some expression of his feeling of embarrassment. For my own part, I should be glad if I could begin in some other way, but I confess that I cannot. For I certainly never did rise to address this House, or any other public body, under a feeling of such oppressive embarrassment as I experience at this moment. It is impossible for me, occupying the position in which I now stand, not to feel that I am opposed to powerful odds, and that there is a sort of foregone conclusion, here, against the views I desire to impress upon the House. It is impossible for me not to feel that the considerations to which I have to ask the attention of the House, are so many and so complex, that no sort of justice can possibly be done them within the limits of my capacity to speak, or of yours to listen. The interests at stake, too, are so large—so much larger than ever were at stake in any question which has yet been brought under the notice of this House, and the difficulties arising out of the question are so formidable, owing in no small measure to what I must call the many reticences with which this scheme has been laid before us, and the ambiguities of expression which

everywhere characterize it, as to tax seriously the courage of those who may attempt to discuss it. I feel, besides, that I am entirely cut off from that description of remark which most of all tends to make one's speech pleasant to listen to; for I cannot prophecy smooth things, or dilate on the marvels of progress to result from Confederation in the future. There is a character of hurry, too, impressed on the whole style of this debate; everybody feels so impatient, that one can scarcely hope to express his views fully, as he would wish and ought, on this vast scheme. I have even the feeling that my capacity for exertion is not up to its ordinary standard. I address the House in a state of health that renders me less capable than usual of physical exertions. I must, therefore, beg honorable members to make allowance for these circumstances surrounding my position; believing me that what I wish to do is to present as briefly as I can, and as truthfully as I can, my own deep seated convictions on the question now before the House. (Hear, hear.) So strongly, Mr. SPEAKER, do I feel my inability to discuss this scheme as I could wish, that I almost must throw myself on the forbearance of hon. members—that I hardly can help saying I should be in danger of shrinking from the duty of addressing you, but for the recollection that time and again, I have known, in cases of contest almost or quite as discouraging as this, that “the race has not been to the swift nor the battle to the strong”—that time and again I have known those who went into such contests with the best hopes of success, disappointed in their expectations. I do know, and I know that others know—I believe it to be the general conviction of those whom I address to-night, as regards this question, that whatever of popular feeling there may seem to be in favor of the views I have to combat, is anything but the deliberate result of a well-considered examination of the whole subject—is a feeling of most sudden growth, and of most passing character. (Hear, hear.) Before I go further, I may be permitted distinctly to accept the challenge which has been more than once thrown out on the other side as to the manner in which this question ought to be discussed. I freely admit and sincerely maintain that it ought not to be discussed otherwise than as a great question, to be considered entirely on a large view of its

merits. It is not a question of party, it is not a question of persons, it is not a question of merely local, or class, or passing interest, and it is not to be met by any of those passing appeals which are too often resorted to. It is not to be settled upon any ground of mere theory, or by any criticism of mere details. It requires indeed to be taken up at once as a question of principle, and also as a question of detail, involving a multitude of details; and there must necessarily be a careful criticism of such details. The question really presented is this: on the whole, viewing them collectively, are the details involved in this great scheme such as to commend the scheme itself to our approbation, or are they not? (Hear, hear.) I pledge myself that I will discuss the question from that point of view. I will do my utmost to avoid mere passing or personal allusions. I will try to tread the dangerous ground before me without arousing dangerous feelings. I do not know that I can succeed, but at least I will make the effort. This, however, I am bound to repeat at the outset, that no one can do justice to a question like this, and start with the idea of at all ignoring details. Here is a measure proposed for our acceptance, embodied in seventy-two resolutions, and which resolutions affirm a great many more than seventy-two propositions, connected with almost every principle known to have reference to the theory and practice of popular government. I say it is a scheme which is as complex and as vast as one can well imagine, and declamation about first principles can be of no real use in its discussion—can avail only to mislead in reference to it. We have to deal with no mere abstract question of a nationality, or of union or disunion, or of a Federal as opposed to a Legislative union. It is idle to talk vaguely about the maintenance of British connection, or to go into magnificent speculations about the probable results of independence, or blindly to urge this scheme as a sure preventative of annexation to the United States. These cheap and easy generalities are thoroughly unreliable. The only question is, how is this plan, in its entirety, going to work? And this question is one which is not easy to answer; it is one requiring much patience, and a close examination of details. It is the question which, if the House will lend me its attention, I will endeavor to discuss to the extent of my ability. (Hear, hear.) I may further

take leave to say at starting, that I do not approach this question from any new point of view whatever. Always I have been, and now I am, a unionist in the strictest and largest sense of the term. I desire to perpetuate the union between Upper and Lower Canada. I desire to see developed, the largest union that can possibly be developed (I care not by what name you call it) between all the colonies, provinces, and dependencies of the British Crown. I desire to maintain that intimate union which ought to subsist, but which unfortunately does not subsist as it ought, between the Imperial Government and all those dependencies. I am a unionist, who especially does not desire to see the provinces of Upper and Lower Canada disunited. To my mind, this scheme does not at all present itself as one of union; and if hon. gentlemen opposite will admit the truth, they will acknowledge that, practically, it amounts to a disunion between Upper and Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) I confess that I am irreconcilably opposed to that portion of the scheme. I repeat I do not care to see Upper and Lower Canada more dis severed than they are; on the contrary, I wish to see them brought into closer union; and far from regarding this scheme as cementing more closely the connection of these provinces with the British Empire, I look upon it as tending rather towards a not distant disunion of these provinces from the British Empire. (Hear, hear.) My position as regards this scheme is that of one who desires to see this union perpetuated, and not of one who would contemplate a state of disunion between any of the component parts of the British Empire. I hold that proper means ought to be taken to prevent our disunion from the British Empire and absorption into the United States, and that this scheme by no means tends that way. I have no fancy for democratic or republican forms or institutions, or indeed for revolutionary or political novelties of any sort. The phrase of "political creation" is no phrase of mine. I hold that the power to create is as much a higher attribute than belongs to man, in the political world, as in any other department of the universe. All we can do is to attend to and develop the ordinary growth of our institutions; and this growth, if it is to be healthy at all, must be slow. There must be the same slow, steady change in political matters, which answers to the growth visible in the

physical world. I do believe in this gradual development of our institutions, but I do not believe in any of those violent and sudden changes which have for their object the creation of something entirely new. I fear this scheme is just of the character to prevent that slow, gradual, healthy development which I would wish to see steadily carried out. If I could be astonished at anything in politics, Mr. SPEAKER, I should be astonished at the attempt which has been made by some honorable gentlemen on the Treasury benches to represent the state of the public feeling on this subject as not having that mere sudden, sensational, unreliable character which I have ascribed to it. Long forgotten expressions of individual opinion; clauses said to have formed part of bills not to be found, and not known to have been even drawn; motions threatened but never made, the small party feelings of past times, from before the days of the Canada Trade Act downwards, have been pressed into service to meet the exigencies of a hard case. Well, I shall not follow out that line of argument: it is not worth while. We all know that, from the time of the union of Canada, at all events, until very lately indeed, nothing like serious discussion of the propriety or impropriety of a Federal union, or of any union at all, of the aggregate of these British American Provinces, has ever so little occupied the public mind. I will here go back merely to 1858, when the sixth Parliament was elected, and from that time bring under review, as rapidly as I can, such few points of our political history as are relevant to shew that this is the fact; although, indeed, argument to establish it is scarcely necessary. At the election of 1857-'58, what really were the issues before the country? They can be easily stated. I take the *résumé*, in fact, from the announcements of the *Globe*, the organ of the great popular party of Upper Canada at that time; mentioning not everything, but everything at all material. The great demand of the then Upper Canada Opposition, which gave the key-note to the whole political controversies of the time, was representation according to population, irrespectively of the dividing line between Upper and Lower Canada. That was urged as involving everything. It was urged for the sake of all the rest, and as sure to bring about all the rest, that was demanded by the party. It was to enable them to carry out

their opposition to what were called sectarian grants, their opposition to the holding of land in mortmain for sectarian uses, their opposition to separate schools on a sectarian basis. It was urged for the avowed purpose of obtaining uniform legislation in the future for the two sections of the province, and also what was spoken of as the assimilation of the existing institutions of the two sections of the province, but which was meant to be an assimilation of those of Lower Canada to those of Upper Canada much more than of those of Upper Canada to those of Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) It was urged with the view of obtaining what was called free-trade, that is, an anti-Lower Canadian commercial policy. It was urged with the view of obtaining the settlement of the North-West; in other words, the relative aggrandizement of Upper Canada. It was urged, also, no doubt, with the view of obtaining what was called administrative reform—the driving from power of a set of men who were alleged, for various reasons, to be unworthy of holding it. But the great questions of measures above alluded to came first; those as to the mere men, second. (Hear, hear.) The grand object was declared to be to obtain an Upper Canadian preponderance of representation on the floor of this House, in order to put an end to everything like sectarian grants, the holding of lands in mortmain and separate schools, to render uniform our legislation, to assimilate our institutions, to carry out an anti-Lower Canadian commercial policy, and to secure the North-West for the aggrandizement of Upper Canada. In this way the question of Upper Canada against Lower Canada was unmistakably raised. What must have been, what could not fail to be, the result of an appeal of that kind? It was easy to foresee that there would be returned in Upper Canada a majority in favor of these demands, and in Lower Canada an overwhelming majority against them. I do not go into this to raise the ghost of past animosities; I am merely showing what cannot be denied—that no one at that time spoke of or cared for this magnificent idea of the union of the provinces, by Confederation or otherwise. (Hear, hear.) The session commenced. Those who had the advantage or disadvantage of sitting in that Parliament that session will remember the tremendous contrast there was between all those debates which had refer-

ence to this class of subjects, and the one single debate which was attempted, but could not be made to take place, on the question of the Confederation of the Provinces. With all his ability—and there are few abler men than the hon. gentleman who undertook at that time to bring that question before the House—with all his ability, and the most earnest effort on his part to press it on the attention of the House, he could scarcely obtain a hearing. No one cared for the matter; and it was felt by every one that such was the case. Soon after, a ministerial crisis took place. A new government came in for a few hours, and started a policy. But that policy, again, was not this policy. It did not touch this question. (Hear, hear.) It was proposed, indeed, to deal with that question of representation by population by applying some system of checks or guarantees, doing or trying to do something that might lessen the objection of Lower Canada to a change urged forward as that had been. But that was all. That government fell—fell instantly—and another was formed in its place. And the present Finance Minister, the honorable member for Sherbrooke, who, with all his ability, had not been able to obtain a serious hearing for his proposal of Confederation of the provinces, going into the new government, induced his colleagues to come before the House and the country, with that as a professed portion of their policy. I may be pardoned, perhaps, for a single word here of personal reference, for saying, *en passant*, that when that idea was thus broached (as it was by a Government of which I was as firm a supporter as any man in the House), I did not fail to make it known, that if ever it should be presented to the House as a practical measure by that Government, I should cease to be (so far as it was concerned) one of such supporters. (Hear, hear.) That was not the first time I had thought of it. It had long before been a matter of study with me; and all the anxious reflection I have ever been able to give it, has only had the result of strengthening my convictions against it every day. But how was this idea then brought forward? Tentatively, and just to neutralize the scheme which the BROWN-DORION Administration had hinted to the country. The one fire was to burn out another's burning. (Hear, hear.) The plan of that Government was to make propositions to the Imperial Government and to the gov-

ernments of the Lower Provinces. But how? If you want to gain an object, you put that object before those to whom you propose it in the way most likely to induce them to say yes. This scheme was suggested to the Imperial Government, and to the people and governments of the Lower Provinces, precisely in the way most calculated to induce them to say no. We went and told them, "We are in such a state of embarrassment, we have political questions which so trouble and bother us, that we do not know if we can get along at all, unless you will be so kind as to come into this union with us." (Hear, hear.) It was just as though I were in business, and went round to half a dozen capitalists, telling them, "I have got into debt; my business is gone to the dogs; I have no business capacity; help me by going into partnership with me, or I am ruined." (Hear, hear.) If the object had been not to carry it, it does appear to me that those gentlemen could not have taken a better method of accomplishing that object. And we saw this—that just so soon as it was found that the Lower Provinces did not, as under the circumstances they could not, say yes to a proposal of this kind, and that the Imperial Government let the matter drop, our Administration let it drop too. We never heard another word about it. The despatches were laid on our table in 1859, but nobody asked a question about them. The child was still-born, and no one troubled himself about its want of baptism. We went on with our old questions—representation by population; Upper Canada against Lower Canada; measures, to a great extent; men also, to a great and increasing extent. And we quarrelled and fought about almost everything, but did not waste a thought or word upon this gigantic question of the Confederation of these provinces. (Hear, hear.) In a little while we drifted into another crisis—that of 1862. And from the time of that crisis, and the formation of the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Administration, down to the time when the present Administration was, last summer, brought into its present shape, the one prominent demand made upon political parties and political men everywhere was, to set aside the older questions of measures, and occupy ourselves very much more—not to say exclusively—with the question of men. (Hear, hear.) I am not blaming

honorable gentlemen; I am not raising the question whether they were right or wrong in taking that course. They may have been the purest patriots, the most farseeing statesmen the world has known, for ought I care. What I say is merely this, that whether for good or evil, whether wisely or unwisely, the fact is, that the public mind was not occupied in the least with this Confederation question. After having fought a long time, mainly about measures, and secondarily about men, we were all suddenly called upon, in 1862, to consider nothing but the question of the men who were to do everything right, and to settle everything fairly and honestly, and so forth. Representation by population was unmistakably, for a time at least, laid upon the shelf, declared to be secondary, almost unimportant. It had been half shelved some time before; then, it was wholly shelved. It was hardly taken down from the shelf in 1863, when the MACDONALD-DORION Government merely put it back to the same place, which it had long occupied to no purpose of a practical character under the CARTIER-MACDONALD Administration. (Hear, hear.) Such, then, was the state of affairs—nobody thinking or caring about this great question, until last Session of Parliament, when the hon. member for South Oxford, the present President of the Council, moved for and obtained a committee on the subject of constitutional changes generally. Certainly that hon. gentleman did a very clever thing, in embodying in his motion extracts from the unfortunate defunct dispatch of Messrs. CARTIER, GALT and Ross.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—It was a fortunate despatch—unfortunate for you, but fortunate for us.

MR. DUNKIN—It is an old proverb that says "He laughs well who laughs last."

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—I expect to laugh the last.

MR. DUNKIN—No doubt. But I do not care to joke in a matter which I think of a very serious character; and, seriously speaking, I think the hon. gentleman is very wrong. We have yet to see, in the first place, whether the thing is done, and then, if it is done, whether it succeeds.

HON. MR. MCGEE—"If 'twere done, 'twere well 'twere done quickly."

MR. DUNKIN—The Minister of Agriculture is too good a Shakspearian to need to

be reminded that the thing to be done in that case was a something very bad. The hon. gentleman is welcome to all he can make of his quotation—"If 'twere done when 'tis done, then 'twere well it were done quickly." To return, however. It was clever, undoubtedly clever, in the hon. member for South Oxford to quote from the despatch of these hon. gentlemen—then, by the way, in opposition to the then Government and to himself—an expression of opinion almost coinciding with his own. He carried his committee. No one made any great objection to it. I have been told that I am guilty of some sort of inconsistency, after having voted for that committee, in now opposing this measure. The *sequitur* is hard to see. I did certainly speak and vote for it, but on the express ground that I believed it would do no sort of harm, and that, on the contrary, it might have the good effect of leading other hon. gentlemen to the sober conclusion at which I had long before arrived myself. I therefore had no objection to the committee, and I sat on it. I am not going to reveal what have been called the secrets of the committee. As in many other like cases, there was mighty little in them. Owing to accidents, wholly aside from this question of Confederation, the report of the committee was presented on the very night that vote happened to be given, indirectly adverse to the TACHE-MACDONALD Administration. The report itself was an accident. All the allusion there was in it to Federation of any sort, found its way there at the last moment and unexpectedly. It is no violation of confidence to say that it was even voted against by the leader of this House, the Attorney General for Upper Canada, the now leading advocate of the present scheme. That fact is on the printed record. It was voted against, also, by the members for Cornwall and West Elgin. There were five other members, of whom I am sorry I was one, who were absent; had I been there, unquestionably my vote would have been against it. (Hear, hear.) And, Mr. SPEAKER, those who were in this House at the time that report was made, will remember pretty well the more than cool indifference with which it was here received, little or nothing, after all, as it amounted to. Well, this vote in the House thus following, the opportunity suddenly offered to honorable gentlemen opposite of starting on a tack which, up to that moment, I believe no two men in the House had ever thought of as

possible. And from that day to this, a series of accidents, each one more extraordinary than its predecessor, has led to a state of things about as extraordinary as the accidents themselves were. (Laughter.)

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—It is said the world was made by a series of accidents.

MR. DUNKIN—I dare say some people think so; and it may be so according to the theology of my hon. friend, but not according to mine. I repeat, what has happened since has been tolerably unexpected, even by the actors in those occurrences. I do not believe they were expected by anybody; and none, I fancy, have been more surprised at them than the very men who now take all the advantage possible of them, and even the credit of having brought them about. And how, MR. SPEAKER, was this scheme presented to the public? Piecemeal, and with reticences innumerable; in a way that made it hardly possible to criticise it in any of its parts. When, after several members of the Government of this province and several other members of the Conference had gone into long explanations of it publicly at Quebec, Montreal and Toronto, the honorable member for Hochelaga came out with a criticism upon and a dissent from it. He was set upon with a clamor, to the effect that he ought not to have pronounced himself so soon, as the whole scheme was not yet developed! It was said he had misrepresented the scheme, and ought to have waited until its details were really known before attacking it. Brought thus before the country, in piecemeal style, with some portions kept back, and others ambiguously and even contradictorily stated, no one could seriously take hold of it. After some time, it is true, a printed paper, purporting to set forth the resolutions of the Conference, was sent round to members, but with the word "Private" written on it, as much as to say that it was not officially communicated, and must be made no public use of. That that private communication was not even perfectly accurate, is now perfectly well known; but that was of little consequence, as it could not be made use of publicly. Such is the way in which this matter was laid before the people. Every possible advantage was given to the people to praise it from every point of view, and nobody got a fair opportunity of saying that he did not like it. The praise was carefully prepared and published, and everything that could possibly be done to prepare the public mind for the scheme before its final announce-

ment was skilfully done. And now what have we? Why, the cry that the whole thing must be passed, "now or never." It will never pass, we are told, if it does not pass now! (Hear, hear.) Was there ever a measure of this magnitude before, on which the heart of a country was set, the whole of which was so wise and good as this scheme is said to be—and yet, that had to be passed (the whole of it) at once, or never? (Hear, hear.) We are even told that it is a positive treaty—made however, by the way; by parties who were never authorized to make any treaty at all. I must say, for one, that I cannot but see in all this precipitancy the unmistakeable admission *de facto*, that the Government themselves know and feel that the feeling they have got up in favor of this scheme is a passing feeling of momentary duration, that they cannot themselves in the least rely upon. (Hear, hear.) MR. SPEAKER, it is rather curious that hon. gentlemen, in recommending this scheme of theirs, seem never to be tired of speaking of its excellencies in general, and of modestly eulogizing the wisdom, and foresight, and statesmanship of those who got it up. I cannot wonder that their judgment in this behalf should be a little led astray by their surprise at the success which has so far attended their project. Their "official" visit to Prince Edward Island took but a very few days, and it resulted in the scheme of a legislative union for the Lower Provinces being (as I think, unfortunately) laid aside; and then followed the Conference at Quebec, where these twelve honorable gentlemen representing Canada, and twenty-one other gentlemen representing the Lower Provinces, sat together for the long period of nineteen days—seventeen working days and two Sundays—and as the result of these seventeen days of but partial work by the way, we have from these thirty-three gentlemen a scheme of a Constitution which they vaunt of as being altogether better than that of the model republic of the United States, and even than that of the model kingdom of Great Britain. Neither the model republic nor yet the model kingdom of whose glorious traditions and associations we are all so proud, is for a moment to be compared with this work of theirs. (Hear, hear.) So perfect do they seem to regard their pet measure, that they tell us we must not take time to discuss it. Even though Her Majesty's Secretary of State has told us that there are features of it that require further consideration and

must be revised, yet they tell us that we must not change a letter or line of it. (Hear, hear.) And yet, we are at the same time told that the details of this scheme, if examined at all, must be examined and viewed as those of a compromise. It is not, they freely admit, as satisfactory in its details as any of us would desire to have; but it is all we can get, and must be accepted or rejected as a whole. It must be examined in the very spirit of compromise, meaning that no serious fault shall be found with it, however unsatisfactory it may be. I have heard of Paddy's notion of a reciprocity that was all on one side.

HON. MR. MCGEE—Now let us have no national reflections. (Laughter.)

MR. DUNKIN—Oh! I mean it as a national compliment. I would, however, ask hon. gentlemen opposite not to throw across the House these jokes; not that I object to an occasional interruption by way of question, but mere jokes thrown into the discussion of a serious subject do not help any man who desires to present his honest, sincere and serious views on a grave question. I must ask the two hon. members of the Government, who have several times, by means of interruptions of that nature, tried to throw me off the track, to desist from such course in future.

HON. ATTY.-GEN. CARTIER—I am sure the hon. gentleman did not intend to disconcert you, nor had I any such purpose in view.

MR. DUNKIN—I will not say it is done for that purpose; but I feel myself more than usually annoyed with interruptions to-night, because the subject is of a nature to require the closest attention. This measure, then, it is said, must be examined in this spirit of compromise, that is to say, not objecting to any of its provisions. One of the expressions used by the hon. gentleman was—that we should not require in the scheme “an impossible perfection.” Well, sir, I do not think there is any danger of our finding any impossible perfection in it, or anything relating to it, unless, indeed, in one particular direction; and in that direction I do not know but that there has been attained all possible perfection at least, if not an impossible perfection. I allude to that particular kind of wisdom and foresight which marks the astute official politician, as contradistinguished from the far-seeing statesman. (Hear, hear.) There has been exhibited, in this one respect, an all but impossible perfection. Every feeling, every

interest, every class, is bid for in the cleverest way imaginable. The seat of the Federal Government is to be at Ottawa, of course. The Governor General or other head of this magnificent future vice-royalty, or what not, will hold his court and parliament at Ottawa; but a handsome sop is thrown to Quebec and Toronto, also. They, too, are each to have a provincial court and legislature and governmental departments. Everything for everybody! As to the state that is to be created, its style and rank are left in most delightful ambiguity. We may be honored with the dignity of a kingdom, or of a vice-royalty, or of we know not what. All we are assured of is, that it is to be a something better, higher and more grand than we now have. Perhaps the Sovereign herself will occasionally come over and exercise her authority in person; or, perhaps, a throne will be created for some member of the royal family; or, failing such dreams as these, we are told, at the least, in reference to the character of the representative who is to be sent here in place of the Sovereign—that is to say, the representative who is to administer the government during the ordinary absence of the Sovereign from this part of the British dominions—we are told, I say, by the leader of this House, that, in view of the functions to be entrusted to him, the high position he is to hold, the vice-regal state he will have to keep, it is possible we shall, at least, have sent out here in that capacity, hereafter, men of the class emphatically called statesmen. I have no taste for paying what may be termed courtier compliments to the living; but, looking back only to the dead, of whom one may speak freely, without such fear, I must say that those who have been appointed to administer our government in the past are hardly of the class to be looked down upon—that the list in which we find the names of DURHAM, SYDENHAM, METCALFE, and ELGIN, is not precisely a list of men inferior to the higher class of those whom we call statesmen; and I am not quite sure that even after this great Confederacy shall have been established, men of much higher mark than those we have already had will be appointed to rule over it. Be that as it may, however, the bait is thrown out that we are to have men much higher than we ever had before; that in all manner of ways our state is to be better, finer, grander, in fact, than our imagination can well conceive. (Laughter.) We are, it seems, among other things, to

get a little more than we now have of what is called a feature of the British Constitution, in the composition of the Legislative Council. It has been spoken of as an impropriety, almost treasonable, to hint at it as a bait thrown out to gentlemen who have been elected to the Legislative Council for a fixed period, that by voting for this scheme they may get themselves made legislative councillors for life. If in this scheme provision had been made, in regard to the members of this branch of the Legislature, that they should hold their seats, not for life, but say, for a mere period of five years, I rather think there would be few found here very mealy-mouthed on the subject; and when it is offered to men who, like ourselves, will have to go before their constituents within a few months, or years, at most, that they are to be made legislative councillors for life, the bait, I think, is not a very small one. (Hear, hear.) We are told, too, on the face of this scheme, that the choice is to be made by the present governments of the several provinces; but of course with perfect fairness to the Opposition in each province! Most satisfactory! Each Opposition is to be treated with perfect fairness—"it is so nominated in the bond." We hear of a minister of the Crown in one place, addressing his neighbors, and telling them they may depend on it, that when Her Majesty comes to make the selection, the utmost respect will be paid to the rights and privileges of the elected members, so that their elected member will have the fairest chance of becoming a life member of the Confederate Legislative Council. In another place, on the other hand, we hear from another minister of the Crown that those gentlemen who hold patents of appointment for life may feel quite as safe, for certainly their claim to be retained in their present position is sure to have full weight. Further, in Lower Canada, each locality is told that it may rest satisfied it will not be overlooked, for each is to be represented in the Legislative Council by a gentleman residing or holding property in it; and both origins and both creeds alike are thus to have representation and full protection. Another point upon which there has been a like pleasant sort of ambiguity kept up, is as to who are to make the future nominations to this Legislative Council. Viewing this part of the scheme as a matter of principle, one would have thought that these future nominations must be made on the

Federal principle. It was not expressly so stated; it is not (as we are at last here told) it is not so meant; but till we were so told, everybody who thought one way said that the resolutions meant it to be that way, and all who thought the other way conveniently found the resolutions to justify their way of thinking. Well, turning then to matters which affect this House, the same sort of thing is still observable. Representation by population is given to meet the grand demand of Upper Canada; but the people of Lower Canada are assured, in the same breath, that it will not hurt them; that their institutions and privileges are made perfectly safe; that they will even have as many members in the Lower House as before, and that they will, in a variety of ways, be really better off than ever. A delightful ambiguity is found, too, upon the point as to who will make the future apportionments of the constituencies. The leader of the Government, in explaining the scheme the other night, admitted that the decennial revisions of our representation districts are really not to be left to the local legislatures, but are to be dealt with altogether by the Federal Legislature. Till then most people, I believe, had held the contrary; but all had admitted the text of the resolutions to be equivocal, and each party had of course interpreted them as it wished. The postponement of the local constitutions is of the same character. Everyone is given to understand that the thing will be made to work to the satisfaction of all; each is promised that he shall have it as he wants. Those who hold to the principle of responsible government, as commonly understood, in the local administrations are, of course, told to expect a lieutenant-governor, with a cabinet, and, presumably, two branches of a local legislature. Those who would have two legislative bodies, without a responsible ministry, are told that very well it may be so. Whoever prefers one legislative body, hears that it is beyond a doubt there very well may only be one; and those again who, even with one House, do not wish to see responsible government in the provinces, are assured that the machinery is likely to be very simple; that each province will probably have a lieutenant-governor, with a few heads of needed departments, and one House, and that so, no doubt, the affairs of each province can be managed most economically and

to the entire satisfaction of all. The appointment of lieutenant-governors is again a bait, and perhaps not a small one for more than a few of our public men. The power of disallowance of local bills, and also that of reserving them for the sanction of the General Government, are on the one hand represented as realities—powers that will really be exercised by the General Government to restrain improper local legislation—to make everything safe for those who want a Legislative rather than a Federal union; but on the other hand, to those who do not want a legislative union, it is represented that they mean nothing at all, and will never be exercised. (Hear, hear.) Uniformity of laws again is to be given to all the provinces, if they desire it, except Lower Canada; but by a peculiar provision of the Constitution, although nothing can be done by the General Parliament to render the laws uniform, without the consent of the provinces concerned, it is stipulated that it shall be impossible for Lower Canada, even though she should desire it, to have her laws uniform with those of the other provinces. So, too, with regard to education in Upper and Lower Canada; the provision is to be made, no one knows how, for everybody, and all are guaranteed some sort of satisfaction. It is true we are not told what the promised measures on this head are to be; whether they really will give increased facilities to the minorities in the two sections for the education of their youth in their own way or not; but we are to take the promise as all right, and everybody is required to be content. Turning to the financial features of the scheme, we find it roundly stated that all the debts and liabilities of each province are to be assumed by the General Government; but if we look again into details we find that—no, they are not. There is a something here, too, beyond what appears on the face of things. Upper and Lower Canada are each to stay burthened with some unstated parts of the debt of Canada, and the other provinces are to have *bonuses* of unstated and variant amounts, not easy to be come at. The financial portion of the scheme, equally with every other, is presented to everybody in whatever light he would like to view it in. It will surely bring about economy, because the local governments will have so little to expend unless they resort to direct taxation; but yet, on the other hand, it is as surely to carry us through all sorts of wild expenditure—to give us new and exhaustless credit

in England—to make possible vast defensive works throughout the country—to construct the Intercolonial Railway—to enlarge our canals westward—to create no one knows how vast a scheme of communication with the far North-West. Literally, it sounds at every turn as a promise of everything for everybody; and yet, when each comes to ask how much it promises, and how, and where, and when, the whole is to be found ambiguous, unsubstantial and unreal. (Hear, hear.) I repeat, there is everywhere throughout this scheme a most amazing amount of that sort of cleverness which may characterize the astute politician, but which, I think, I shall be able to show is yet far from being the wisdom and foresight characteristic of the far-seeing statesman. (Hear, hear.) The game of all things to all men is a game that cannot be played with success in the long run. It can, under any circumstances, be but temporary in its success. (Hear, hear.) Seriously, then, Mr. SPEAKER, I pass on to examine this work in a constitutional point of view, clearing away, as best one may, these ambiguities that surround it, dealing with it as it is, and comparing it primarily with the Constitution of the United States, and secondarily with the Constitution of Great Britain. I wish I could compare it primarily with that of Great Britain; but it is so much more like that of the United States, that I cannot. In parts only has it any resemblance to the British Constitution; and for this reason the order of comparison cannot be reversed. I must say, before I go further, that I am by no means an admirer of a great deal that I find in the Constitution of the United States. I have always preferred, decidedly preferred, and do now prefer, our own British Constitution. But this, at least, no one can deny, that the framers of the American Constitution were great men, wise men, far-seeing men; that their work was a great work; and that to compare anybody else's work—especially a work such as this, of the few gentlemen, doubtless able gentlemen, who framed this Constitution—with it, is to submit that work to a very severe and trying test. (Hear, hear.) The framers of the Constitution of the United States were, indeed, great men—living in, and the product of a great age, who had passed through a great ordeal and been brought up to the level of their work by great events in which they had been leading actors; and their work was a great work, which cost much time and much

discussion, and underwent long and painstaking revision of all sorts, in all quarters, before it was finally adopted. (Hear, hear.) Yet we are called upon to admit now, and to admit it without examination, that this work of thirty-three gentlemen, done in seventeen days, is a much better work than that; and not only so, but that it is even better for our people and situation, than the time-honored Constitution of our Mother Land; that it combines essentially the advantages of both, with the disadvantages of neither. I do not think so. The Constitution of the United States, it must be borne in mind, at least lasted seventy years without fracture. It has stood a good deal of straining, from events beyond the possible foresight or control of those who framed it; and it may yet stand many more years, notwithstanding this late strain upon it. If, indeed, Louisiana had not been purchased, if the cotton-gin had not been invented—the two unforeseen events which so encouraged the growth of cotton and therefore of slavery—if it had not been for these, what I may call extraneous events, which could not be expected to enter into the minds of the framers of that Constitution, it probably would not have received the shock that it has received; but we do not know yet that that shock will have a fatal effect, or that it will break up the wonderful fabric which they created. Perhaps it may change that fabric more or less in some of its parts; and after it shall have passed away, the fabric itself may not improbably endure for a very long time to come. But as to this proposed Constitution of ours, should it become the organic law of the land, how long will it last? How will it work, if it does last? And to or towards what, while working, will it tend? To these questions, I have now to call the earnest attention of this House. I begin, Mr. SPEAKER, with the future House of Commons—falsely so called. I shall not take up the different resolutions one after another, and criticize them in that manner; but I will take up the different leading features of the scheme consecutively, and endeavor not to misrepresent them. If I should do so, or at all misstate their character or probable effects, I give honorable gentlemen opposite full leave, if only they will do so without throwing jokes across the floor of the House, to correct me, and I will do my best to set myself right. The House of Commons, then, incorrectly so called, to distinguish it

from the other House that corresponds with, but is not named after the House of Lords, the Legislative Council, forms the leading feature of this project; and I take it up first, comparing it with the House of Representatives of the United States, and speaking here not so much of its powers as of its composition. I cannot, in this view, compare it with the Imperial House of Commons, because the principle of its construction is so entirely different. In that respect, it is simply copied from what I think the wrong model; and the copied parts correspond most faithfully and exactly with what I venture to call the least desirable features of the Constitution of the United States House of Representatives. (Hear, hear.) The copy is not, I repeat, of a thing absolutely good, but only of a thing as good as the framers of the Constitution of the United States, circumstanced as they were, could make it; but the peculiarity of their system that I object to, was not at all necessary to ours. I think it was absolutely unnecessary; I think it even very much of an excrescence. It can hardly be denied, Mr. SPEAKER, that there is a good deal of practical objection to the plan of shifting representation districts, which is what this system adopts, and what the system of the United States adopted. Every ten years the representation from each province in the House of Commons is to be changed or readjusted by a rule which, for all practical purposes, is essentially the same as that of the United States. Of course we have not the little addition of the allowance for the three-fifths of the slave population which they have; but decennially we are to take the population of the several provinces, and by a rule in all essentials common to the two systems, we are to declare how many representation districts are to be allowed to each province. Now, the result of that system must be that we can have no lasting constituencies for the future House of Commons. These representation districts cannot be kept to correspond with our municipal, business or registration districts, or with our districts for representation in our provincial legislatures. We are to have a set of special, shifting districts for the mere purpose of electing our Federal House of Commons. I must say that this principle is not, from a British point of view, a sound one. (Hear, hear.) What we ought to do is, to try to establish in this country of ours a set of representation

districts as permanent and as closely coinciding with our territorial divisions existing for other purposes, as circumstances will allow us to have them; subdividing or otherwise altering them, or erecting new ones, only as occasion may be found to require.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—We will do that for the local parliaments.

MR. DUNKIN—Perhaps so, and perhaps not. That distinction, however, is just what I complain of. We are to change our districts for purposes of representation in the local parliaments, if we like, but not unless we like. These subdivisions of our provinces may thus, in the main, be permanent. But for representation in the Federal Parliament we are, at each of these decennial periods, to have a general readjustment of the whole country, so as to divide each province anew into its due number of aliquot parts. This is an innovation on our usages, greatly for the worse. It goes to destroy that character of reality, convenience and stability which—if our system, as a whole, is to have such character—had need be maintained to the utmost extent practicable, in respect of our constituencies and of our minor territorial delimitations generally. This changing every ten years brings together electors who have not been in the habit of acting with each other. In England they do nothing of this sort; they do not change their limits lightly. The several bodies of men who send representatives to the Imperial House of Commons have the habit of so coming together, as bodies not likely to be broken up. We ought to keep this as an element of our Constitution, but it is carefully eliminated from it.

HON. MR. McDOUGALL—I am sure the honorable gentleman does not wish to build up an argument on a misconception of the resolutions for the purpose of misrepresentation. I am sure that he must have observed this fact, that it may, and probably will often happen, that there will be no change as to the number of members or electoral districts, and there certainly will be none if the increase of population in Lower Canada keeps pace with that in Upper Canada, and therefore the evil he complains of will not occur unless there be some different rule of increase from that which has prevailed heretofore.

MR. DUNKIN—If any one imagines that the population of the different provinces is going to increase upon any thing like the same rule, then I differ from him. I believe

there will be a very much more rapid rate of increase in some provinces than in others; a divergence between them in this respect, of the same kind, and perhaps, even to the same degree as in the case of the United States. There, in the old states, at every decennial revision, the number of representatives lessens, and in the new states it increases, and that rapidly. It is only in the comparatively few states which may be said to be neither old nor new that it remains about the same. The rule is one of change, for the country everywhere. Any escape from change is the exception. And with us, those provinces which shall be found to increase faster than Lower Canada, as some certainly will be, will re-divide their whole territory every ten years, in order to increase their number of districts; and those which increase slower will do the same, in order to cut some off. Even Lower Canada, to meet the varying rates of increase of its several parts, will be drawn into doing the same sort of thing. I shall be told, no doubt, that this need not be—that mere partial changes here and there may be made to answer the end; but I know that in the nature of things it will be, that such partial changes will not be made the rule. The sweeping rule is laid down, in the abstract, of basing representation on mere population; and that rule is sure to be followed out—not only as between the several provinces, but also as within each; and here again, not only as for Federal, but also as for provincial legislation. For all legislative purposes, we must look to have all our territorial divisions open to frequent, one might say perpetual, reconstruction; and this subject perpetually to the disturbing influences of the party warfare of the hour. The exigencies of that warfare, we may be sure, will tell; and whatever the party in the ascendant, whether in the country at large or locally, will find means in this part of our machinery for advancing its ends—means not quite of the sort to commend themselves to one's approval. (Hear, hear.) It is claimed, I know, as a merit of this scheme, that it allows a five years' term to our House of Commons, in place of the two years' term fixed for the House of Representatives. Apart from these decennial revisions, I would be glad of this. But five is the half of ten, I think; and though our Houses of Commons may often not last their full term, there will yet seldom or never, in all probability, be more than either two or three general elections held between any two decennial revisions. A less

satisfactory arrangement, if one is to think of our House of Commons at all treading in the footsteps of its great namesake, I confess I can hardly imagine. There everything favors that combined steadiness and variety of local influences upon the representative machinery which is at once characteristic of, and essential to, the British system, and without which neither public parties nor public men can act or last as it requires they should. Here everything is to be allowed to tend in precisely the opposite direction. Nor is this all. At home, while the constituencies are wisely kept as lasting as they can be, the members they return are all held members of the one House of Commons, as little distinguished by the English, Scotch, Irish or Welsh location of their constituencies as they well can be. Here, again, this United States system which we are asked to copy, is the reverse, and the reverse of sound judgment. The House of Representatives is an aggregate of state delegations, and our mock House of Commons is to be an aggregate of provincial delegations. Each man is to come to it ticketed as an Upper or Lower Canadian, a New Brunswicker, a Nova Scotian, Newfoundlander, a Prince Edward Islander, or what not. These distinctions, which, if we are to be a united people, we had better try to sink, we are to keep up and exaggerate. The system will do that, and but too well. There is, however, one marked contrast as to this, between the system of the United States and that proposed here. In the United States, for the House of Representatives, the system is at least sure to work, whether for good or evil. Theirs is a true Federation. Its founders took care, when, with the foresight of statesmen, they arranged the details of their constitution, to frame it so as to work in all its important parts, and with that end they left it mainly to the several states to work out the arithmetical rule laid down for these decennial revisions, giving them such powers as to make sure that the thing intended would be really and punctually done. I thought when I read these resolutions first, that it was, of course, the intention of their framers to adopt that system here; but we are now authoritatively told that it is not so. The General Parliament is alone to do the whole work of these re-divisions of the constituencies throughout the provinces. But, suppose that for any cause, such as readily may suggest itself—under pretext of alleged

incorrectness of a census, or without pretext—it should fail to discharge this duty promptly, or should discharge it in a questionable way, or not at all—what then? Is the Imperial Parliament to reserve a right of interference in such case; or is the doctrine broached the other night by the Attorney General for Lower Canada, as to its power to revoke our constitutional charters, to be acted on? I should fancy not. But why, then, pretend to ask the Imperial Parliament to do so weak a thing as to lay down for us a bad rule for all time to come, merely that we may follow it or not, as in our wisdom or unwisdom we may please? Well, then, Mr. SPEAKER, I turn next to our Legislative Council—too little like the House of Lords, to bear even a moment's comparison in that direction. It must be compared with the Senate of the United States; but the differences here are very wide. The framers of this Constitution have here contrived a system quite different from that; and when we are told (as it seems we are) that the Legislative Council is to represent especially the Federal element in our Constitution, I do not hesitate to affirm that there is not a particle of the Federal principle about it; that it is the merest sham that can be imagined. (Hear, hear.) To show the contrast. The Senate of the United States consists of just two senators, freely chosen by the Legislature of each State of the Union.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—And sometimes by the Governor.

MR. DUNKIN—That does not in the least touch what I am saying. I say that the Senate consists of just two senators from each state, who are freely selected by the legislature of each state. It is true that in case of any casual vacancy power is given to the Governor of the state to fill up such vacancy until the next meeting of the legislature of the state. But it is the legislatures of the several states who regularly elect these senators from each, for a stated term of six years, and subject to an arrangement for their retiring in such rotation as never to leave any state unrepresented. Well, sir, the Senate of the United States, thus constituted of two picked men from each state, and presided over by the Vice-President or by one of themselves, freely chosen by themselves, have devolved upon them the important judicial function of impeachment. Even the President of the United States may be impeached before them for treason or

malversation in office. They have a large share of executive power also; sitting in secret session upon all treaties and upon most appointments to office, that is to say, upon all appointments of the more important kind. There are appointments which the President may make without their concurrence; but as a rule, there are no important appointments which he can so make. Every treaty and every important appointment must go before them, and may be disallowed by them. They further exercise coördinate legislative functions, as to expenditure and taxation, with the House of Representatives. From all these circumstances combined, the Senate of the United States is, I believe, on the whole, the ablest deliberative body the world has ever known. As to men of third and fourth rate importance finding their way there, it is hardly possible. The members of the Senate, almost without exception, are first or second-rate men. There are no small men among them. (Cries of "Yes! yes!") Well, Mr. SPEAKER, there is certainly no proportion of small men, comparatively speaking.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—It is a question at this moment as to the relative averages of the House of Representatives and of the Senate. I heard it discussed when I was in Washington.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Hear! hear!! Looking to Washington. (Laughter.)

MR. DUNKIN—What I say is, I believe, fully borne out by constitutional writers of the highest mark—by DE TOCQUEVILLE, CHEVALIER, and others. They say that the peculiar constitution and attributes of the Senate of the United States have made it a deliberative body of the very highest mark. And even were it doubtful whether or not in this respect it is all I have called it, at least of this there can be no doubt at all. As intended for the Federal check in the system of the United States, it is a machine simply perfect. It is a very able, deliberative body, of moderate numbers, carefully chosen on the strictest principle of federation, changing constantly, and having, on every matter of importance, a voice and veto of the most efficient kind. For stopping everything, for bringing about a deadlock—all parts of their machinery viewed together—it affords no formidable facilities; whilst for preventing anything from being done which it may be to the public interest, or to that of any number of the states, to prevent, it is as perfect as can be. Look now on the other hand, Mr. SPEAKER, at the Le-

gislative Council under the proposed Confederation; what is it? There is a sort of attempt to prevent its numbers from resting on a population basis; and this is about the only principle I can find in it. (Hear, hear.) It would seem to have been thought, that as the branch of the legislature was to be shared between the provinces in the ratio of their population, there must be some other rule followed for the Upper Chamber. So we are to have twenty-four for Upper Canada, twenty-four for Lower Canada, twenty-four for the three Lower Provinces, and four for Newfoundland; simply, I suppose, because the populations of these equalized sections are not equal, and because four is not in proportion to the population of Newfoundland. (Hear, hear.) And these legislative councillors, thus limited in number, are to hold their seats for life. They are not to be even freely chosen, in the first instance, at least, from the principal men in each section of the country. They are to be selected, as far as possible, from the small number of gentlemen holding seats in the present Legislative Council, either by the accident of their having been nominated to them some time ago, or by the chances of popular election since; and until that panel is exhausted, no other person in any province is to be taken; and hereafter, Mr. SPEAKER, as vacancies occur, they are to be filled as we are now told—and this is the strangest thing of all—not by the provincial legislatures, nor by any authority or under any avowed influence of the local kind, but possibly by the General Government. And forsooth, this is called the Federal feature of our system! (Hear, hear.) The vacancies, to be sure, in Lower Canada are to be filled by selection of individuals having or holding property in Lower Canada,—and more than that, in particular territorial divisions of Lower Canada! But are these individuals to be ever so little chosen by the people of such territorial divisions, or even of Lower Canada, or with any necessary reference to their wishes in that behalf? Bless you, no! not at all. That would go towards making a Federal body of this House! (Hear, hear.) It might then be something of a Federal check upon the General Government, and that would never do. But suppose this should happen—and honorable gentlemen opposite must admit that it may,—that in the Federal Executive Council some one province or other—Upper Canada, Lower Canada, or any other, no matter which—either is not represented, or is represented

otherwise than as it would wish to be. While thus out in the cold, a vacancy arises in the Legislative Council, requiring to be filled as for such province. Where is the guarantee that it will be filled on any sort of Federal principle? (Hear, hear.) And yet, what worse wrong or insult could be put upon a province, than would be involved in the kind of selection likely under such circumstances to be made for it? Surely, Mr. SPEAKER, this Legislative Council, constituted so differently from the Senate of the United States, presided over by a functionary to be nominated by the General Government; having no such functions of a judicial or executive character as attached to that body, and cut off from that minute oversight of the finances which attaches to the Senate of the United States; although it may be a first-rate deadlock; although it may be able to interpose an absolute veto, for no one can say how long, on all legislation, would be no Federal check at all. I believe it to be a very near approach to the worst system which could be devised in legislation. While the Senate of the United States is nearly perfect in the one way, our Legislative Council is to be as nearly perfect in the other way. (Laughter.) The Hon. Attorney General for Upper Canada, the other night, devised and stated just the cleverest defence he could, of this constitution of the Legislative Council. But what did it amount to? Nothing. He undertook to tell us, that from the ordinary course of events, the deaths to be counted on in a body numbering its certain proportion of elderly men, and so forth, the personal composition of this Council would not change so slowly as many feared. He also urged that those who thus found their way into it would be but men after all—perhaps politicians a little or more than a little given to complaisance—but at any rate men, who would know they had no great personal hold on public confidence; and so, that they might sometimes even yield to pressure too easily, in place of resisting it too much. Well, sir, I have heard it said that every government in the world is in a certain sense a constitutional government—a government, that is to say, tempered by check of some kind. The despotism of the Grand Turk has been said to have its constitutional check in a salutary fear of the bow-string; and there may prove to be something of the same sort here. But I confess I do not like the quasi-despotism of this Legislative Council, even though so tempered. Representing no public opinion or real power of any kind, it may hurt the less;

but it can never tend to good, and it can never last. It is satisfactory for one to find that in this view I do not stand alone. This plan is condemned, not simply by the Colonial Secretary, but by the Imperial Government, as one which cannot be carried out. The Imperial authorities cannot but see that a body appointed for life and limited in numbers, is just the worst body that could be contrived—ridiculously the worst.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—Do they say it is the worst?

MR. DUNKIN—I say it is the worst. They say it is bad. It is condemned by Her Majesty's Government, in diplomatic terms it may be, but in sufficiently emphatic terms. I believe Her Majesty's Government regard it as I do—as pretty nonsensical. I know it may be said that Her Majesty's Government, perhaps, may apply a remedy by leaving out the provision about a limited number of members.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—That is our security.

MR. DUNKIN—Security it is none, but the very contrary. But, Mr. SPEAKER, even though this should be done, or though the Imperial Act should even not state the restrictions by which it is proposed to limit the Crown in its first choice of Legislative Councillors, such remedy would be the merest palliative imaginable. The restrictions on such choice would be maintained in practice all the same; and even the limitations as to number would remain as an understood rule, to be set aside for no cause, much less grave than might suffice to sweep away even a clause of an act of the Imperial Parliament. Before leaving this subject, Mr. SPEAKER, let me ask the attention of the House for a few moments to the past history of Canada in respect of our Legislative Council. (Hear, hear.) Did it not happen, as matter of fact, that the first Legislative Council of Canada, not being limited in point of numbers, being like the House of Lords in that respect—the Crown, I say, having the full choice of its members, and full control over their number—did it not happen, I say, that its members were most of them, for some time, named from one side in politics? The gentlemen named by Lord SYDENHAM and his immediate successors, were, undoubtedly, most respectable. There was nothing out of common course that I see about these appointments; they were party, political appointments of the ordinary kind. And under this proposed scheme the same kind of thing would naturally happen again.

But in 1848, with a change of government, it became necessary to carry through Parliament a measure or measures to which it was well known that a large majority of this Upper House were decidedly opposed. There had to be some talking about a swamping of the House—a similar step to what was threatened once in the constitutional history of Great Britain. It was not really done. It did not need to be done, or at least, it only needed to be done in part; the peculiarity of the position of honorable gentlemen, and the impossibility of their standing out beyond a certain point, made it unnecessary to carry out the threat to extremity. But it was carried far enough to destroy their self-respect, and the respect of the public for them. It was felt that they had no sufficient *status* in the country; they sank in public opinion, and sank and sank until every one quietly acquiesced in the change which was afterwards made in the Constitution of the Council. (Hear, hear.) I do not overstate the truth when I say that the Legislative Council so sank in public opinion, because there was no machinery by which public opinion could act upon it, except that of a further creation of councillors by the Crown, and there being no other way of averting a deadlock, they had to be made to feel that in case of extremity their power would not be found equal to their will.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—That is because the number was unlimited.

MR. DUNKIN—If the Crown had not been able to increase the number, those honorable gentlemen might have stood out against the popular demand, until a revolution had swept them away, or they might have shrunk before the fear of it; as it was, they gave way under a milder pressure. (Hear, hear.)

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—There is a central power in all things. There is a centrifugal force and a centripetal force. Too much of either is dangerous, and what is true in the physical world, is true also in the political world.

MR. DUNKIN—Certainly. But I do not see that that has much to do with the remarks I am just now offering. (Hear, hear.) I say the elective Legislative Council was rendered necessary, in the opinion of the country, by this unfortunate state of things, even though the system then in existence was not so bad as the system now offered for our acceptance. There was then the power constitutionally given to the Crown to augment the numbers of the Legislative Council, so that the

gentlemen constituting that body could recede before the determined expression of the public will, as gracefully as did the House of Lords on the memorable occasion I have already alluded to. Had that House not yielded in those days of the Reform Bill, even the Crown of Great Britain might not have escaped the consequences of a bloody revolution. That House might have been constitutionally omnipotent, but its physical was not equal to its constitutional capacity. What is it that is proposed to be given to us here? A body not at all weighty in the influence of its members, and which, it is said, will have to shrink from the exercise of its prerogatives. I do not know whether it will or not. But I had rather not give to a body of men limited in number—though even so little weighty in the community—an absolute veto on all legislation, for so long as the Almighty may be pleased to continue them in life. I think a much better system could be devised—nay, I am sure of it. At all events, here is this proposed body, which, we are told, is to be Federal, but which is not to be so. We are told it is to be a constitutional check, but it is not to be that either. It is rather, I take it, a cleverly devised piece of dead-lock machinery, and the best excuse made for it is, that it will not be strong enough to do near all the harm it seems meant to do. Her Majesty's Government condemns it. It may not be necessary that we should say with very marked emphasis how we join in that condemnation. (Hear, hear.) I have then shewn, I think, MR. SPEAKER, as regards our House of Commons, that we have not reached perfection; and that, as regards our House of Lords, we have not come near it. I pass on to the Executive. Here, too, there is to be a very wide difference between our proposed system and that of the United States. To begin, they have an elective president, chosen for a short term; with all the evils, therefore, of frequent presidential elections, aggravated by the president's allowed capacity for reelection. No doubt, we avoid these; our Viceroy, or Governor General, is not to be elective. Nobody proposes that—I do not think anybody ever did propose it. And the authors of this project have, therefore, no great right to take credit for this, any more than for their unasked offer to continue Her Most Gracious Majesty upon the throne, or in other words, create her Queen of British North America, by the grace of the Quebec Conference! (Laughter.) This, however, MR. SPEAKER, by the way. What is more im-

portant to notice in this connexion, is the marked distinction on which I have already touched, between the United States system, which devolves in part upon the Senate—and our system, which devolves not at all upon the Legislative Council, but wholly on the Executive Council, the duty of advising and aiding the head of the Government in the discharge of his executive functions. As I have said, in the United States the Senate has large executive functions.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—Without responsibility for their advice. We have responsibility, and in that respect our system is better.

MR. DUNKIN—My honorable friend says "without responsibility." I rather think not. Take the case of a senator from Massachusetts or New York. I rather think he will feel himself very distinctly responsible to the state he represents. He is not responsible to the whole people of the United States, nor is the Senate, as a whole, collectively responsible. But each senator is particularly and personally responsible to his own state, and acts under a sense of that responsibility. (Hear, hear.) Take the case which occurred a number of years ago, when President JACKSON named, as Minister to the British Court, MARTIN VAN BUREN, afterwards his successor in the presidential chair. A majority of the Senate disallowed that nomination. Did not the senators who voted for or against that nomination, do so under a weighty, practical responsibility? Every man of them did. They voted in the view and under the sanction of that responsibility; and some of them had to pay for the exercise of it. And so they do, all along. (Hear, hear.) This, however, is a digression into which I have been led by the remark of my honorable friend. I return to the line of argument I was pursuing. What I am just now shewing is, that in respect of the constitution of the executive power, this scheme urged upon our acceptance differs *toto cælo* from the system in operation in the United States. I shall consider presently the question of its advantages or disadvantages. In the United States, as is admitted, the Senate does a certain part of what we undertake here to do by means of a Cabinet. The Federal check so exercised by the Senate renders unnecessary, for any Federal purpose, the existence of a Cabinet. Indeed they do not want a Cabinet for any purpose at all. It is not of their system. But here, with our chief magistrate not elected, we must have one. And

yet, how are we to make it work, engrafted on a system which, in its essentials, is after all more American than British? This is what I have now come to. I have to ask honorable gentlemen opposite how they are going to organize their Cabinet, for these provinces, according to this so-called Federal scheme? (Hear, hear.) I think I may defy them to shew that the Cabinet can be formed on any other principle than that of a representation of the several provinces in that Cabinet. It is admitted that the provinces are not really represented to any Federal intent in the Legislative Council. The Cabinet here must discharge all that kind of function, which in the United States is performed, in the Federal sense, by the Senate. And precisely as in the United States, wherever a Federal check is needed, the Senate has to do Federal duty as an integral part of the Executive Government. So here, when that check cannot be so got, we must seek such substitute for it as we may, in a Federal composition of the Executive Council; that is to say, by making it distinctly representative of the provinces. Well, I must say that this sort of thing is utterly variant from, and inconsistent with British practice and British principle; with the constitutional system which makes the whole Cabinet responsible for every act of government. The British Cabinet is no Cabinet of sections, but a unit. In illustration of the view which I am anxious to impress upon the judgment of the House, let me revert for a moment to our Canadian history. I can only look forward to the future by the lights given me by the past. The union of the Canadas, consummated in 1841, was a legislative union. There was nothing in it savoring ever so faintly of Federalism, unless it were the clause which declared, and quite unnecessarily declared, that there should be an equal representation in the Legislative Assembly of Upper and Lower Canada respectively. If the Union Act had merely distributed the constituencies in such a way as to give equality of representation to Upper and Lower Canada, it would have done for practical purposes all it did. But besides doing this, it quite uselessly added in terms that the numbers were to be equal—subject always, however, by a strange anomaly, to our declared power thereafter by legislation of our own to disturb that equality, if we pleased. Well, sir, when an Executive Government had to be first organized for Canada, Lord SYDENHAM was obliged to call into his Cabinet certain officials whom he found in Upper and

Lower Canada respectively, and he did so without observing any rule of equality as to their numbers. Indeed, until 1848, equality in the representation of the two sections of the province in the Cabinet was never seriously aimed at. In 1848, from considerations of a peculiar character—perhaps more personal than political—the usage was commenced, and it has since been persevered in, of having a Premier and a sub-Premier, and a Cabinet organized under them, respectively, in two sections—of course equal in numbers, or as nearly so as possible. And on this usage and in connection with it have developed themselves all those double majority and double ministry notions and practices which again of late have so constantly been leading us into all manner of constitutional difficulties. (Hear, hear.) It has been found again and again impossible to constitute a satisfactory ministry of two sections; because one or other of the two sections, if they came together on any basis of real political agreement, was so very likely not to be able to command a majority of its sectional representation in this House. It was, practically, a division of the House, as well as of the Government, into two sections—practically, all but a government by two ministries and with two Houses. We did not quite admit, to be sure, that there were two ministries; although, by the way, at one time—I refer to the time of the first proposed vote of want of confidence in the MACDONALD-DORION ministry—a motion was on the point of being made—notice of it was given—which positively did speak of a Lower Canadian ministry as contradistinguished from an Upper Canadian ministry. I go into this to shew that already, in Canada, the force of circumstances has been one too many for us, and has inflicted upon us a system more complex—less workable—than obtains in England. With us, as at home, the Constitution makes the whole Ministry, collectively, responsible for all the acts it performs; but it is well known that here, for all practical purposes, we have for years had our Ministry acting by two sections—each section with a chief of its own, to a large extent a policy of its own, and the responsibility of leading and governing a section of this House of its own. (Hear, hear.) We have been federalising our Constitution after a very new and anomalous fashion ever since 1848, and by that, more than by anything else, have been getting ourselves into that sort of difficulty in which we have latterly found ourselves. (Hear, hear.) And now, Mr. SPEAKER, I just want to know

how this proposed scheme is going to work in this respect? As we have seen, it starts with a principle, as to the election of the House of Commons, which must involve the arraying on the floor of that House, not of a set of members of Parliament coming there to judge and to act each for the whole of British North America, but of a certain fixed number of Upper Canadians, a certain fixed number of Lower Canadians, a certain fixed number of Nova Scotians, of New Brunswickers, of Prince Edward Islanders, of Newfoundlanders, of Red River men, of men from Vancouver's Island, of British Columbia men, of Saskatchewan men—each to act there for his own province. (Hear, hear.) If we ever get all these territories laid out into provinces, we are to have just so many sections, numerically most unequal, upon the floor of this House, and the only abiding distinctions between members will be those represented by the territorial lines between their provinces. The Legislative Council, we have seen, will not be the check which these sections will require. The Executive Council has got to be that check, and in the Executive Council these sections will have to reproduce themselves. Apart from the provinces or vast territory to the west of us, we shall thus have our six such sections on the floor of the Commons House, with their six corresponding sections in the Executive Council, and six parliamentary majorities to be worked together, if possible, while hitherto we have found our two sections and two majorities one too many. Our constitutional difficulties, I repeat, are referable to that very practice, and so it is proposed that we should try a system three times—and more than three times—more complex still. (Hear, hear.) That cleverest of politicians who, for two or three years running, under such a system, shall have managed to carry on his Cabinet, leading six or more sections in our Commons House, six or more sections in the Legislative Council, and, forsooth, six or more local parliaments and lieutenant-governors, and all the rest of it besides—that gifted man who shall have done this for two or three years running, had better be sent home to teach Lords PALMERSTON and DERBY their political alphabet. The task will be infinitely more difficult than the task these English statesmen find it none too easy to undertake. (Hear, hear.)

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—There will be no difficulty.

MR. DUNKIN—The hon. gentleman never sees a difficulty in anything he is going to do.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—And I have been generally pretty correct in that. I have been pretty successful. (Hear, hear.)

MR. DUNKIN—Pretty successful in some things—not so very successful in some others. The hon. gentleman has been a good deal favored by accident. But I am not quite certain that I believe in the absolute omniscience of anybody. (Hear, hear.) But now, if this Executive Council is to have in it, as I am sure it must have, in order to work at all, a representation of the different provinces, all or nearly all of them, let us look for a moment at what will have to be its number. There are two ways of calculating this—two sets of data on which to go. Either we must go upon what I may call the wants of the component parts, or we may start from the wants of the country as a whole. Suppose, then, we start from the wants of the different provinces. I take it that no section of the Confederation can well have less than one representative in the Cabinet. Prince Edward Island will want one; Newfoundland, one. A difficulty presents itself with regard to Lower Canada. On just the same principle upon which Lower Canada wants, for Federal ends, to have a proper representation in the Executive Council, on that same principle the minority populations in Lower Canada will each want, and reasonably want, the same thing. We have three populations in Lower Canada—the French-Canadians, the Irish Catholics, and the British Protestants. In other words, there are the Catholics, and the non-Catholics, and the English-speaking and the non-English-speaking, and these two cross-lines of division cut our people into the three divisions I have just indicated. Well, if in a government of this Federal kind the different populations of Lower Canada are to feel that justice is done them, none of them are to be there ignored. The consequences of ignoring them might not be very comfortable. Heretofore, according to general usage, the normal amount of representation for Lower Canada in the Executive Council has been six seats out of twelve. Of those, four may be said legitimately to belong to the French-Canadians, one to the Irish Catholics, and one to the British Protestant class. Everyone is satisfied that that is about the fairest thing that can be done. There have been times when these proportions have varied. There have been exceptional times when the British Protestant population has had to put up with a Solicitor-General out of the Cabinet,

and has done so with no very loud complaint. There has never been a time, I think, when there was not an Irish Catholic in the Cabinet. There have been times when the number of French-Canadians has been less than four, and there was then much complaint. Six members—four, one and one—are just about what you must give to please each section of Lower Canada. Well, sir, if there are to be six for Lower Canada, there must be six or seven for Upper Canada, and you cannot very well leave less than three each for Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and, as I have said, one each for Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island; and thus you have an Executive Council of twenty or twenty-one members, besides all we might have to add for other provinces; and this, I rather think, is a little too many. The thing could not be done; for so large a Cabinet could never work. Suppose then, on the other hand, that we start with the idea of limiting the number of our Executive Council to meet what I may call the exigencies of the country as a whole. Eleven, twelve or thirteen—the latter, as an hon. member observes, is an unlucky number—will be as many as we can possibly allow. Of this number one, as before, will be wanted for Newfoundland and one for Prince Edward Island. If one is wanted for each of the little provinces, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia will be sorely discontented unless they get, at least, two apiece; and neither Lower Canada nor Upper Canada will be contented with the three left for each of them. And for Lower Canada, in particular, how will anyone divide this intractable figure between her French, Irish and British? Shall we give them one apiece, and ask the French-Canadian element to be content with one voice in a cabinet of a dozen?—or, give that element two, without satisfying it—so leaving out either the Irish or the British, to its intense disgust?—or, give the preponderating element the whole, to the intense disgust of both the others? It will be none too easy a task, sir, I think, to form an Executive Council with its three members for Lower Canada, and satisfy the somewhat pressing exigencies of her creeds and races.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—Hear! hear!

MR. DUNKIN—The Hon. Attorney General East probably thinks he will be able to do it.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—I have no doubt I can. (Laughter.)

MR. DUNKIN—Well, I will say this, that if the hon. gentleman can please all parties in Lower Canada with only three members in the Executive Council, he will prove himself the cleverest statesman in Canada.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—Upon whose authority does the hon. gentleman say there will be only three?

MR. DUNKIN—The hon. gentleman has evidently not been listening to my line of argument, and I do not think that, to enlighten him, I am called upon to punish the House by going over it all again. (Hear, hear.) What I say is, that if the number of the Executive Council is fixed according to the wants of the country as a whole, and not to what I may call the local wants of the several provinces, there will be in all some eleven, twelve or thirteen members; and you will have a number so small in proportion to the various interests to be satisfied, that it will be extremely difficult to avoid serious trouble in the matter of its local distribution. On the other hand, if you give all the localities the number they had need have, on local grounds, the Council will be too large to work. It will be practically impossible to meet the needs of all the provinces; and yet, none can be left out in the cold, on pain of consequences. (Hear, hear.)

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—When the matter is brought to a test, the hon. gentleman will see that he has aggravated the difficulty.

MR. DUNKIN—SIDNEY SMITH once said of a leading Cabinet minister at home, that he would be willing at the shortest notice, either to undertake the duties of the Archbishop of Canterbury or to assume command of the Channel fleet. (Laughter.) We have some public men in this country who, in their own judgment, have ample capacity for assuming the responsibility and discharging the functions of those two high posts, and perhaps of a field marshal or commander-in-chief besides. (Renewed laughter.)

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—I would say, that although I do not feel equal to the task of commanding the Channel fleet or filling the office of Archbishop of Canterbury, I do feel equal to the work of forming an Executive Council that will be satisfactory to Upper and Lower Canada, as well as to the Lower Provinces. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

MR. DUNKIN—Well, it will require, in my opinion, something more than bold assertion, and capacity for a hearty laugh, to overcome the difficulty that will some day or other be presented. (Hear, hear.) And now, sir, I come to speak of the relations to subsist between this Federal power and the different provinces, as compared with those between the United States and the different states. Again, the comparison has to be made much more with the United States system than with that of Great Britain; although, unfortunately, perhaps, there is in this part of the scheme some confusion of inconsistent features of the two systems. Great Britain has not yet, in any true sense of the term, federated herself with any of her colonies. She just retains a nominal supremacy over them.

MR. SCOBLE—It is a real supremacy.

MR. DUNKIN—No; it is only nominal as regards its exercise. It is not real in the sense of amounting to a substantial, practical exercise of power over the colonies. For these nearly five and twenty years past, I call to mind no legislative act of ours disallowed by the Home Government.

AN HON. MEMBER—Yes, there was one—Mr. HINCKS' Currency Act.

MR. DUNKIN—Well, I believe that was. But in that case we got our own way in effect directly afterwards. I am referring more particularly, of course, to what may be called the conduct of our own domestic affairs. There is no mistake but we have had given to us by Great Britain a control practically unlimited over our own affairs; she lets us do what we like, while professing to retain a perfect nominal supremacy over us. She appoints our Governor General, but when he comes here, he does what we want, not what she may want. She can, if she likes, disallow all our statutes; but for all practical purposes she never does. She may, if she chooses, alter or repeal the Charter of our liberties which she granted to us, but she never thinks of doing such a thing, and we know she will not. Well, here in this proposed Constitution—looking to the relations which are to subsist between the Federation and the provinces—in lieu of a real Federation, such as subsists between the United States and the different states, we find an attempt to adopt to a considerable extent the British system of a stated supremacy, not meant to be in fact the half of what it passes for in theory. But, however such a system may work as between Great

Britain and her colonies, it by no means follows that it admits of extension to this case. If the vaguely stated powers of our so-called Federation are to be merely nominal, they will be insufficient; if not nominal, they will be excessive. Either way, the United States idea of an attempted precise statement of the powers meant to be given and used, is the true one. What, then, is the system adopted in the United States, as regards these relations between the Federal power and the several states? There are two leading principles, and very sound principles, that pervade it. In the first place the United States, by its Constitution, guarantees to every state in the union a republican form of government; by which is meant a Constitution, in the main, analogous to that of the United States—an elective executive, an elective second branch, an elective popular branch—the whole without what we here call responsible government. This is what everybody understands as the republican system. Accordingly, just the same sort of thing in principle and in all its great outlines as the Constitution of the United States, is the Constitution of each separate state of the union. And in the second place, along with this uniformity in principle and outlines between the Constitution of the United States and those of the different states, there is established a very exact system of what I may call limited state autonomy. The state, within its certain range of subjects, does what it likes, and is as free to act as the United States; it has its own functions, and within the limits of those functions nobody controls it. The United States have their special functions also, and within the range of those functions can, in turn, control everything. The respective judiciary systems of the state and of the United States, are further so contrived as to be the most perfect check that can well be imagined to secure the smooth and steady working of this Federal national machinery. It is a complex piece of machinery, if you will; there are many delicate parts in it, one depending nicely upon another; but, upon the whole, it has worked pretty well for many years, and may go on working pretty well for many more.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—But the judges are elected.

MR. DUNKIN—Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell this House that the principle of elective judges forms a part of the constitutional system of the United States? Why, sir, an elective judiciary is a mere excre-

cence of quite late growth, and has not fastened itself on the system of the United States at all. It is not even as yet adopted by nearly all the individual states, but only by some of them. It is an excrescence which the founders of the United States system never, I fancy, thought of, or in all human probability they would have expressly provided against it. (Hear, hear.) But now, sir, what is the system we are going to adopt according to these resolutions? What are the relations to be established between our general and local governments? We are told to take for granted that no clashing of interest or feeling need be feared; that the Federal union offered us in name will be a legislative union in reality. Yet, whoever dislikes the notion of a legislative union is assured it will be nothing of the sort. Now, sir, I do not believe that you can have all the advantages of these two systems combined in one. (Hear, hear.) A Legislative union is one thing; a Federal union is another. The same system cannot be both at once. You cannot devise a system that shall have all the advantages of the one and of the other; but it is quite possible that you may devise one that will combine the chief disadvantages of both, and that is, I fear, pretty much what this system does. (Hear, hear.) Let me first take one feature of the scheme, or, I might say, one absence of a feature from the scheme—the non-provision of anything like provincial constitutions. We are not told about them; they are kept back completely in the dark; it is part of the scheme that we are not to know what it means them to be. (Laughter.) It is part of the scheme, too, from all appearance, that they may not be at all alike. For anything I can see, Nova Scotia will have a right under this scheme to devise a system of responsible government, with a cabinet and two branches of the legislature. New Brunswick, if it pleases, may have only one legislative body, with or without responsible government. So may the Prince Edward Island people have anything they like; and the people of Newfoundland may do what they like, and so may we in Canada. Lower Canada may even have a constitution of one kind, and Upper Canada one of a totally different kind. There may be no two of our six or more local constitutions framed on the same model. (Hear, hear.) It seems to be meant that these constitutions shall be as varied as the people of the different provinces may see fit to make them;

may, there are even left to the people of the different provinces the same large powers for amending them afterwards. To be sure there is the grand power of disallowance by the Federal Government, which we are told, in one and the same breath, is to be possessed by it, but never exercised.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—The presumption is, it will be exercised in case of unjust or unwise legislation.

MR. DUNKIN—The hon. gentleman's presumption reminds me of one, perhaps as conclusive, but which DICKENS tells us failed to satisfy his Mr. BUMBLE. That hen-pecked beadle is said to have said, on hearing of the legal presumption that a man's wife acts under his control:—"If the law presumes anything of the sort, the law's a fool—a natural fool!" (Laughter.) If this permission of disallowance rests on a presumption that the legislation of our provinces is going to be unjust or unwise, it may be needed; but under that idea, one might have done better either not to allow, or else to restrict within narrower limits, such legislation. If the promised non-exercise of the power to disallow rests on a presumption that all will be done justly and wisely in the provincial legislatures, the legislative power is well given; but then there is no need, on the other hand, for the permission to disallow. (Hear, hear.) I repeat, this system, or no-system, aims at nothing like uniformity between the general and local constitutions, or between the local constitutions themselves; and in this respect, it is essentially at variance with the much wiser system adopted in the United States. It further allows of no real autonomy; in fact, the only trace of uniformity it can be said to have about it, consists in its disallowance of all autonomy to the provinces. (Hear, hear.) Now, let me take up those few features that undoubtedly are given to us, as characterizing our provincial system. Wide as we have seen the latitude is which the provinces may take in framing their constitutions, there are a few matters as to which the system lays down an iron rule. There is the appointment of a lieutenant-governor which is to be vested in the General Government. It is not said in so many words that he is to be a colonist, but I think it may be taken for granted that he will be. It is not very likely that we shall get any right honorable gentleman or eminent statesman, from home, to come out here for an appointment of that kind; and I take for granted, there-

fore, that the General Government will always nominate Mr. Somebody or other, of local distinction, to this office of lieutenant governor. An hon. gentleman opposite, (I beg his pardon for noticing his gesture,) seems never to have had the thought cross his mind, that perhaps if he were named to it, there might be a doubt in some quarters as to his entire fitness for it. (Hear, hear.) But seriously these lieutenant-governors thus selected, are all to hold office by a very peculiar tenure. They are not to be removable except by the Federal power; nor by it within the term of five years, except for cause, which cause must be stated in writing, and laid before both branches of the Federal Parliament. For five years, therefore, they may be said to hold office during good behaviour. They are to be paid, too, by the Federal power. They are to exercise the reprieving and pardoning power, subject to such instructions as they may receive from the General Government from time to time. And they are to have the initiation, by message, of all money bills, and the power to reserve bills for approval of the Federal Government. They are to have these leading functions of the nominated lieutenant governors under our system, but with one most marked difference—the attribute of non-removability. Beyond these few points, the resolutions leave us all at sea. Save as to these, they leave room, as we have seen, for the widest divergencies of constitution. To be sure, I gather one hint more, not from the resolutions themselves, but from the dispatch sent along with them to the Colonial Secretary, by the Governor General, and this is, that according to the view of our Canadian Government, the provincial legislatures had better be framed on the one chamber principle. I presume this will hardly be gainsayed by the honorable gentlemen who have laid the dispatch before us, and which supplies this feature that we cannot find in the resolutions themselves. Says the dispatch:—

For the purpose of local administration, it is proposed to have in each province an executive officer, to be appointed by the Governor, and removable by him for cause to be assigned, assisted by a legislative body, the constitution of which it is proposed to leave to the decision of the present local legislatures, subject to the approbation of the Imperial Government and Parliament.

But, sir, whether our local legislatures are to be of one house or two, or however other-

wise any of our provinces may experiment, in the way of variation, in framing their constitutions, at least there must everywhere be some attempted approach, in principle, to one or other of the two great divergent systems—the British on the one hand, with its responsible Cabinet—the American, on the other, without. That you cannot work the problem on the former of these two plans, I will show presently. For the latter, Mr. SPEAKER, in the States, it is always carried on with two elective houses, never with one, and with an elective governor; and all are chosen for terms that are not long. It could not be made to work otherwise. An appointed governor, holding independently, for a term not short, and above all, with only one House, is an experiment as new and unpromising as need be. For a moment, before going further, I revert to the principle on which the Federal Executive is to be constituted. We are promised there a cabinet, responsible after the British model, and strangely and anomalously as we have seen that it will have to be organized, in sections to represent our provinces, we must understand that the British principle of its joint responsibility is to be and will be carried out. But it is of the essence of responsible government, that with its responsibility such government should have power. No ministry can be answerable for the entire government of a country, unless it has the power to control in some way or other, and to the requisite extent, the course of affairs. If we are going to build up or suffer in the country any power too strong for it to deal with, it will cease to be responsible. It must be able to overcome opposition, and that in a constitutional manner. Yet, according to this scheme, independently of and besides all the difficulties our sectionally-organized Federal Cabinet will find in dealing with its sectionally-organized Federal Legislature, it is to have these provincial governments also, to embarrass it. Let these last be what you will, responsible or republican, or some of them the one and some the other, so soon as they begin to act for themselves, so soon you have got powers in action that cannot long move together without clashing, and yet neither of which can overcome the other, unless by practically destroying it, or in other words, by revolution. (Hear, hear.) Whether we adopt one system or another, we must create the proper machinery for carrying out whatever system we adopt. And the plain truth is,

that the Federal system is simply inconsistent with the first principles that must prevail in a properly organized British responsible central government. (Hear, hear.) Indeed, aside even from Federalism, the British system and the republican are antagonist in principle; neither of them will work mixed up with the other. You must be content with one or other, and must not commit the folly of attempting any new, untried, mongrel system, or compound of the two—such as nobody can shew to be capable of being worked at all. And now, Mr. SPEAKER, let us just follow out the course of our distinguished fellow-colonist who is trying to govern some one of our provinces under this proposed amalgamation of the two systems. We will suppose him a most admirably fitted person for the post, the functions of which he is called upon to exercise; but he must necessarily have one or two causes of incapacitation, so to speak, for it. When Her Majesty appoints a governor to come out to Canada, or any other colony, she is presumed by every one here to have named somebody holding a good position at home, and somebody against whom no one in the colony can have any ground of dislike. He comes with a social rank and *status* presumed higher than that of the people whom he is here to meet with and govern. Every one is disposed to recognise in him the representative of Her Majesty; and he has every chance of maintaining himself in that pleasant attitude—that of administering his government to the satisfaction, so far as such a thing is possible, of all parties. In adopting the views of his constitutional advisers, he is not called upon to give up any views which he may himself be thought to entertain. He can express to the people's representatives the views of his Cabinet, whether they be conservative or reform, or even though they be conservative this session and reform the next, without any sacrifice of position, no matter what his own political views may have been in the Mother Country. But suppose any of our politicians, whether of this province or of any other in the Confederacy, say Canada, Newfoundland or Nova Scotia, to be assuming this rôle of lieutenant-governor in any of our provinces. He has this disadvantage to begin with; he has to that moment been passing through that ordeal of abuse under which every prominent public man in this country must have suffered before attaining any distinction what-

ever. (Hear, hear.) When a politician, Mr. SPEAKER, in the United States, who is obnoxious to the ill-will of any large body of the people, is there elected to be Governor of his state, the halo of his election surrounds him with a something of political glory that throws into shade any stains on his political reputation. But if the governors of the several states of the American Union were appointed from Washington, do you think the people would put up with the results of such appointment, as they now do with those of their own choice; when they might feel that the man was even a despised, dishonest man, and his appointment as well an insult as a wrong? Who does not know that our chief public men of all parties have been so assailed, as to be held at this moment at a painfully low value by the large section of our people who have differed from their views? I do not say that they have deserved this fate, but the fact is undeniable that they have met it. Let any one of our dozen or twenty most prominent Canadian politicians be named Lieutenant-Governor of Upper or of Lower Canada, would not a large and powerful class of the community in either case to be governed, be very likely to resent the nomination as an insult? Do not tell me that we are entering upon a new era, that all such things are passed away, that we are to have a political millennium, by virtue of this Confederation? Come what may, we are going to have pretty sharp contests for place and power in the future as in the past. No matter over what colony appointed, or from what colony coming, a lieutenant-governor will have hard cards to play, and will have very much to put up with from the people over whom he is set, on this mere score of his past political exploits. And he will not find it easy, either, to get along without exciting a good deal of ill-feeling, as he goes. He has been known as a politician, and will be held to be favorable or unfavorable to this or that party in the province he governs. He will have stepped into position as a statesman of the Confederation. No man so placed will be able to blot the record of his past, or deny his participation in this, that and the other proceeding, which his opponent may choose to brand as perhaps next to criminal; how then will he be able to hold that position of equilibrium between political parties, which, if he is not to fail utterly in his rôle of governor, he must maintain? He will be suspected, watched, attacked, vilified; must stick by friends and

punish enemies; cannot win respect, esteem and sympathy, as a stranger might. Nor will he be free from another source of embarrassment. I incline to think there will be a sort of distinction between the two classes of politicians to grow up under our proposed Confederation. There will be those who will aim at and get seats in the Federal Legislature, and who may be denominated the senior or higher class of our politicians. It will be from this class that men will get into the Federal Executive Council, into high-caste judgeships, lieutenant-governorships, and other high places of the new system—"the chief seats in the synagogue." The lower seats, with their less tempting prizes, will be left to the junior or lower class of our politicians. But if anything ever so little like responsible government is to be carried out in the provinces, while the lieutenant-governors must be taken from the former of these two classes, the members of any cabinets or quasi-cabinets that they may have (not to say their provincial Premiers even, very likely), must be taken from the latter class. Do you mean to tell me that a governor chosen from among our politicians, of what I may call high caste, will put up with much of control from a lot of politicians of low caste, sitting at his sham council board or forming his sham legislature? I fancy he will want to have—and will be held by his people to be wanting to have—a vast deal more of power than they will like, or than any system ever so little free can allow of. And meantime, what of the power behind, and nominally above him—the Federal Executive—with its Premier, sections, and what not? Once named, he is likely to feel every inch a governor; might perhaps run round to the Premier and Ministry that had named him, and tell them in effect, though probably not in so many words: "I am here and you are there. I shall be careful not to give you sufficient cause for so bold a step as my dismissal, but there is a good deal I can do. I am here for five years; and your tenure of office is less certain." He may be drawn into this attitude by differences growing up between himself and them. Or, the Federal Cabinet may so change its composition or policy as to force such attitude upon him. Why, Mr. SPEAKER, you may have a Lieutenant-Governor—say of Lower Canada—in open quarrel with the Premier who named him, or with a successor of such Premier; the two, may be, not speaking in the streets! He ha-

his seat for five years, and the unfortunate Federal Premier, his supposed master, whose views do not agree with his, may—

A MEMBER—Whistle! (Laughter.)

MR. DUNKIN—Yes, may whistle—may find his Lieutenant-Governor counter-working him in Parliament, in the Provincial Legislature, everywhere; and perhaps, in the encounter, may catch a very ugly fall. (Laughter.) MR. SPEAKER, let me once again make reference to Canadian history. Just before the union of the Canadas, and after it, the late Lord SYDENHAM, who was certainly not a fool, thought he would try a political experiment. I believe he made no secret of its being, to his own mind, an experiment, nor yet of the fact that he did not suppose it would so far succeed as to last long. He was very anxious to introduce into Canada a municipal system. Well, he tried first to get such a system embodied in the Union Act; but he failed in that. He afterwards got his enactment passed as he wished, for Lower Canada, by the Special Council, and for Upper Canada by the Canadian Parliament at its first session. That system had in it certain features of this scheme now proposed for our Confederation. Each municipal district was to have its warden appointed by the Governor General, and to have its elected district council, or little legislature of one chamber. The powers of that little legislature, or large municipal body, were well stated. There was no mistake as to just how far it could go. The power of disallowing by-laws passed by it, and also that of nominating the warden, were carefully reserved to Government. And, mind you, my Lord SYDENHAM did not make the blunder of letting his wardens hold otherwise than during pleasure. He kept in his own hands all needed control over them; and, by the way, he kept, too, what was most material, the power of dissolving any refractory council, in the hands of Government. The whole thing was nicely arranged, and was meant to work, and Lord SYDENHAM probably thought it would work for some few years, and that then the districts would outgrow the system, and elect their own wardens and pass their by-laws freely. But, Mr. SPEAKER, the plan never did work at all, neither in Lower nor in Upper Canada; and the first thing done by the next Parliament was to sweep it all away—nominated wardens and power of disallowing by-laws together. Everybody saw and felt that it was a

real power and not a sham, that was so reserved to Government. And so it will be in this case. Your Lieutenant-Governor will be felt to have a real power, not a sham one. What your petty districts would not put up with five and twenty years ago, your provinces will not put up with now. Is a larger illustration wanted? One comes readily to hand. The Imperial Government used once to try the experiment of sending out governors to colonies having representative institutions, without instructing them to pay due deference to those institutions, and it led to a most lamentable failure. (Hear, hear.) Are we going to try to work, in all these provinces, a worse system than that which, when worked from the Colonial Office at home, resulted in what Lord DURHAM well called "constituted anarchy?" If we are, how long may we count on putting off the conflict of authority that shall end in a complete crash of the entire fabric? (Hear, hear.) But, MR. SPEAKER, I have not come to the crowning difficulties of this case, even yet. Not at all. Between the states of the United States, as I have already stated, while there is an essential identity of constitution, there is at the same time a carefully distinct separation of powers and functions. I do not say that the dividing line is drawn exactly where it should be, but that there is a distinct dividing line, no one can gainsay. But how do we stand here, MR. SPEAKER, as to the attributes of our own provincial legislatures and government; on the one hand, and those of the Federal power on the other? Do we follow American example, and give so much to the union and the rest to the provinces; or so much to them, and the rest to it? Either rule would be plain; but this plan follows neither. It simply gives us a sort of special list for each; making much common to both, and as to much more, not shewing what belongs to either. I cannot go now—it is impossible for me at this hour of the night to go—into detail on this head. I can give no more than some few specimens; and I take first the three subjects of the fisheries, agriculture, and immigration. These three subjects are equally assigned to the General Legislature on the one hand, and the Provincial Legislature on the other. It is provided by the 45th resolution, that in all such cases, wherever any statutes of the general and local parliaments clash, those of the General Parliament shall override those of the local. So that in these matters of the fisheries, agriculture and immigration, either the local legislatures must not legislate at all, or if they do

the General Legislature may at any time undo anything they may have done. One can easily foresee any amount of clashing of authority in such cases. Fishery regulations of all sorts—bounties perhaps; the thousand questions affecting agriculture. Or to take just one that suggests itself as to immigration; one province wishes, perhaps, to encourage immigration of a certain kind, say, for instance, from the continent of Europe. It is a legitimate wish; but the Federal Legislature may, perhaps, in the varying shifts of public opinion, adopt a different policy, and reverse all that the province may have done. To what end give powers to the local parliaments which may thus be taken away at any moment by the Federal Legislature? (Hear, hear.) But, Mr. SPEAKER, there are a hundred other cases as to which I could satisfy the House, had I time for doing so, that more or less of this confusion arises. Take the subject of marriage and divorce for one—a subject on which there is a great deal of local prejudice and feeling, and into which even religious convictions largely enter. That matter is given to the General Legislature. But on the other hand the larger matter, civil rights—of which this of marriage and divorce, from one point of view, forms a mere part—is given to the local legislatures. I turn to another matter, haphazard—the subjects of railway legislation, of railway incorporation, and of railway amalgamation. What Legislature has power in these matters under this scheme? I am not sure that there are not here as nice a lot of pretty little questions as one would desire to see in a summer's day. And I am not alone in the matter of this criticism. Her Majesty's Colonial Secretary expresses an opinion, rather diplomatically, it is true, but still an opinion on this point; and what does the Colonial Secretary say?—

The point of principal importance to the practical well-working of the scheme, is the accurate determination of the limits between the authority of the central and that of the local legislatures in their relation to each other. It has not been possible to exclude from the resolutions some provisions which appear to be less consistent than might, perhaps, have been desired with the simplicity of the system. But, upon the whole, it appears to Her Majesty's Government that precautions have been taken which are obviously intended—[“intended;” he does not say “calculated”]—which are obviously intended to secure to the Central Government the means of effective action throughout the several provinces, and to guard against those evils which must inevitably arise if any doubt were permitted to exist as to

the respective limits of central and local authority.

It is perfectly plain from this that Her Majesty's Government could see that whatever may have been the intention, there has been a good deal of short-coming between it and the execution. (Hear, hear.) A thing is not done by being merely intended. I will take now a criticism on the same point from the *London Times*. In an article most eulogistic of these resolutions on the whole, the writer in the *London Times* says—“But the most important clause in the whole resolutions, and unfortunately by no means the easiest to understand, is the one which defines the powers of the Central Federal Legislature.” He then quotes the words of the resolutions, and goes on to say:—

It is exceedingly difficult to construe these provisions. First, general powers of legislation are given in the widest terms to the General Parliament; then a power is given especially to make laws on thirty-seven subjects, one of those being all matters of a general character not exclusively reserved to the local legislatures. Nothing is exclusively reserved to the local legislatures, and it would seem, therefore, that the effect of this clause is to cut the power of central legislation down to matters of a general character—a most vague and unsatisfactory definition, and one sure, if it be retained, to produce conflict and confusion. In the same way, what are matters of a private and local nature not assigned to the General Parliament? We have failed to discover any matters of a private and local nature which are so assigned, and therefore the power will be limited by the words “private” and “local,” so that the effect of these clauses will be that, beyond the subjects attributed to each, the Central Legislature will have jurisdiction over general matters, whatever they are, and the Local Legislature over local matters, whatever they are; while it is in the highest degree doubtful what the courts would consider general and what local, and whether the Central Legislature has any concurrent jurisdiction over private and local matters or no.

The writer in the *Times* goes on to say—and I have great respect for the opinions of those writers when they criticise what they understand, though I have none whatever for them when they take it upon themselves to tell us what we know a good deal better than they:—

These inaccuracies are probably the result of a succession of compromises, and we can do no better service to the federative movement than by thus early pointing them out. The resolutions ask for the co-operation of the Local and Imperial Parliaments for the purpose of giving them effect, and we have no doubt that before they assume the form of law they will have under

gone consideration and scrutiny fully commensurate to their importance.

I rather think this writer had little idea of what we were to be asked to do! He little thought that there was not a word of alteration to be allowed; that these resolutions were to be laid before Parliament, and that Parliament would be required to swallow them at once, defects and all. (Hear, hear.) Well, Mr. SPEAKER, I have stated what, in diplomatic phrase, are the views of Her Majesty's Government, and I have also read those of the leading journal; and now I desire to quote a few expressions from the last number of the *Edinburgh Review*. The *Edinburgh Review* is about as good an authority as can be cited on a question of this kind, for its articles are never lightly written.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—It is the organ of the Liberal-Whig party in Great Britain.

MR. DUNKIN—Certainly, it is a most important and influential publication; and there are a few words that I desire to quote from an article it contains on this subject. The article is in the last or January number of the *Review*, and purports to be in commendation of this scheme. After giving the words of the resolutions themselves on the subject, and especially their residuary legacy, if I may so call it, to the General Legislature, of all matters of a general character not specially and exclusively reserved for the local parliaments, this probably not undistinguished writer remarks—"Obviously very loosely expressed; for what are matters of a general character, and who is to decide whether a matter is of a general character or not? * * We should prefer to the foregoing enumeration of the powers of the Federal Parliament, a simple declaration that all powers are given to it except those expressly reserved to the several members of the Confederation." And in another part of the same article, reverting to the same subject, we have these words—"And although the distinction attempted to be drawn between general and local matters is in some respects scarcely traceable in the draft minutes of the Conference"—Yes, sir, so this writer calls them, their looseness of expression evidently leading him to take them for something far short of the solemnly drawn treaty they are now set up for,—though this distinction, says he, is hardly traceable in these draft minutes, "*the object they had in view* is sufficiently clear and intelligible." Perhaps so; or perhaps that object was little more than to give people to understand that somehow or other the General Government and

Parliament were to have great power, and the provincial governments and parliaments none too much. Any way, the idea is very like that of the Colonial Secretary's despatch, and the two run rather to the tune of the left-handed compliment paid SLENDER, "I think my cousin meant well."

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—Quote the concluding part of the article.

MR. DUNKIN—I shall do so before I sit down, if my strength allows me to complete my argument. I pass now to another matter, as to which further capacities for conflict are very well laid out for us. In the framing of the United States Constitution they did not forget to provide for a district of Columbia, for a territory within which the power of Congress and the General Government was to be perfectly and unmistakably supreme for all purposes. And they did not forget to declare that the powers, legislative and otherwise, of the Federal authority, were to be complete over all the vast territories belonging to the nation, and over all its smaller properties, such as forts, arsenals, dockyards and the like. We have nothing of the kind here; and, at least as regards the seat of Government, this is not a mere forget. We find it stated that "The seat of Government of the Federated Provinces shall be Ottawa, subject to the royal prerogative." It is distinctly laid down as a part of our system that the royal prerogative, the right to change the seat of the Federal Government at will, is to be maintained. But I venture to say that the maintaining of that right is simply inconsistent with the practical working out of a Federal system. And this is a matter involving a good deal of anomaly, as honorable gentlemen will see when they begin to think of it. The Governor General or Viceroy, the all but king of this Confederacy, with his all but Imperial Government, and all but Imperial Legislature, constituted no matter how, resident within the territorial jurisdiction of a subordinate province! The police of the Federal capital, not Federal but provincial! That thing won't do. The framers of the Constitution of the United States knew it would not do, and therefore they were particular to give power to their General Government to acquire and hold and control and legislate for, in all respects, as they liked, a territory within which they could reign and rule and have no subordinate authority over them. We have not got to Ottawa yet, but suppose the seat of Government were in Ottawa—perhaps we may yet get it there—it might so

happen that some Honorable Premier of the Federal Administration may not be on speaking terms with the Lieutenant-Governor of Upper Canada; or at least, there may be between them the most decided, thorough, unmistakably proclaimed antagonism of views and feeling. It is easy to imagine that a Premier in that position, and a Lieutenant Governor in that position, could between them make a Viceroy very uncomfortable; and that the result might be the bringing up of a great many ticklish questions for adjudication by the various authorities. It is clear there is a defect here, which might lead to plenty of trouble. But it is said—"Oh! there won't be any trouble; men are in the main sensible, and won't try to make trouble." Well, sir, if this is so, if there is this general disposition to be sensible, and make things work well, I just want to know how we come to have had four crises in two years? (Hear, hear.) There is another matter, intimately connected with this, to which also I must pass on. I said a little while ago, that the United States system was one of exceeding skill as regards the constitution of the judiciary. DE TOCQUEVILLE, and every other writer who has treated of the United States, has awarded it this praise; and they are right. Each state has its own judiciary; and the United States have theirs; and the functions of the two are most carefully laid down, so that no serious trouble has ever arisen from their clashing. The judiciary of the United States is undoubtedly the most conservative and strongest bulwark of their whole system. (Hear, hear.) What then are we going to do on this head? Just as we have forgotten all about difficulties where the seat of government is concerned, so here. We are not quite sure whether we are going to have any distinctively federal judiciary or not. There is a power given to have one—there may be one; but we are expressly told that perhaps there will not be. But what are we told on the other hand? Oh, there is no doubt whatever, according to the resolutions laid before us—no doubt whatever—that whether we have a Federal judiciary or not, the provincial judiciaries are to be a sort of joint institutions. And a very curious kind of co-partnership the Federal Government and the provincial governments—the Federal Legislature and the provincial legislatures—are thus to have in the judicial institutions of the country, generally. All the courts, judges, and other judicial officers of the provinces are to be, for all manner of

federal purposes, servants of the Federal Government. There is an old saying, "No man can serve two masters." But all these unfortunate courts, and all their officers, and specially all their judges, must serve two masters, whether they can or not. All the Superior Court judges—and, in Upper Canada, the judges of the County Courts—are to be named and paid by the Federal authority, and are only to be removable by the Federal authority, on a joint address of the two Houses of the Federal Parliament. But, on the other hand, the provinces are to constitute the courts—(hear, hear)—are to say what their functions shall be—what the number of the judges—how they are to perform their functions—are to give them more work or less—to make their work pleasant or disagreeable, high work or dirty work, as they like. (Hear, hear.) In this way they can wrong a judge just as much as they please; the only check on them being the power of the Federal Government to disallow their legislation. The Federal Government, forsooth, names the judges, and pays them, and alone can remove them. Does that take away the power from the local parliaments and governments, the power to change the constitution of the court, to change it in the way most distasteful to those judges, to legislate away the court altogether, to legislate down its functions in such a manner as may drive the judge to resign? And we are told there will be no clashing! (Hear.) I have no doubt the Hon. Attorney General East thinks he could manage courts on this system; could have one authority constituting the courts and another naming and removing the judges, and have the system work harmoniously. He may think so. I do not. I am satisfied if ever the scheme is tried, it will be found that it will not work. Human nature is human nature; and here is a first-rate lot of matters to quarrel over, and to quarrel over seriously. Why, there is even a special refinement of confusion as to criminal matters. Criminal procedure is to be federal; civil procedure, provincial; criminal legislation, proper, is to be federal; but with a most uncertain quantity of what one may call legislation about penalties, provincial; civil rights, in the main, provincial; but with no one can tell how much of federal interference and over-ruling, and all with courts provincial in constitution, but whose judges hold by federal tenure and under federal pay. I pity the poor man who is at once a criminal judge and a civil judge. Between the clashing of his masters and the clash.

ing of his book authorities, he had better mind what he is about, with the painful doubt rising at every turn whether provincial legislation may not be overridden by federal legislation. His province may well have legislated on what it holds a local matter, while the Federal Parliament may have legislated on it, thinking it a federal matter. Anywhere there may well be some bit of federal legislation contradicting something in a local statute. And do our resolutions say that the federal statute shall always override the local statute? No, only in cases where there is concurrent jurisdiction. And yet our judge who is to decide these nice questions is paid by one power and removable by that power, and may have his functions taken away and be persecuted to the death by the other. He will have a bad time of it. Well, Mr. SPEAKER, I have so far been dealing with matters, nearly all of which may be said to be general to every part of this great Confederacy; but now I must ask the attention of the House for a few moments, to some sources of misunderstanding which may more particularly make trouble, unless human nature ceases to be human nature within this Canada of ours. There are in Canada, and especially in Lower Canada, the two differences of language and faith; and there is no doubt that the real reasons which have rendered, or are supposed to have rendered necessary this plan of a sort of Federal Government, are referable to this fact. This machinery is devised, on purpose to meet a possible or probable clashing of races and creeds in Canada, and particularly in Lower Canada. Now, in the United States, when their constitutional system was adopted, the framers of it must have foreseen, of course, that controversy would arise on the subjects of state rights and slavery. There was a jealousy between the small states and the large, and the commencement of a dissent between the Northern and the Southern States of the republic. There was undoubtedly a foreshadowing of trouble on the subject of slavery, though, by the way, slavery was to all appearance dying out rapidly in the Northern States, not so rapidly in the Southern. How, then, did the framers of that Constitution undertake to deal with these foreseen troubles, these questions of state rights and slavery? Sir, they did all they possibly could to keep both out of sight—to bury them—that they might not rise up in the future to give trouble. It is true that in so doing they but buried the dragon's teeth, and that these, all buried as they were, have yet since sprung up, armed

men; but so far as they could, they kept them down, kept them from growing, prevented recognition of them at that time and for long after. Well, how are we going to carry out this scheme of ours? Are we burying, or are we of set choice sowing, our dragon's teeth? Are we trying to keep our difficulties out of the way, to bury them out of sight, that we may smooth our way for the future lessening of them? I think not. On the contrary, we are setting ourselves as deliberately as we well can to keep up the distinctions and the differences which exist among us, to hold them constantly in everybody's sight—in the hope, I suppose, that while everybody is looking at them intently, somehow or other no one may see them at all. (Laughter.) In the United States, be it remembered, they started with their states sovereign and independent. From that they went into their system of confederation, which was a great improvement; and from that they went on into their present federal-national constitution. At each step they were moving to limit state rights, and also, indirectly, the extent and influence of slavery. It is true they did not altogether succeed in this policy, but their want of success has been mainly owing to circumstances over which they could exercise no control. We in Canada, for the last twenty-five years, have been legislatively united, and we have worked that union in a federal spirit. We complain that, as a result of this, the distinctions which exist among us have become so prominent—the truth being, that it is rather this proposed change which is suddenly bringing them into startling prominence—we have worked that union, however, I say, in a federal spirit, and it is said to have produced or aggravated a certain state of feud amongst us; and now, for the purpose of perpetuating this state of feud, we are going to effect a professedly Federal union which is even expressly recommended to us, or to many of us, as meant and calculated to be so worked as to amount, for all practical purposes, to disunion. Under it Lower Canada has all sorts of special exceptions made, as the phrase runs, in her favor. The Legislative Council is to be named in a peculiar manner, so far as its members from Lower Canada are concerned. The other provinces may have their laws made uniform, but an exception in this respect is made for Lower Canada, and as if to make it apparent that Lower Canada is never to be like the rest of the Confederation, it is carefully provided that the General Parliament may make

uniform the laws of the other provinces only—that is to say, provided those provinces consent to it, but by inference it cannot extend this uniformity to Lower Canada, not even if she should wish it. Supposing, even, that the other provinces were to desire to adopt our Lower Canadian system, according to the letter of this Constitution, one would say they cannot do it. They may become uniform among themselves, but Lower Canada, even though her people were to wish it, must not be uniform with them. Again, as to education, exceptions of some sort are to be made in Lower Canada, and indeed in Upper Canada too, though no one can tell to what extent these exceptions are or are not to be carried. Thus, in one way and another, Lower Canada is to be placed on a separate and distinct footing from the other provinces, so that her interests and institutions may not be meddled with. I say this system, as a whole, and these peculiarities and exceptions in regard to Lower Canada, are adopted with a special view to remedy our Canadian difficulties of race and creed. But, sir, this is no way at all of avoiding or lessening trouble from this cause. It is idle to pretend that by this system collision is going to be prevented. Under the legislative union of the Canadas, even worked as it has been, the tendency of the minorities in Upper and Lower Canada, respectively, has been towards the maintenance of the union—towards the avoidance of all intemperate language and prejudiced feelings—towards the pulling down of the feuds that before divided them and the respective majorities. And the result has been, that while just before the union the feud between the races in Lower Canada was at its highest and bitterest point, it has since then all but disappeared. The complaint of Upper Canadian politicians has been that they could not set the British and French races in Lower Canada by the ears, that they could not get the former, either as British or as Protestants, to join with them in a crusade against the Lower Canadian majority.

MR. A. MACKENZIE—Who made that complaint?

MR. DUNKIN—I do not say that it has been said in words, but it has been in spirit.

MR. A. MACKENZIE—No, no. (Hear, hear.)

MR. DUNKIN—Yes; the complaint has been made, perhaps not in that particular

form, but certainly in that spirit. The British of Lower Canada have been again and again told they were worse than their French neighbors, for not casting in their lot with the people of Upper Canada. (Hear, hear.) Well, **MR. SPEAKER**, undoubtedly, before the union, Lower Canada, as I have said, was the place where the war of races was at its height; and that war of races did not nearly cease for a number of years after. But the strife did very gradually lessen, and a better and more friendly feeling has for some time prevailed, in both camps. Indeed, there has been a more tolerant state of feeling in both camps, than in any other community so divided as to race and creed, that I know of. But the moment you tell Lower Canada that the large-sounding powers of your General Government are going to be handed over to a British-American majority, decidedly not of the race and faith of her majority, that moment you wake up the old jealousies and hostility in their strongest form. By the very provisions you talk of for the protection of the non-French and non-Catholic interests, you unfortunately countenance the idea that the French are going to be more unfair than I believe they wish to be. For that matter, what else can they well be? They will find themselves a minority in the General Legislature, and their power in the General Government will depend upon their power within their own province and over their provincial delegations in the Federal Parliament. They will thus be compelled to be practically aggressive, to secure and retain that power. They may not, perhaps, wish to be; they may not, perhaps, be aggressive in the worst sense of the term.—I do not say that they certainly will be; but whether they are or not, there will certainly be in this system the very strongest tendencies to make them practically aggressive upon the rights of the minority in language and faith, and at the same time to make the minority most suspicious and resentful of aggression. The same sort of alienation, as between the two faiths, will be going on in Upper Canada. Note of warning is already given by this scheme, to both parties, that they prepare for fight; and the indications, I regret to say, are that such note of warning is not to be given in vain. (Hear, hear.) The prejudices of the two camps are once more stirred to their depths; and if this scheme goes into operation, they will separate more

and more widely, and finally break out into open war, unless, indeed, it shall work very differently from what any one can now imagine. If provincial independence is to be crushed down by a General Government careless of local majorities, then you will have this war. Or, if on the other hand, the policy of the Federal Executive should be to give effect to the aggregate will of the several local majorities, at whatever sacrifice of principle, still then you will have this war. The local minorities—threatened with elimination, in their alarm and jealousy, will be simply desperate, ready for any outbreak of discontent at any moment. Take a practical case. Suppose the rule adopted, of not having an Executive Council inconveniently large, Lower Canada, as we have seen, can then only have three members of it; and if all these three are French-Canadians—as they almost must be, because the French cannot put up with less than three out of twelve—how will not the Irish Catholics and the British Protestants feel themselves aggrieved? You cannot help it. They must in that case feel deeply aggrieved, and so feeling, they will cause troubles. The Irish Catholics will be told, I suppose, “Oh, you will have an Irish Catholic member of the Government to look to from Newfoundland;” and if so, they will have to guide themselves by some sort of Irish-Catholic Newfoundland rule of policy, and not by any rule ever so little savoring of a regard for larger or higher principle. The British Protestants, in their turn, will be told: “You have a majority of your own tongue and faith from Upper Canada and the Lower Provinces; you must be content with that, and look to their members of the Government for such care as you may need in the matter of your affairs.” “Oh, we must, must we?” will be the answer; “then we will square our conduct, not by any rule for British America or even Lower Canada, but by the shifting exigencies of prejudice or passion, whatever they may be, in Upper Canada and your Lower Provinces.” (Hear, hear.) These discontented elements in Lower Canada, depend upon it, will create no small confusion; and among those thus driven into making trouble, there will be not a few whose preferences will even be American, and who will appeal to outside influences for protection. Such will be the legitimate effect of this system; and if any one tells me that it will be conducive to the

peace and good government of this country, I say he prophesies in a way that I cannot understand. Thank God, Mr. SPEAKER, I do not need, as I stand here, to defend myself from any charge of bigotry as against any sect or party. There was a time in Canada when it was most difficult for any person who spoke my tongue to stand up and say that the French-Canadians ought not to be politically exterminated from the face of the earth. I stood out steadfastly against that doctrine then. I remember well the painful events of that sad time. I foresee but too distinctly the fearful probability there is of that time coming again, through the adoption of these resolutions. And I do not shrink from the danger of being misunderstood or misrepresented, when I now stand up here and warn the country of this danger. If trouble of this sort ever arises, it is one that will extend very rapidly over the whole Confederacy. In all parts of it, in every province, there are minorities that will be acted upon by that kind of thing. In the Lower Provinces, and in Newfoundland, things are but too ripe for the outburst of hostilities of this description. Talk, indeed, in such a state of things, of your founding here by this means “a new nationality”—of your creating such a thing—of your whole people here rallying round its new Government at Ottawa. Mr. SPEAKER, is such a thing possible? We have a large class whose national feelings turn towards London, whose very heart is there; another large class whose sympathies centre here at Quebec, or in a sentimental way may have some reference to Paris; another large class whose memories are of the Emerald Isle; and yet another whose comparisons are rather with Washington; but have we any class of people who are attached, or whose feelings are going to be directed with any earnestness, to the city of Ottawa, the centre of the new nationality that is to be created? In the times to come, when men shall begin to feel strongly on those questions that appeal to national preferences, prejudices and passions, all talk of your new nationality will sound but strangely. Some other older nationality will then be found to hold the first place in most people's hearts. (Hear, hear.) Mr. SPEAKER, it is only right that I should state to the House that I have not reached within a long distance of the point which I had hoped to reach before sitting down; but

I feel compelled to ask the indulgence of the House, from my strength being insufficient to bear me through. (Cheers.)

The debate was then adjourned, Mr. DUNKIN having the floor again for to-morrow.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

TUESDAY, February 28, 1865.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—Before the House rises, I desire to submit a statement of the revenue of the Island of Prince Edward, which has come into my hands since the close of the debate on the proposed union of Canada and the Lower Provinces. The hon. member for Niagara seemed to take exception to what I said in relation to that particular point, and I am therefore happy to be able to satisfy the hon. member that what I then stated is fully sustained by the authentic return now before me. I hold in my hand a "Report of the Comptroller of Customs and Sundry Statistics" of that colony for the year 1863, which shows that the total revenue of the island for that year was £61,688 14s. 4d., island currency, equal to £41,125 16s. 3d., sterling, an increase over the previous year of nearly 35 per cent. The hon. member seemed to think it impossible that such a sum as I had stated should have been raised, and suggested that a great part must have come from local sources. Well, the amount derived from excise and duties on imports for 1863 was £46,057 6s. 7d., island currency, from the post office £1,590, and from custom house office fees, £71 9s. 9d.; together £47,718 16s. 4d., island currency, or about £32,000, sterling, equal to \$156,000 or thereabouts. There are a good many other items of revenue, but I have selected these three, as those certain to come into the treasury of the General Government, and there may be others. But it will be seen that these alone would make up the sum I gave as the revenue of the island, which would be available for the general purposes of the Confederation.

HON. MR. CURRIE—I did not question the correctness of the figures of the Honorable Commissioner of Crown Lands; but I felt and expressed some surprise at the sum, which, when compared with former years, exhibited, as I thought, an almost incredible

increase. Will the Honorable Commissioner state what proportion of these imports was foreign, and what came from the provinces it is proposed to unite, as after the union no revenue would of course be derived from the latter?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—There are tables shewing the imports and exports, and the imports from the following places were in 1863:—

United Kingdom.....	£122,880	5	6½
Nova Scotia.....	66,890	11	5½
New Brunswick.....	19,975	3	11
Newfoundland.....	1,865	15	3
Bermuda and West Indies....	3,969	5	7
Saint Pierre.....	292	11	3
Canada.....	6,152	8	3
Magdalene.....	302	3	0
United States.....	71,103	0	8

Total, sterling..... £293,431 4 11

Taking from the above the imports from Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Canada, amounting to £94,883 18s. 10d., the balance of nearly £200,000 was all foreign, and such as would pay duty to the General Government. The exports were £209,472 9s. 6d., to which was to be added the value of 24,991 tons of shipping built in the island, which at £5 sterling per ton, was equal to £124,955, and raised the credit side of the sheet to £334,427 9s. 6d., against £293,431 4s 11d to the debit side, thus shewing a balance in favor of the colony in 1863 of £40,996 4s. 7d. (Hear, hear.)

[The honorable member here handed the report to the Hon. Mr. CURRIE, who, after having examined it, seemed to concur in the statement of the Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands.]

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

TUESDAY, February 28, 1865.

MR. DUNKIN, continuing his speech from yesterday, said—Mr. SPEAKER, when the kindness of the House permitted me to resume my seat last evening, I was comparing the constitutional system of the proposed Confederacy with the Constitution of the United States primarily, and with that of Great Britain secondarily. I had gone over several leading points of comparison; and it will be in the recollection of the House, no doubt,

that I had compared the composition of our proposed House of Commons with that of the House of Representatives of the United States; and I endeavored to shew, and I think I had shewn, that we were departing altogether from the principles upon which the British House of Commons is constituted, and taking up *mal à propos*, and unfortunately, the least inviting features of the composition of the American House of Representatives. It is proposed to adopt here a plan which has a direct tendency to place on the floor of our House of Commons a number of provincial delegations, and not a number of independent members of parliament. The tendency is therefore towards a system antagonistic to, and inconsistent with, those principles on which the British Constitution reposes. With provincial delegations, rather than members of parliament, on the floor of the Federal Legislature, we are not likely to have that political longevity, whether of men or parties, without which the British system of government can hardly exist. Turning then to the Legislative Council, and comparing its constitution with that of the Senate of the United States—the principles governing the former are diametrically opposite to those on which the latter is founded. The Senate of the United States forms an excellent federal check upon the House of Representatives, partly owing to the way in which it is constituted, and partly on account of the powers given to it, and which are not proposed to be given to our Legislative Council. All that can be said of it is, that it is proposed to be constituted upon almost the worst principles that could have been adopted. It seems as if it were so constituted for the mere purpose of leading to a dead-lock. The members of it are not to represent our provinces at all, but are to be named by the Federal power itself, for life, and in numbers to constitute a pretty numerous body, but without any of the peculiar functions wisely assigned to the Senate of the United States. In fact, the federal battle that must be fought will have to be fought in the House of Commons and in the Executive Council, very much more than in the Legislative Council. Turning then to the Executive Council, I had shown that it is a necessary consequence of the proposed system, that we are to have not merely a House of Commons cut up into sections, but also an Executive Council cut up in the same unfortunate way. You can get nothing else in the

nature of a real federal check. Your federal problem will have to be worked out around the table of the Executive Council. But this principle, which must enter into the formation of the Executive Council, is clearly inconsistent with the principle of the British Constitution, which holds the whole Cabinet jointly responsible for every act of the Government. In our present union of the Canadas, we have latterly gone upon the plan of having almost two ministries. The plan urged upon our acceptance purposes the experiment of six or more sections in the Executive Council, instead of the two that we have found one too many. Among the difficulties that will grow out of that plan is this, the absolute necessity of either having an Executive Council that will be ridiculously too numerous, or else one that will represent the different provinces in sections entirely too small. From this comparison of these three leading features, I had passed on to consider the relations of the Federal Government with the several provinces, comparing them with the relations subsisting between the United States Government and the governments of the several states of the American Union. The several states or the neighboring republic commenced their existence as states with all their constitutions constructed on the same general plan as that of the United States, and in fact the same republican principles underlie all their governmental institutions, municipal, state and federal. But it is here proposed, that while we are to start with a system of general government, part British, part republican, part neither, it is to be an open question, left to the decision of each separate province, what kind of local constitution is to be constructed for itself. Each province must, of course, have an elective chamber, but as to a second chamber, that is to be as each local legislature may see fit. Some, probably, will have it elective, while others may dispense with it entirely. Then, looking to the appointment of the lieutenant-governors, and the tenure by which they are to hold office, it becomes about as clear as day that you cannot carry on responsible government in the provinces, but must have in them all a system that is neither British nor republican, and that, I believe, will be found to be totally unworkable. Turning to the assignment of powers to the Federal Government on the one hand, and the local or provincial governments on the other, we meet again with the unhappy contrast be-

tween the wisdom displayed on that point in the Constitution of the United States, and the lack of wisdom in the arrangement proposed for adoption here. There is, in the United States' system, a clear and distinct line drawn between the functions of the general and state governments. Some may not like the idea of state sovereignty, and many may wish that more power had been given to the General Government. But this much is plain, that it is not proposed to allow anything approaching to state sovereignty here. We have not even an intelligible statement as to what powers are to be exercised by the general, and what by the local legislatures and governments. Several subjects are specifically given to both; many others are confusedly left in doubt between them; and there is the strange and anomalous provision that not only can the General Government disallow the acts of the provincial legislatures, and control and hamper and fetter provincial action in more ways than one, but that wherever any federal legislation contravenes or in any way clashes with provincial legislation, as to any matter at all common between them, such federal legislation shall override it, and take its place. It is not too much to say that a continuance of such a system for any length of time without serious clashing is absolutely impossible. This is in effect so declared in the despatch of Her Majesty's Colonial Secretary, and it is clearly pointed out in the *London Times* and in the *Edinburgh Review*. It seems as if our statesmen had sought to multiply points of collision at every turn. Then as to the non provision of a permanent seat of government, and the arrangements contemplated for the judiciary, we find still more of the same sort of thing; and as to the extraordinary pains that seem to have been taken to throw up a great wall or hedge round those institutions of Lower Canada which of late have been giving us no trouble to speak of—as to the extraordinary pains, I say, that seem to have been taken to put a wall around those institutions, and to give every possible guarantee about them on this side and on that; why, this very machinery, provided for the mere purpose of inducing people to agree to the scheme, who would not otherwise countenance it, is calculated, at no very distant day, to cause the cry to resound throughout the land—"To your tents, O, Israel!" (Hear, hear.) I had reached this point of my argument, when I was compelled to throw myself on the indulgence of

the House. There is just one consideration connected with these matters to which I have been alluding, that I wish to revert to in few words, because I believe it escaped me, in part at least, last night. A marked difference between the history of the United States just before they framed their constitution, and our late history, is this: the adoption of the Constitution of the United States followed immediately upon their successful war of independence. The men who adopted it had just gone shoulder to shoulder through the severest trial that could have been given to their patience and other higher qualities. Their entire communities had been, you may say, united as one man, in the great struggle through which they had passed, and were then equally united in their hopes as to the grand results which their new system was to bring forth. They had tried the system of mere confederation, and were agreed that it was inadequate to meet the wants of their situation. They were all trying to remove the evils that they felt and apprehended from it, and to build up a great nationality that should endure in the future. That was the position they occupied. Ours is some thing very different indeed. We have not gone through an ordeal such as that through which they had so proudly passed. On the contrary, we have ended, temporarily ended at any rate, a series of struggles it is true, but struggles of a very different kind; struggles that have just pitted our public men one against another, and to some extent, I am sorry to say, even our faiths and races against each other. (Hear, hear.) For one, I do believe that these struggles—of the latter class I mean—were dying out, but for these contemplated changes, which are threatening to revive them. But, however that may be, struggles there have been amongst us, of which we have no cause to be proud; things have occurred since the union of which we ought to be ashamed, if we are not (Hear, hear.) Of this kind are the only struggles that we have had; and when, from such a past and present, we are told to start with the idea, so to speak, of at once creating and developing the character of a new and united nation, under institutions giving us a something short of independence, and at the same time any quantity of matters about which to dispute and come to trouble, we may as well not shut our eyes to the fact, that we start with but poor omens

of success. (Hear, hear.) But I have to turn now, Mr. SPEAKER, to another branch of my comparison—the financial; and here, I may at once give the House an assurance, which I am sure it will be glad to have, that I will not trouble it with more figures than are absolutely necessary to my explanation of the views I have to present, and that I will not give a single figure as to which there can be the possibility of a controversy. The contrast between the financial system as a whole, with which the framers of the United States Constitution started, and the financial system with which it is proposed we shall start, is as salient as it is possible for the human intellect to conceive; and further the contrast between this proposed financial system, and the financial system of England, is just as salient too. The framers of the United States Constitution started with the principle, that between the United States and the several states there should be no financial dealings at all. They were to have separate financial systems, separate treasuries, separate debts—all absolutely distinct. And ever since the time when the unhappy attempt on the part of Great Britain to tax the colonies was given up, almost as absolute a line of demarcation between the Imperial finances and treasury and the colonial finances and treasuries, has been maintained. We have had our own separate finances and our own separate treasury, with which the Imperial Government has had nothing to do. The Imperial Government may have gone, and may still go, to some expense on provincial behalf; but the British principle is, that Imperial finance is as distinct from the provincial, as in the United States Federal finance is from that of any state. Now, the system proposed here for our adoption is not this of entire and simple separation of the federal from the provincial treasuries, but a system of the most entire and complex confusion between them. One has to think a good deal upon the subject, and to study it pretty closely to see precisely how the confusion is going to operate; but there it is, unmistakably, at every turn. I do not mean to say that under all the circumstances of the case something of this sort was not unavoidable. In the course of debate the other day, I remember a remark was thrown across the floor of the House upon this point and the Hon. Minister of Finance in effect said: “Yes, indeed, and it would have been a very pleasant thing for gentlemen opposed to the scheme, if it had thrown upon the provinces a

necessity of resorting to direct taxation.” Of course, in the mere view of making the scheme palatable, it was clever to make the Federal treasury pay for provincial expenditure; but the system that had need be established should bear testimony, not to cleverness, but to wisdom. Is the system proposed for our acceptance as good, then, as statesmen ought to and would have made it? I think not; and the extraordinary thing is, that it is brought out with a flourish of trumpets, on the ground that in some undescribable way it is to work most economically! (Hear, hear.) Well, to test it, I will take it up in three points of view—first, as to assets; next, as to debts and liabilities; and, lastly, as to revenues. As to the asset part of the question, the tale is soon told. The assets of these provinces, speaking generally, are of very little commercial value. They are much like the assets of an insolvent trader, with lots of bad debts upon his books; it is of small consequence to whom or how they are assigned. The general principle upon which the scheme proceeds, is to give the Federal Government the bulk of these assets. The only exceptions of any consequence—I am not going into the details of the scheme, but still I must present to the House so much of detail as to show that I am making no rash statement, not borne out by facts—the only important exceptions, I say, to this rule are those I am about to notice. Certain properties such as penitentiaries, prisons, lunatic asylums, and other public charitable institutions, and other buildings and properties of the kind, which, together with those I have just mentioned, may be characterized as exceptional properties, are to be assigned by the general to the provincial governments. Also, with the exception of Newfoundland, the several provinces are to take the public lands, mines, minerals and royalties in each, and all assets connected with them—in common parlance, their territorial revenues. The General Government is, however, to have the mines, minerals and public lands of Newfoundland, paying for them of course. (Hear, hear.) Then, Upper and Lower Canada are severally to have those assets which are connected with the debts, reserved for payment by them respectively; but these will not be worth much, and I shall not take the trouble of saying much about them. It is enough to know that the proportion of the debts to be assumed by the two has not yet, for some reason, been stated, and that the assets connected with them amount to very

little. Further, I am not quite sure that I am right, but I understood the Hon. Attorney General for Lower Canada, the other night, to intimate that the seigniory of Sorel is to be somehow a provincial asset of Lower Canada. If that is not to be the case I will pass on; but if it is, perhaps the honorable gentleman will say so.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—I will speak on that subject at another time.

MR. DUNKIN—Then, I am to take it for granted, I suppose, that it is not to be a provincial asset?

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—I will not interrupt the hon. gentleman now.

MR. DUNKIN—Well, Mr. SPEAKER, I did suppose that I should have had an immediate answer as to whether this seigniory is to be a provincial asset or not; but the hon. gentleman does not seem inclined to give any information upon the point. By these resolutions it is provided, that all ordnance properties are to be taken by the General Government; and I never heard but that the seigniory of Sorel is an ordnance property. But from the statement made here the other day, it would seem that although this printed document purports to be the scheme, it does not give us true information on this point. The wording of the 55th resolution is, that the "property transferred by the Imperial Government and known as ordnance property" is to belong to the General Government; if any part of it is really a provincial asset, it must become so by one of those explanations or glosses which we are not allowed to insert in the instrument now, but are to take our chance of for some future time. (Hear, hear.) Passing over the mystery that seems to hang over the subject, I refer then to a matter about which there can be no mistake. There certainly cannot be a doubt that the lands, mines, and minerals of Newfoundland are to be a Federal asset; and there is not any doubt either that the Federal Government will have to pay \$150,000 a year for them. It is perfectly certain that these lands will cost that money; and it is perfectly certain, I think, that the administration of them will also cost a certain amount of trouble and dispute, as to the manner in which it is to be carried on. But if human nature remains human nature, we may reasonably and probably surmise that they will not yield so great a revenue to the General Government as is by some thought. We

shall have Newfoundland delegations in the Commons House, and in the other House; and in order to keep them in anything like good humor, and to enable the Lieutenant-Governor of Newfoundland to carry on his government with anything like ease and comfort, their lands, mines and minerals will have to be administered, not with a view to Federal revenue—even though to that end they are costing the direct payment of \$150,000 a year—but with a view to Newfoundland popularity. In fact, I think it will be found that the management of these properties will be carried on more with a view to the development and profit of Newfoundland, than for any profit of the people of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Upper and Lower Canada. Every man, woman and child—from the Lieutenant-Governor downwards—connected with Newfoundland, will regard it as a fit article of political faith, that they must be worked with a special view to the great future of that great country. And the consequence will be many little passages between the province and the Federal Government, not advantageous to the latter, but illustrative of the way in which governments too often have to deal with things for which they have had to pay. Well, sir, I pass to the matter of the debts; and these, it must be acknowledged, are rather more important than the assets. (Hear, hear.) There is no mistake about that; though there might seem to be a mistake about the resolutions on this subject, were you to take their letter only. The sixtieth resolution says that the General Government shall assume all the debts and liabilities of each province; while the sixty-first has it, that part of our Canadian debt is to be borne by Upper and Lower Canada respectively. In a sense, I will presently explain. I think the sixtieth resolution about tells the truth, or rather, I ought to say, falls short of it. But it requires one to work the oracle out, to follow the calculation through, in order to see that it does so, that these debts will indeed all—and more than all—fall, directly or indirectly, on the Federal Government. Meantime, on our way to that part of my argument, I set it down that under the sixty-first resolution there is an amount of reserved debt which, in a certain manner, is to fall on Upper and Lower Canada respectively. Pretty much as it was just now in the ordnance property, so here,

we cannot get an intelligible answer as to what these reserved debts are, as against either province, or what the assets are that each is to take as an offset to them. But, for the purpose of constituting the stated debt of the future Confederation, Upper and Lower Canada, we are told, are to throw into it an amount of \$62,500,000, the surplus of their debt being nominally left to be borne by themselves, after they shall have become confederated; Nova Scotia, on the other hand, is to be allowed to increase her debt to \$8,000,000; and Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island are to throw in theirs at the nominal figure they stand at now. But, by an ingenious contrivance, the aggregate real debt of the country is to be, in effect, a good deal more than the aggregation of these figures would give. Upper and Lower Canada, to begin with, as we have seen, are, besides, separately to pretend to bear the weight of their considerable excess of debt over the \$62,500,000, or \$25 a head, allowed under this arrangement. Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, should they not increase their debts to be assumed up to this figure of \$25 a head, are to be paid interest at five per cent. on any amount of shortcoming in that behalf they may be guilty of. And Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island are to be paid interest at the same rate, on the amount to which their smaller debts fall short of this same normal \$25 allowance. For practical purposes, therefore, the debts of the four Lower Provinces are thus brought up to this standard level. The Federal Government is to pay interest on them to that tune—if not to creditors of those provinces, then to the provinces themselves. And we are to start with a clear, practical debt of \$25 a head for every man, woman, and child in the Confederacy. Incurred or not, we start with it as due, and pay accordingly. And there are, besides, those amounts of debt left nominally to the charge of Upper Canada, as to which I shall have a word more to say shortly. Meantime, I proceed to our third head—of revenues. And here, the first and most striking fact is, that the Federal Government is to make yearly grants, payable, by the way, semi-annually and in advance, to each province, in proportion to its population as shown by the census of 1861, and at the rate of 80 cents a head. And the way in which this 80 cents a head apportionment is come at, is in itself somewhat edifying. According to the statements made here by Ministers,

the Finance Ministers of the several provinces were invited at the Conference to come forward with a statement of their respective wants. Of course their statements were to be framed with a due regard to economy. Such things are always to be done economically. This is a diplomatic phrase, of which we understand here the full meaning; and I was not at all surprised to hear, that however economically the statements were made out, they had to be cut down. Whether they are said to have been cut down once or twice, or oftener, I do not distinctly recollect. But at last, after having been duly cut down, they were found to require this grant or subvention, at the rate of 80 cents a head all round—subject always to deduction as against the Canadas, and to additions in favor of the four Lower Provinces, as we shall presently see. With less, the provinces could not get on at the rate thought necessary, unless by levying undesired taxes. Well, besides these subventions, the provinces (all but Newfoundland) are to have the proceeds of their lands, mines and minerals; and Newfoundland is to have, instead, the further grant from the Federal treasury, of \$150,000 a year, for ever. They may all, further, derive some more indirect revenue from licenses of various sorts; and Nova Scotia may add to these an exceptional, and exceptionable, export duty on coal and other minerals; and New Brunswick, the like on lumber. Besides which, on the mere ground that she cannot do without it, New Brunswick is to have a further Federal grant of \$63,000 a year for ten years; unless, indeed, in the event of her not augmenting her debt to the full amount, in which case, any payment made to her of interest on that score is to be deducted from the \$63,000—a shrewd hint, by the way, that she had not best be too economical—and, lastly, all are to have the precious right of direct taxation, and the higher privilege of borrowing without limit. The Federal power is to have, of course, the right to tax in all sorts of ways, the special export duties made over to New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, alone excepted. Now, Mr. SPEAKER, taking this whole arrangement together, I must repeat that I see in it no principle but one. The provinces are to be able to carry on their operations according to their supposed probable future exigencies, without danger of direct, that is to say, oppressive or new taxation. Well, sir, engineers say that the mea-

sure of strength of a fortified place is the strength of its weakest part. And this principle is here applied to our provinces in a financial point of view. The need of the neediest is made the measure of the aid given to all. The most embarrassed is to have enough for its purposes, and the rest are to receive, if not exactly in the same ratio, at least so nearly up to the mark as that they shall all be satisfied; while, on the other hand, the debts of all the provinces are to be, for all practical ends, raised to the full level of the most indebted. To show this, sir, another word or two as to the amount of the promised subventions to Upper and Lower Canada. This is to be, as we have seen, only the 80 cents a head, less some deduction, I care not what, for the purpose of my present argument; but there is no doubt, I say, that they are to receive less than the 80 cents, because the excess of their debt over \$62,500,000, though thrown on them, will have to be guaranteed, and the interest on it will have to be paid by the Federal Government, and that interest will be deducted by the Federal Government from the subventions payable to them respectively. The Lower Provinces, on the other hand, as we have also seen, are really to get more. Well now, suppose for the moment the arrangement had been, for the Confederation to assume at once the whole debt of Canada, and accordingly to pay proportionably larger amounts of interest to the other provinces. The two Canadas would then have needed, exactly, so much the less of nominal subvention, and the other provinces too. The cost to the Federal treasury, in the whole, would still have been exactly what it is. Indirectly, therefore, I say that for all practical purposes there is thrown upon the General Government the whole amount of the past debts of these provinces, and more; and the whole burden, too, of the carrying on of the machinery of government, both Federal and Provincial; unless, indeed, any of the provinces should see fit hereafter to undertake what I may call extraordinary expenditure, and to defray it themselves. I do not think they will. It would involve direct taxation. And I think they can do better. But for all this part of the plan, sir, it is like the rest, framed on the mere idea of making things pleasant—the politician idea of anyhow winning over interests or parties for to-day—not on any statesmanlike thought as to its future working and effects. (Hear, hear.) Now, Mr. SPEAKER, with this outline of the sys-

tem, I should be glad to know where the prospect of economy of administration is to be found. The Honorable Finance Minister of the future Federal Government will have to do—what? To come with a budget, not merely to cover the outlay of the Federal Government—that is of course—but with a budget to cover also all that I may call the normal outlay, the intended outlay, the foreseen outlay of all the provinces. (Hear, hear.) The Minister of Finance—if any there is—of the province, unless he chooses to outrun the constable; unless, with his lieutenant-governor and local government and legislature, he chooses to spend more than he can get out of the Federal Government, by this system, or by that nice modification of it which is pretty sure to be soon thought of, and to which I shall by and by advert, need have no budget at all. He knows he is to have about so much from his lands, mines and minerals, so much from licenses and so forth, so much from the Federal Government, so many thousand or hundred thousand dollars in all; and he will of course make the best he can of that. And by the way, it is a remarkable fact in this connection, that we find that with one accord those who are undertaking to speak to the different provinces in support of Confederation are agreed in each telling the people of his own province what a first-rate bargain has been made for it. (Hear, hear.) My hon. friend from Hochelaga read us an extract the other night from a speech of Hon. Mr. TILLEY, of New Brunswick, in which that hon. gentleman cyphered out, perfectly to his satisfaction, and to that of many who heard him, that New Brunswick is guaranteed an excess over her real needs, of \$34,000 a year. If I am not mistaken, the Hon. Solicitor General for Lower Canada undertook since, in this House, to shew us that some \$200,000 or more a year beyond hers, is in the same way secured to Lower Canada; even though she does not receive the full 80 cents a head. I think I remember that the Hon. President of the Council—though I have not yet got the report of his speech to refresh my memory—made it a point that really Upper Canada, as well as Lower Canada, is comfortably off in this respect. One hears too, I think, of the same song in Nova Scotia; and in Prince Edward Island certainly, we have the advocates of Confederation telling the people there—“You, too, have got a capital bargain, you have so much more to spend, according

to this arrangement, than you ever had before." A strange comment on that earnest desire for economy, which is claimed to have dictated the whole of these arrangements. (Hear, hear.) If that was the intention, the performance has fallen far short of it. (Hear, hear.) And before I go further, there occurs to me this consideration, arising out of this state of things—out of this abundance, not to say plethora, that is meant to characterize the provincial exchequers, whatever may be the case with the Federal exchequer under the system—one consideration, I say, connected with this, which should not be lost sight of when we are talking about the application of anything in the least like responsible government to our provinces. I never yet heard of an elected legislative body that had much control over a government, unless it had hold of the strings of a purse from which the government wanted to get something. In the old days, before responsible government was thought of—in the days when casual and territorial revenues gave provincial governments all they wanted, or a little more—provincial legislatures had mighty little to do with government, and, if they complained of a grievance, were little likely to be listened to. It was even the same long before at home. When the English Crown had its abundance of resources, English kings cared little for their parliaments. But when their resources were exhausted, and they could not borrow easily, and had to ask for taxes, then the House of Commons began to acquire power, and, in course of time, became the body it is now. I shall be surprised if we do not find, in the event of this Confederation taking place, that for some time our provincial legislatures, whether they consist of one chamber or of two, will be less powerful for good than many would wish to have them, that the machine of state will not be altogether driven by their means. But there is another result, about which there can be no question. With one accord, not in Newfoundland merely—I was hinting a little while ago at what would be the case of Newfoundland, as to its lands, mines and minerals—not there only, but in all the provinces—the provincial governments will, in a quiet way, want money, and the provincial legislators and people will want it yet more; grants for roads and bridges, for schools, for charities, for salaries, for contingencies of the legislative body—for all manner of ends they will be wanting money, and where is it to come from? Whether the constitution of

the Provincial Executive savors at all of responsible government or not, be sure it will not be anxious to bring itself more under the control of the legislature, or to make itself more odious than it can help, and the easiest way for it to get money will be from the General Government. I am not sure, either, but that most members of the provincial legislatures will like it that way the best. (Hear, hear.) It will not be at all unpopular, the getting of money so. Quite the contrary. Gentlemen will go to their constituents with an easy conscience, telling them: "True, we had not much to do in the Provincial Legislature, and you need not ask very closely what else we did; but I tell you what, we got the Federal Government to increase the subvention to our province by five cents a head, and see what this gives you—\$500 to that road—\$1000 to that charity—so much here, so much there. That we have done; and have we not done well?" (Hear, hear.) I am afraid in many constituencies the answer would be; "Yes, you have done well; go and do it again." I am afraid the provincial constituencies, legislatures and executives will all show a most calf-like appetite for the milking of this one most magnificent government cow.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—There will be more municipal loan funds.

MR. DUNKIN—Yes, that is one of the analogies, and there is another even nearer. Years ago, we in Canada said we would for ever give a certain fixed sum per annum for an education fund. It was to be divided, in a certain ratio, between Upper and Lower Canada. But from time to time, as the census shewed changes of their relative population, the division was to be altered. In a little while this alteration of ratio gave Lower Canada less money and Upper Canada more. "Oh! but," said the Administration, "we cannot do that with Lower Canada. After having had distributed to her so many thousands a year, she could not stand having ever so much less. No, no; we cannot do that. What shall we do, then? In our estimates we will put in a vote for Lower Canada, just to keep her figure up to the mark of what she has been receiving. And what then? Why, of course, we must add a vote for Upper Canada in the same proportion, just to take her so much further beyond her former figure." (Hear, hear.) To be sure, I do find, with reference to this subvention, a pleasant little expression, which one wishes may be carried out. It is to be "in full." "Such aid shall be *in full settlement*

of all future demands upon the General Government for local purposes, and shall be paid half-yearly, in advance, to each* province." Yes, sir, so the text runs. But suppose ourselves in the time of our first, or second, or third Federal Cabinet, consisting of its six or more sections, of course; and, for the sake of my argument, I will suppose a great deal, that every one of these sections controls comfortably the delegations from its own province in the two Houses of Parliament, that the machine is working beautifully, that there is no lieutenant-governor crusty, no provincial administration kicking over the traces, and no provincial legislature giving any other trouble than by its anxiety to be well paid. I will suppose even that this halcyon state of things has gone on for some time. But one or two or more of the provinces begin to feel that they cannot do without having more money. And the pressure will be such upon the Provincial Legislature and upon the Lieutenant-Governor, and upon the delegations to the General Legislature, and upon the section of the Federal Executive representing each such province, that it never can be long resisted; there will be trouble if it is, and things must be kept pleasant. (Hear, hear.) One mode—the most obvious, though the least scientific—will be just to increase the subvention from eighty to eighty-five, or even to eighty-two or eighty-one cents a head. An additional cent a head from the Federal Exchequer would be an object—a few cents a head would be a boon. Or suppose the demand took this form: suppose the people—say of Upper or Lower Canada—should say, "Those Newfoundlanders are getting \$150,000 a year for their lands, mines, and minerals; and the Federal Government is positively administering those lands, mines, and minerals, not for Federal profit, but more for the advantage of that province than we find we can administer our own; the General Government, therefore, must take our lands, mines, and minerals, and give us also an equivalent." That is one way of doing the thing; and, when the time comes for making that sort of demand, depend upon it that it will sound singularly reasonable in the ears of the provinces whose representatives shall make it; and if two or three provinces shall join in the demand, my word for it, the thing will soon be done. The same sort of thing may be looked for in reference to the New Brunswick timber export duty and the Nova Scotia mineral export duty. Here is one form of the cry that may be raised—"You give these

exceptional privileges to New Brunswick and Nova Scotia; give them, or some equivalent, to us also." With common ingenuity lots of such cries may be nicely got up. But for everything so given, much or little, to whatever province, you will have to do the like for all the rest, and the figure will be alarming before you get to the end. And even this is not all. Not only will you have these comparatively direct demands—more or less ingeniously, but always irresistibly—made, but you will have demands made in a more indirect form which it will be yet easier to carry, from their consequences not being so clearly seen, and which will therefore be still worse in their effects. I speak of that tremendous catalogue of outlays which may be gone into without the appearance of a grant to any particular province—the costly favors which may be done in respect of inter-provincial ferries, steamship lines between or from the provinces, railways between or through the provinces, telegraph lines, agriculture, immigration, quarantine, fisheries, and so forth. There will be claims of every description under all these heads; and besides them there will be the long roll of internal improvements of all kinds, whether for the benefit of one or of more than one of the provinces. For any local work in which it can be at all pretended that it is of general interest, pressure may be brought to bear upon the General Government and Legislature, and whenever one province succeeds in getting any such grant, every other province must be dealt with in the same way. Compensation must be made all round, and no human intellect can estimate the degree of extravagance that before long must become simply inevitable. (Hear, hear.) Sir, with our Upper and Lower Canada we have had pretty good proof of this. We know that whenever anything has had to be done for one section of this province, it has constantly been found necessary to do something of the same or of some other kind for the other. If either needed anything very badly, then the ingenuity of the Minister of Finance had to be exercised to discover something else of like value to give the other. In one word, unless I am more mistaken than I think I can be, these local governments will be pretty good daughters of the horse-leech, and their cry will be found to be pretty often and pretty successfully—"Give, give, give!" But, sir, there is very little need for our dealing with considerations of this kind as to a future about which one may be thought to be in danger of drawing more or less upon imagin-

ation. We have in these resolutions a something that is to come upon us, one may say, at once; I allude to the expenditure for our defences—the Intercolonial Railway—the opening of communication with the North-West—and the enlargement of our canals. There is no doubt that all these new sources of outlay are immediately contemplated. Their cost is not given us; it could not be given with any safety to the scheme. I do not pretend to say, sir, but that some of these expenditures are necessary; and this I am even prepared to say as to one of them—the outlay for defences—that every province of the empire is bound to do its full share towards its own defence. (Hear, hear.) I never gave a vote or expressed an opinion in any other sense. I was always ready with my vote for that purpose. (Hear, hear.) But looking at the great outlay, I may say the enormous outlay here understood to be contemplated, I confess I cannot approach the subject in this connection without a feeling of misgiving. I can quite understand our going to the full limit of our means for all the expense that is necessary for the thorough maintenance of our militia on an efficient footing as to instruction and otherwise; but when we hear of Imperial engineers, with Imperial ideas as to cost, laying out grand permanent works of defence, then I confess I am much inclined to think that we had need try to practice what economy we can in that direction. (Hear, hear.) Then, as regards the Intercolonial Railway, we have in these resolutions a very blind tale indeed. “The General Government shall secure, without delay, the completion of the Intercolonial Railway from Rivière du Loup, through New Brunswick, to Truro in Nova Scotia”—and this quite irrespectively of the expense. The vague pledge is, that the General Government shall at any cost secure the immediate completion of this work. As to its commercial or military advantages, I have not a great idea of them. I believe there has been much exaggeration as to both. Unless with a strong force to defend it, in a military point of view, it would be of just no use at all. (Hear, hear.) For my own part, as I have often said, I heartily wish to see the road built; but unless we can get it done upon terms within our means, we had better do without it a little longer, and develop what other means of communication are at our command. While I want to see the thing done, I am not prepared for the declaration I find in these resolutions, that, *coûte que coûte*, we will at once

have it. I doubt the policy of that way of dealing. (Hear, hear.) Viewed in its political aspects, the work is as much an Imperial as a provincial work; is one for which we have a right to look for aid from the Empire. I know it is said the Empire is going to aid us. Well, for a long time we held this language: if the Imperial Government and the Lower Provinces between them will combine to do the rest, we are ready with lands and subsidies, in a certain proportion and to a certain limited amount. It is unfortunate, in my opinion, that that proposal led to no result. I should have been glad to have obtained it on such terms, and even would have bid up the limit to the utmost extent of our means.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—That offer is extant yet.

MR. DUNKIN—I know it is, but those since made have left it out of sight. In 1862 the start was made to a larger and not limited outlay—five-twelfths of an unstated whole—Great Britain to reduce the cost by endorsing for us to a stated figure. I regretted that scheme; but still it was better for us than what is now being forced upon us. By this last scheme, Canada will have to bear some nine-twelfths—it has been said ten-twelfths—but some nine-twelfths, at any rate. In fact, the bulk of the burden is to fall on us; and it is significant, though I dare say that the honorable gentlemen who drew up this resolution did not mean it, that it seems to let the Imperial Government off from its guarantee. This is no mere criticism of mine; my attention was drawn to the point by the article in the *Edinburgh Review* from which I was quoting last night. That writer—who is not a nobody, you may depend upon it—remarks, in effect, that from the wording of this resolution, the honorable gentlemen of the Conference do not seem to be holding to the Imperial guarantee. Should it not be given, the cost to us will be frightfully increased. And this it had not need be. For the honorable gentlemen who are running us into it might do well to remember the past. We had the Grand Trunk railway offered us for what was called next to nothing. The guarantee we were to give was not for much; and it was well secured; and we were assured it was not meant to be made use of—was more a form than a reality. Yet the guarantee was used and extended, and made a gift of; every estimate failed; the cry ever since has been for more, more; and the whole concern is now in such a state as to be threatening us day by day

with yet larger demands on the public purse than ever, to keep it going. Well, sir, I pass on from these heavy outlays for permanent defences, and the Intercolonial Railway; and I read in these resolutions that "the communications with the North-Western territory, and the improvements required for the development of the trade of the Great West with the seaboard, are regarded by this Conference as subjects of the highest importance to the Federated Provinces, and shall be prosecuted at the earliest possible period that the state of the finances will permit." Well, sir, we are told that this last phrase is synonymous with those unqualified words, "without delay," that are used as to the Intercolonial. I am reminded of a saying current in the days of Lord SYDENHAM, who was a good deal in the habit of wanting work done faster than the workers liked, and of whom it used to be said that all he ordered had to be done "immediately, if not sooner." (Hear, hear, and laughter.) I take it, the Intercolonial Railway is to be done "immediately, if not sooner," and these other improvements are to wait till "immediately, if not later." They are to be prosecuted as soon as the state of the finances will permit. I know some hon. gentlemen think that will be very soon, but if so, there must be most extraordinary means taken to borrow or otherwise raise money. (Hear, hear.) Nothing can be vaguer than the intimation given as to what these works are to be. The communications with the Great North-Western territory, where are they to begin; what are they to be; and where are they to end? And the other improvements to be carried out—the communications with the seaboard—the enlargement of the canals—how much enlargement, sir, and of how many and what canals? An honorable friend near me says canal enlargement is or should be productive. No doubt, but at what rate? I remember reading in a Lower Province paper the other day of a late speech of Hon. Mr. TILLEY's, in which he said that at the Quebec Conference they went into a calculation of the productive value of the entire outlay of these provinces upon productive public works, and found them to be yielding an average of one and an eighth of one per cent., or something like that, of yearly return upon their cost. I admit there may be in the widening of these canals a something of productiveness; but to say that it will be anything like proportionate to the outlay, is absurd.

But what I am coming back to is this—we are to go at once into the outlay of the Intercolonial Railway, and we are to go into this other, too; but yet, almost beyond the shadow of a doubt, these canals and other communications with the west—which western politicians think they are to get as their equivalent—are to be held back a bit. I forgot to bring here an extract from a late speech of Hon. Mr. TILLEY's, in which he plainly said that an immediate carrying on of these western works did not enter into the calculations of the Conference, that the Intercolonial was unmistakably to be put through at once; but that the Lower Province delegates gave no promise of the like prosecution of these other works as the price of that. (Hear, hear.)

AN HON. MEMBER—Where do you find that?

MR. DUNKIN—It is quoted in a late number of the *Toronto Leader*; and if anyone will bring me the fyle of that paper from below, I will read the words with pleasure. Now, Mr. SPEAKER, I am raising no question of any one's sincerity upon this question. The politicians of the eastern provinces, I have no doubt, are thoroughly in earnest in their demand for the construction of the Intercolonial road, and are quite willing to have the western improvements begun about as soon as they can be; and I am quite sure that the friends of this scheme in the west want their western works instantly gone on with. I even believe they both think they will get what they want; but I am surprised at their credulity, for I do not see how they can. I believe they are deceiving themselves and their friends with the bright pictures their fancy has been painting, and that my western friends, at any rate, are doomed to some disappointment. Whenever a Federal Parliament shall meet, I fancy it will become a question of grave interest whether or not the state of the finances will admit of the construction of all these works; and if not, then what is to be done first—and how—and when? And as I have shewn, unless the six majorities are pretty much agreed, there will be no great deal done in any hurry.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—That is worse than the double majority.

MR. DUNKIN—Yes, three times as bad, to say the least. Well, suppose the financiers of the Lower Provinces, having before their eyes the fear of direct taxation by the Federal Parliament, should come to the

conclusion that it will not signify for a few years, whether these western works are begun at once or not; and should propose to sit down first a little, and count the cost.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—Insist on having a survey made, for instance, first?

MR. DUNKIN—Well yes, that would probably be insisted upon before they would consent to commit themselves further to the undertaking. Suppose, then, Lower Canada to go with the Lower Provinces for staving off this commencement of these works, how will it fare with Upper Canada's demand for them? And what will not be the indignation of the people of Upper Canada at being tied to, and controlled by the non-progressive people of the east? Or, suppose that Upper and Lower Canada should agree, and the Lower Provinces be seriously angry, at any over-caution eastward, or over-rashness westward; would not they too, so left out in the cold, be making things quite unpleasant? Or again, suppose the more eastern and the western interests should continue to push on both plans, careless of cost, and that Lower Canada, for fear of direct taxation, should hold back in earnest, would that make no trouble? Is not any one of these suppositions more probable than the cool assumption, over which western gentlemen are so happy, that when the time comes all interests will instantly work together, and by magic do everything, east and west, at once? But, be this as it may, sir, on all three accounts—defences, Intercolonial road and western works—we are sure of cost, as well as of disputes, in plenty. And there is, besides, a fourth. I shall have occasion to shew presently that we are going to be called upon to spend money for yet another kindred purpose, and a large amount too—and this, as a part of this scheme. Our star of empire is to wing its way westward; and we are to confederate everything in its track, from Newfoundland to Vancouver's Island, this last included. But, between us and it, there lies the Hudson Bay territory. So, of course, we must acquire that for confederation purposes; and the plan is, that before we get it we shall have to pay for the elephant—though, after we get him, we may find him costly and hard to keep. It will not be difficult to prove that this is contemplated by the promoters of this scheme. Between railways and canals, and western extension, before we get the scheme carried out in all its contemplated amplitude, we shall have bled pretty well, and seen some

sights that we have hardly yet learnt to anticipate. (Hear, hear.) Well, with this certain prospect before us of a gigantic outlay, what is the prospect for a gigantic income?

A MEMBER—Oh, never mind that.

MR. DUNKIN—I quite understand that many hon. gentlemen take little thought of where money is to come from, if only it is to be spent as they wish. But, MR. SPEAKER, before I go further, I am handed the fyle of the *Toronto Leader*, and, with the leave of the House, I will read from it the extracts from Hon. MR. TILLEY's speech to which I was referring some minutes ago. This journal refers to it as follows:—

MR. TILLEY, we are sorry to say, does not give us much hope of the speedy enlargement of our canals. He laughs at the idea of his opponent quoting MR. BROWN as authority that this work is to be undertaken at once. "The Conference," says MR. TILLEY, "agreed to build the railroad without delay, the canals as soon as the state of the finances will permit." But he ridicules the idea that the finances will be held at once to admit of this being done. "Canada," says MR. TILLEY, "could not have been brought into the union on a promise to build her canals, for the railroad will cost \$12,000,000, which added to the \$22,000,000 for canals, would be an amount far above what they could have gained them for without Confederation."

Such is Hon. MR. TILLEY's style of remark, and I do not think it is at all encouraging to the very sanguine view of the scheme taken by some western politicians. It is presumable that he will take Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia with him, and along with them he will get much of Lower Canada. If I should have the honor of a seat in the House, they may depend upon it, I shall do what I can to get them fair play. But I repeat, I do not expect to see them satisfied with the result. Well, sir, however this may be, there is going to be, at any rate, an immense amount of money required, come from whence it may. Where is it to come from? We cannot shut our eyes to the fact, that the customs tariff must come down. (Hear.) There are no two ways about that. Our tariff is much higher than those of the Lower Provinces; and the advocates of Confederation there have to assure people that their tariffs will not be materially raised, in order to get any sort of hearing for the scheme. To tell them that the tariff of Canada is to be that of the Confederation, would be to ruin the chances of getting a favorable reception for it. (Hear, hear.)

We are marching fast and steadily towards free trade. We must meet the views of the people of the Lower Provinces, who are hostile to high tariffs, and the demand of the Imperial authorities that we should not tax their manufactures so heavily as—in their phrase—almost to deprive them of our market. It was distinctly and officially stated the other day, in Newfoundland, that assurance had been given to the Government of Newfoundland that the views of the Canadian Government are unmistakably in this direction. And I do not think there is any mistake about that, either. To shew how people at home, too, expect our tariff to come down, I may refer to the speech of Mr. HAMBURY TRACY, in seconding the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne, in the House of Commons the other day. He could not stop, after saying generally that he was pleased with this Confederation movement, without adding that he trusted it would result in a very considerable decrease in the absurdly high and hostile tariff at present prevailing in Canada. I have not here the exact words, but that was their purport. Well, if the customs tariff is to come down largely, we must look for a decrease of revenue. I am free to admit that a reduction of the tariff on certain articles, or even some measure of reduction all round, might be no material loss, or might even be a gain, to the revenue—in ordinary or prosperous times, that is to say. But when the object of reducing the tariff is to meet other exigencies than those of revenue, one can hardly hope to get such a tariff as shall give us the largest revenue attainable. And besides, no one can deny that we are about entering upon a time, commercially speaking, that may be termed hard. We have had, for some time past, pretty heavy importations, and our best informed and shrewdest commercial men tell us that we are going to have, for some time to come, pretty light importations. We are not to have a plethoric purse, even under ordinary drafts upon it, for some years.

HON. MR. HOLT—The hard time is come now.

MR. DUNKIN—Yes, it is come, or is close on us, and it rather threatens to last. And if, with this state of things before us, to oblige the Imperial authorities and the Lower Provinces, under pressure of an inevitable state necessity, we are to reduce our customs rates, or any number of them, below what I may call their figure of largest productive-

ness, then surely it is little to say that we cannot look forward to an increase in the revenue, or even to a continuance of our present income, and it is rather strange that we should be called upon, withal, at the same time so to change our whole system as to involve ourselves in the enormous extravagances here contemplated. No taxing scheme can ever meet the case. Nothing can be looked to, but a device of borrowing without limit—the incurring of an amount of debt that, in interest and sinking fund, must prove to be simply unendurable hereafter. (Hear, hear.) But, in fact, we cannot even borrow to any large amount unless under false pretences. We cannot borrow without telling tales of our condition, resources and expectations, that will in the end be found out to be lies. We must awaken hopes in the minds of money lenders abroad, that cannot but prove delusive—the memory of which must work us hereafter an aggravation of punishment that we shall then scarcely need. And when that time of reckoning shall have come, then staggering under the load, without credit at home or abroad, the country will have to choose whether it will have heavy direct taxation—for heavy such taxation then must be—or have recourse to more or less of repudiation; or even run some risk of both. Sir, if ever that time shall come, the public men of that day and the people on whom the burthen will then press, will not bless the memory of those who held out the false hopes and inducements under which it is now sought to decoy us into wild expenditure and crushing debt. (Hear, hear.) Well, Mr. SPEAKER, I now pass to another branch of my subject altogether. There is a further salient contrast between the American system and the system proposed for our adoption. The people of the United States, when they adopted their Constitution, were one of the nations of the earth. They formed their whole system with a view to national existence. They had fought for their independence, and had triumphed; and still in the flush of their triumph, they were laying the foundations of a system absolutely national. Their Federal Government was to have its relations with other nations, and was sure to have plenty to do upon entering the great family of nations. But we—what are we doing? Creating a new nationality, according to the advocates of this scheme. I hardly know whether we are to take the phrase for ironical, or not. Is it a reminder

that in fact we have no sort of nationality about us, but are unpleasantly cut up into a lot of struggling nationalities, as between ourselves? Unlike the people of the United States, we are to have no foreign relations to look after, or national affairs of any kind; and therefore our new nationality, if we could create it, could be nothing but a name. I must say that according to my view of the change we ought to aim at, any idea of Federation that we may entertain had need take an Imperial direction. Whenever changing our institutions, we had need develop and strengthen—not merely maintain, but maintain, develop and strengthen—the tie, not yet Federal as it ought to be, between us and the parent state. (Hear, hear.) It is the entire Empire that should be federalized, and cemented together as one, and not any mere limited number of its dependencies here or there. A general, or so called federal government, such as we are here proposing to create, will most certainly be in a false position. As I said just now, the Federal Government of the United States was to take its place in the great family of the nations of the earth; but what place in that family are we to occupy? Simply none. The Imperial Government will be the head of the Empire as much as ever, and will alone have to attend to all foreign relations and national matters; while we shall be nothing more than we are now. Half-a-dozen colonies federated are but a federated colony after all. Instead of being so many separate provinces with workable institutions, we are to be one province most cumbrously organised—nothing more. How many grades of government are we going to have under this system? The Imperial Government, the one great head of the Empire; then this Federal Government; then our lot of provincial governments; below them again, our county municipalities, and, still below these, our township and other local municipalities. (Hear, hear.) We have thus five different sets of governmental machinery, and of these five there is just one too many in my judgment. You might as well make six while you are about it, and interpolate between our provincial and county governments a district governmental machinery. If we did that we should be doing a thing not a whit more absurd than we propose to do now, in erecting a new piece of such machinery between the Imperial and provincial governments. We do not want a third municipal government, because there is nothing for it to

do; and when we propose to create a Federal Government between the Imperial and Provincial, we are equally proposing to create a something which, having nothing of its own to do, must find work by encroaching on the functions of the Imperial and provincial governments in turn, with no place among nations, no relations with other countries, no foreign policy; it will stand in just the same position towards the Imperial Government as Canada now stands in, or as Upper or Lower Canada before the union used to occupy. That intermediate work of government which is now done by the Province of Canada, the Province of New Brunswick, the Province of Nova Scotia, the Province of Prince Edward Island and the Province of Newfoundland, is to be done, part by the Federal Government and part by the provinces. The work is simply divided that is now done by the provincial legislatures and governments, and in my opinion there is no use in this subdivision of work at all. You are putting this fifth wheel to the coach, merely to find out that a misfitting odd wheel will not serve any useful purpose, nor so much as work smoothly with the other four. (Hear, hear.) Your Federal Government will occupy about as anomalous a position between the Imperial and provincial governments as I showed, last night, will be occupied by your lieutenant governors between the Federal authority and the provinces. Both will be out of place, and to find themselves in work they must give trouble. I do not see how they can do good, but I do see how they can do any quantity of harm. (Hear, hear.) The real difficulty in our position is one that is not met by the machinery here proposed. What is that difficulty? In the larger provinces of the empire we have the system of responsible government thoroughly accorded by the Imperial Government, and thoroughly worked out; and the difficulty of the system that is now pressing, or ought to be, upon the attention of our statesmen is just this—that the tie connecting us with the Empire, and which ought to be a federal tie of the strongest kind, is too slight, is not, properly speaking, so much as a federal tie at all. These provinces, with local responsible government, are too nearly in the position of independent communities; there is not enough of connection between them and the parent state to make the relations between the two work well, or give promise of lasting long. There is in the machinery too much of what may be called the centrifugal ten-

gency. (Hear, hear.) All the great provinces are flying off too much, attending too exclusively to mere local considerations, too little to those of the general or Imperial kind. And at home, as we seem to be flying off, they, too, are thinking of us and of the interests they and we have in common less and less. What is wanting, if one is to look to the interest of the Empire, which is really that of all its parts—what is wanting, as I have said, is an effective federalization of the Empire as a whole, not a subordinate federation here or there, made up out of parts of it. I have neither time nor strength to-night to go fairly into the question of how this thing should be done; but a few words more as to that, I must be pardoned for. Until latterly in Canada we have not had, and some colonies have not now, I believe, a Minister of Militia. Even we have not as yet, in our Cabinet, a minister to attend to what may be called Imperial affairs. It is not the business of any minister, nor is it even distinctly recognized as that of the Ministry as a whole, in any of these provinces, to attend to what is really at the present juncture the most important part of our whole public business—the regulation of affairs between them and the Mother Country. I know it may be said this is in the hands of the Governor. So are other things. But for them, we see the need of his having advisers. And as to this, if a Cabinet leaves it wholly to him, that practically amounts to its neglecting these affairs altogether. Let me go back to a point or two in the history of affairs in Canada within the recollection of all honorable gentlemen. In 1862, when the then Militia Bill was before the House, it was asked over and over again by gentlemen of the Opposition, what communications, if any, had been received from the Imperial Government in respect of the defence of this province; and the answer invariably was, that there had been none, none known to the Administration, as an administration. Now, if there had then been an officer—the Provincial Secretary, the Minister of Militia, or any other member of the Government—whose duty it had been and was to attend to that important branch of the public service; if the relations between the Mother Country and this province had been known to be in his charge, such an answer as that could never have been given, nor the second reading of that bill lost in consequence. The other night, when the Raid Prevention and Alien Bill was before the House, we did receive the intimation that the Mother Country desired legisla-

tion of that kind at our hands; and it passed accordingly. But that intimation was then given us exceptionally. There is a large class of questions springing up continually which affect Imperial interests and Imperial views as well as our own, and we ought to have—and if our connection with the Empire is to last, we must have—this department of our public affairs attended to by a regularly appointed Minister of the Crown here, who, whenever occasion requires, may explain them and who shall be responsible to this House. Of course, nobody denies that the Governor General is the channel of communication between us and the Imperial Government. He is the Queen's representative and servant, and his communications with the Home Government must be of the most confidential character, except in so far as he may see fit to make them known. But fully admitting this, still besides those communications of this character which he may, have and indeed at all times must have unrestrictedly with the Imperial Government, there should be—and, if our Imperial relations are to be maintained, there must be—a further class of communications between the two governments, as to which the Governor should be advised by a minister whose particular duty it should be to manage affairs between the Mother Country and ourselves, and to be in effect a local adviser, as to such matters, of the Imperial advisers of the Crown in England. In one word, we have got to develop the Imperial phase, so to speak, of our provincial system; to find the means of keeping our policy and that of the Mother Country in harmony; and if we do not, we cannot long keep up our connection with the Empire. If this were done—if we had in our several provincial administrations some member charged with this department of the public service, as latterly we have come to have one charged with the cognate subject of the militia and defence of the country—if these ministers of Imperial relations made periodical visits home, so as there to meet one another and such members of the Imperial Government or others as the Crown might charge to meet and confer with them—if there were thus organized, some sort of advisory colonial council upon the precedent (so far, of course, as the analogy might hold) of the Council for East Indian Affairs lately created—if, I say, something in this way were done, then indeed we should be developing our Imperial relations in the proper direction, taking at least a step—the first and hardest—towards the framing of that Imperial feder-

ation of which we so stand in need. But there is no provision of that kind in the system here proposed; there is no apparent contemplation of a step of that kind in connection with this step. On the contrary, this step is all in the wrong direction. We are here proposing to create in this part of the Queen's dominions a mere sub-federation, so to speak, tending, so far as it tends to anything, towards the exclusion of this kind of provision. This other machinery to which I have been alluding, Mr. SPEAKER, if we had had it a few years ago, would have been of extreme usefulness. Suppose we had had something of that kind when the Rebellion Losses Bill was passed, when so much excitement was thereby created in the country. Suppose that then when the indignation of a large class was concentrating itself against Lord ELGIN for his supposed purpose of assenting to that bill, he could have said—"It is idle for you, as you must see, to require me to listen to you against the advice of my constitutional advisers; but you know there is a tribunal at home, to which you may appeal from that advice, where you will be heard and they, and from which you may be sure of justice if you have been aggrieved or injured here." Sir, if it had been possible for the Governor General to have given such an answer at that time to the angry remonstrances of those who opposed that measure, the Parliament House would not have been burnt, nor would we have had to deplore the long train of consequent disturbances and troubles which then and ever since have brought so much discredit and mischief to the country. Take another case. If such machinery had existed when the fishery treaty with France was entered into by the Imperial Government, conditioned upon the consent of Newfoundland, no such anomalous proceeding could have taken place. For the representatives of Newfoundland and of the rest of these provinces would at once have shown the Imperial Government that it would not meet approval in that colony, nor indeed for that matter, anywhere else in British America. Great Britain would have been saved from entering into a treaty that—as matters went—had to be disallowed, with some discredit to the Empire, and some risk of a rupture of its friendly relations with a foreign power.

MR. SCOBLE—Does not the House of Commons afford that machinery?

MR. DUNKIN—The House of Commons knows very little, and cares much less, about our local affairs. (Hear, hear.) I say, if there had then been a Colonial Council at

home, where representatives of the different provincial administrations might have met and advised with any of Her Majesty's ministers, there would have been no difficulty. It would have disposed of any number of other questions more satisfactorily than they have been disposed of. The north-eastern boundary question with the States, for instance, would never have been settled in a way so little accordant with our views and interests; and the question of the western boundary would have been settled sooner and better, also. Take another illustration. When the difficulty arose between this country and England about our tariff, when the Sheffield manufacturers sought to create a feeling at home against us, because we, mainly to raise revenue, placed duties higher than they liked on importations of manufactured goods, if any such machinery had been in operation, no such wide-spread and mischievous misapprehension as to our acts and purposes could have arisen, as ever since has been prevalent in England, and even on the floor of the House of Commons. In fact, I repeat that without some such system, I do not see how our relations with the Empire can be maintained on a satisfactory footing. It is just the want of it that is leading so many at home now to think us in a transition state towards separation and independence, when, in truth, we have such need to prove to them that we are in a transition state towards a something very different indeed—the precise antipodes of separation. (Hear, hear.) Sir, I was saying that in this scheme there is no such conservative tendency as this—nothing indicative of a set purpose to develope, strengthen and perpetuate our connection with the Empire. That end we might indeed better gain without than with this extra machinery of local federation; for disguise it how you may, the idea that underlies this plan is this, and nothing else—that we are to create here a something—kingdom, viceroyalty, or principality—something that will soon stand in the same position towards the British Crown that Scotland and Ireland stood in before they were legislatively united with England; a something having no other tie to the Empire than the one tie of fealty to the British Crown—a tie which in the cases, first, of Scotland, and then of Ireland, was found, when the pinch came, to be no tie at all; which did not restrain either Scotland or Ireland from courses so inconsistent with that of England as to have made it necessary that their relations should be radically changed, and a legislative

union formed in place of a merely nominal union. Suppose you do create here a kingdom or a principality, bound to the Empire by this shadow of a tie, the day of trial cannot be far distant, when this common fealty will be found of as little use in our case as it was in theirs; when, in consequence, the question will force itself on the Empire and on us between entire separation on the one hand, and a legislative union on the other. But a legislative union of British America with the United Kingdom must be, in the opinion of, one may say, everybody at home and here, a sheer utter impossibility; and when the question shall come to be whether we are so to be merged in the United Kingdom or are to separate entirely from it, the answer can only be—"At whatever cost, we separate." Sir, I believe in my conscience that this step now proposed is one directly and inevitably tending to that other step; and for that reason—even if I believed, as I do not, that it bid fair to answer ever so well in the other respects—because I am an Englishman and hold to the connection with England, I must be against this scheme. Suppose now, on the other hand, this scheme were not to go into operation, there would be no earthly difficulty in working out, with this Canada of ours, the other plan I have been suggesting for the placing of our relations with the Empire on a better footing. Nor would there probably be any material difficulty either in bringing about a legislative union of the Lower Provinces, or in developing a very near approach to free trade, or indeed absolute free trade between us and them. I know there are those who say that this mock Federal union is necessary in order to our getting that free trade with those provinces. Well, sir, as to that, all I care to say is this, that for a number of years past we have had a near approach to free trade with the United States—a foreign country; and I imagine we can have it with the Lower Provinces as well, without any very great difficulty. (Hear, hear.) I say again, we had far better hold firmly to the policy of thus maintaining and strengthening our union with the parent state, than let ourselves, under whatever pretext, be drawn into this other course, which must inevitably lead to our separation from the Empire. (Hear, hear.) But, Mr. SPEAKER, there is still another point of view in which this scheme requires to be considered. The people of the United States, when they framed their institutions, were not only starting as a nation—they were so starting with no dangerous neighbor-nation near them. If we are

to take the step now urged upon us, not only are we to be something less than a nation, but we are to be this with a very dangerous neighbor-nation indeed. In this connection I may be allowed to read a few words. The thirtieth resolution says:—

The General Government and Parliament shall have all powers necessary or proper for performing the obligations of the Federated Provinces, as part of the British Empire, to foreign countries, arising under treaties between Great Britain and such countries.

It is quite right that the General Government should have such powers; but the very fact of our having to make a reservation of this kind, is an unpleasant recognition of the fact, in itself the reverse of encouraging, of the all darkening neighborhood of the United States. It is a most singular thing that we are required on the one hand to go into this union on this very account—for downright dread of the United States—and yet that on the other, we are as confidently assured of our own immense resources, are told that we are so wonderfully great and wonderfully rich, that we are something like—I don't know whether we are not—the third or fourth power, or maritime power, one or other, in the world. Really, I would not undertake to say how great we are, or are not, according to honorable gentlemen. They startle one. I had no idea how great we were! (Hear, hear.) But yet, with all this wonderful magnificence and greatness, we are told we positively must not, for very fear of the United States—for fear of their power—for fear of their hostility, we must not any longer stay disunited, but must instantly enter into this so-called union. Just as if either their power or their hostility towards us—taking that to be their feeling—would be lessened by our doing so. Just as if they would not be only the more jealous of us and hostile to us, for our setting ourselves up ostentatiously as their rivals. (Hear, hear.) In this connection, it does seem to me that we have more than one question to answer. Many honorable gentlemen appear to think they have done all that need be done, when they have answered to their own satisfaction the one question, What is the amount of our resources? Starting with the vastness of our territory, they go into all kinds of statements as to our trade and so forth, multiplying tonnage impossibly, adding together exports and imports—those of the Intercolonial trade and all. I only wonder they do not, on the same principle, calculate our inter-county and

our inter-township tradings, or our dealings between cities and country, adding exports and imports of course all round, and so proving that we have done more trade than all the rest of the world put together; unless, indeed, they were to count up the trade of the rest of the world by the same rule; and then to be sure they would find out that, after all, the rest of the world do more business, are more populous, richer, and stronger, than we. The question is not simply, What are our own resources? We must supplement it with a second—What are they comparatively? And especially, what are they as compared with those of the United States? And while we are asking this question, we may as well not take it for granted as a fact, that the larger our country the stronger we must be. Suppose we are to be four millions of people in a country as large as Europe or larger. I wish to Heaven we were four millions of people—with all the adjacent unexposed territory you will—but in a country smaller than England. Why, sir, New England alone has more population and resources, all told, than the Lower Provinces and Lower Canada together; and with her compactness and advantage of position, she could alone, presumably, beat both.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—New England stronger than the Lower Provinces and the two Canadas?

MR. DUNKIN—I did not say that; I said stronger than Lower Canada and the Lower Provinces.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—It is about the same in population, two and a half millions, while we have more shipping than they.

MR. DUNKIN—I fear that if we were to come into collision, a good deal of shipping might change hands. At any rate, at the best, we should have a pretty tight time of it. (Hear, hear.)

AN HON. MEMBER—Better put a bold face on it.

MR. DUNKIN—Yes, yes. "Brag is a good dog, but Holdfast is a better." Then, there is the State of New York, which would certainly be more than a match for Upper Canada—and New York is but one of several states continuous with Upper Canada. Who in his senses, sir, thinks of these provinces as able, of themselves, to hold their own against New England, New York and the rest of the tier of states along our frontier? And yet we are talked to as if Confederation were about to make us the

third or fourth power, or maritime power in the world! But what I was saying more particularly was, that too much of territory, and above all too much of exposed frontier, does not increase our strength, but lessens it. Ours is the 'long thin line of red,' which is not so well able to receive a charge as the solid square.

COL. HAULTAIN was understood to signify dissent to some of the propositions here advanced.

MR. DUNKIN—If the hon. member for Peterborough thinks that in a military point of view, the length and narrowness of our territory adds to our strength—if he thinks we are the stronger for our length of frontier, I would respectfully recommend him to attend one of our military schools (Laughter.) But seriously, sir, if we are to compare our resources with those of the United States, we shall find, as I have said, that theirs are unmistakably, and beyond count, greater.

COL. HAULTAIN—Than the British Empire?

MR. DUNKIN—That is not the comparison. We are continually hearing of what Confederation is to do for ourselves, how it is going to make us a great power in the world. It is going to do nothing of the kind. But again—and here is a third question that in this connection we have got to answer—how is the temper of the United States going to be affected, on the one hand, by the policy here urged on us, of what I may call hostile independent effort—effort made on our part, with the avowed object of setting ourselves up as a formidable power against them; or on the other hand, by a policy such as I have been urging, of unobtrusive development of our institutions in connection with the British Empire? In which of the two cases are they likely to be the more amiable, or, (which is perhaps more to the point), the less aggressive or practically unamiable, as our neighbors? Besides, there comes up still another question. What is to be the attitude of Great Britain under either of these two suppositions? As I have said, the question is, first, as to our own resources; next, as to the comparative resources of the United States; then, as to their attitude and temper towards us, upon one or other of these two suppositions; then, as to the attitude and temper of Great Britain, in reference to each of these suppositions; and lastly, as to the reaction (so to speak) upon ourselves, of these respective attitudes of the two countries in either case.

If, sir, we are thinking to give other people the idea, that by uniting ourselves together in any such way as this, we are going to make ourselves able to take care of ourselves, we are merely humbugging ourselves, and trying to humbug others. The people of the United States are stronger than we are, and are known so to be; and if we are to hold our own against or beside them, it can only be by remaining strongly, avowedly, lastingly, attached to Great Britain. This is the firm conclusion I have come to; and I believe it is the conclusion to which any one who will give his thoughtful attention to the subject must come also. And I must and do protest against the notion which seems to prevail among the advocates of this scheme, that somehow or other it is going so to increase our power, as to make us a formidable neighbor of the United States. The danger is, of its making that people more jealous of us and more hostile towards us than before. And if, besides that, it is going to give them and the people of England, or either of them, the idea that as a result of it we are to care less for the connection with the Empire than before—that under it we are before long to go alone, it is going to commit us to about the saddest fatal mistake that a people ever made. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. SPEAKER, I must apologize for the length to which I have wearied the House. (Cries of "Go on!") I have gone through, as well as I could, the leading points of my arguments, so far; and have indicated a number of points of contrast between this system and that of the United States. I trust I have not been too prolix in my attempts to shew that the Constitution now offered for our acceptance presents machinery entirely unlike that of the United States, and entirely unlike that of the British Empire—that it is inconsistent with either—that so far from its proffering to us all the advantages of both and the disadvantages of neither, it rather presents to us the disadvantages of both and the advantages of neither; that so far from its tending to improve our relations either with the Mother Country or with the United States, it holds out to us very little prospect indeed for the future, in either of these respects. (Hear, hear.) I shall not attempt to review my argument on these heads, for I do not think that to anyone at all willing to reflect, what I have advanced can require to be proved more fully. If I am not entirely wrong, the only

way in which this proposed machinery can be got to work at all, will be by an aggregation, so to speak, in the first Federal Cabinet, of the leading men of the different existing provincial administrations. The attempt must be made to combine the six majorities, so as to carry on an administration in harmony with the understood wishes of the six several provinces, irrespectively of every consideration of principle, or of sound far-seeing policy. I do not see how, although this thing may be done at starting, it can be carried on—I was going to say, for any length of time—I might say, for any time, long or short, unless by a system of the most enormous jobbery and corruption. Whenever any sore spot shall show itself—and we may rely on it, there will be more than one such show itself very soon—then feuds and divisions of the worst sort will follow, and the machinery will no longer work. Unfortunately, there are in it none of those facilities for harmonious workings, none of those nice adaptations by which the stronger power is so tempered as not to fall too harshly on the weaker. Just so long as the majorities in all the different provinces work cordially together, well and good. But they cannot possibly work harmoniously together long; and so soon as they come into collision, there comes trouble, and with the trouble, the fabric is at an end. (Hear, hear.) For myself, I am decidedly of opinion that our true interest is to hold this machinery over, to consider it carefully, to see if something better cannot be devised. (Hear, hear.) I am sure there can. But instead of that, we are called upon emphatically and earnestly at once to throw aside all considerations to the contrary, and to adopt the measure; and we are at the same time told, in unmistakable language, that we positively cannot—must not—shall not—change a single word of it. Various considerations are urged upon us for this unseemly haste; considerations connected with the attitude of the United States, with Great Britain, with the Lower Provinces, and with our own domestic affairs. With the permission of the House, I will touch as briefly as I can on these four classes of considerations, and then cease longer to weary the House. I begin, then, with the considerations connected with the attitude of the United States, which are urged upon us as reasons why we should rush into this measure of Confederation. To some extent I have already incidentally

touched on these in another connexion; but they call for some further notice, and in giving it them, I will try not to repeat myself. Judging from much of the language which we have heard on the floor of this House, one would suppose we must be on the verge of a war with the United States. For my part, I believe nothing of the kind. But if we were, would it be at all the right thing for us to abstain from the more pressing questions of our defences and the organization of the militia, and to be instead discussing here these plans of a Federal Union, Provincial Constitutions, and I know not what? These we are called upon, I admit, to discuss in a tremendous hurry, to settle off-hand, in workable or unworkable shape, nobody seeming to know or to care which, everybody professing to hope that all will come right in the end, whether he thinks it will or not. But, sir, I say again, if war were imminent with the United States, the one question for us would be the state of our defences, the organization of our militia, how much England can do for us, how much we can do for ourselves, how much England and we, each of us, are to undertake to do together. That is not the question at the present time at all, and I therefore take it that the outcry raised in connection with this scheme, about our defences and the militia, is just so much buncombe. (Hear, hear.) If honorable gentlemen opposite believed in it, I am certain that the pressing question would be taken up first. Further, if such danger were not even pretty far off, I for one would be disposed to think that the taking up now of this other class of questions comes a little late in the day. With any near, real danger of war with the United States, it would be quite too late for us to be sitting here, gravely discussing a political union, to be consummated months hence, at soonest, and then only to lead to the construction of railways which will take years, and defences which cannot be put in order for months or years, and to future developments of all kinds, which it will take years on years to carry out. If war, I say, is imminent, these ulterior undertakings, though begun now, would be begun all too late. Whenever there is such danger, our defence will not be found in the making of federal or other constitutions, or in paper display of any kind, but must be found in the strong arms and determined courage of our people, responding earnestly to the call

of the Mother Country, and backed with all the power she can bring to bear upon the conflict. Supposing that time come, we have plenty of governing machinery for that defence. We do not need, in order to it, a viceroy and court, and lieutenant-governors, and all the complicated political apparatus of this scheme. We could get along just as well under our present system, and I think better. Certainly, if modified as I have indicated it might be—if improved by the better development of our relations to the Empire—the system which would thence result would be as good as that here offered for our acceptance—indeed, would be much better. But, sir, the real danger is not of war with the United States. It is from what I may call their pacific hostility—from trouble to be wrought by them within this country—trouble to arise out of refusal of reciprocity—repeal of the bonding system—custom-house annoyances—passport annoyances; from their fomenting difficulties here, and taking advantage of our local jealousies; from the multiplied worries they may cause us by a judicious alternation of bullying and coaxing, the thousand incidents which may easily be made to happen if things are not going on quite well in this country, and the people and government of the States are minded to make us feel the consequences of our not getting on quite so well as we might. Whether the union of the States is restored or not, this kind of thing can go on. The danger is, that either the whole United States, or those portions of the United States which are near us, and which are really stronger than we are, and enterprising enough and ambitious enough, and not very fond of us, and not at all fond of the Mother Country, not at all unwilling to strike a blow at her and to make us subservient to their own interest and ambition—the danger is, I say, that the United States, or those portions of the United States near us, may avail themselves of every opportunity to perplex us, to embroil us in trouble, to make us come within the disturbing influences of their strong local attraction.—Now, to pretend to tell me that the United States or the Northern States, whichever you please, are going to be frightened, from a policy of that kind, by our taking upon ourselves great airs, and forming ourselves into a grand Confederation, is to tell me that their people are, like the Chinese, a people to be frightened by loud noises and ugly grimaces. (Laughter.) I do not believe they are. They

are not to be frightened by any union we can make here. They have among them politicians, to say the least, quite as bold, shrewd and astute as any we have here. The danger will just be that of our having agitation of our own going on here, and internal troubles, while these annoyances on the part of our neighbors across the border are being multiplied upon us; and that England may at the same time be feeling that the tie between her and us is more or less relaxed, and that wrong and humiliation put upon us do not concern her so much as they would have done when our connection with her was practically more intimate. In and before 1840, after the troubles which had been distracting Canada were put down, it was declared, and perfectly well understood, that the Imperial Government was simply determined to hold on to the connection with this country. And the knowledge of that expressed determination guaranteed us a pretty long term of comparative freedom from annoyances and trouble of the kind to which I have been referring. If, now, a different idea is to prevail—if the notion is to go abroad that we are, by creating ourselves into a new nationality, to be somewhat less connected with the Empire than these provinces heretofore have been, then I do apprehend that a very different future is before us, and that in all sorts of ways, by vexations of all kinds, by the fomenting of every trouble within our own borders, whether originating from abroad, or only reacted on from abroad, we shall be exposed to dangers of the most serious kind. And, therefore, so far from seeing in our relations towards the United States, any reason why we should assume a position of semi-independence, an attitude of seeming defiance towards them, I find in them the strongest reason why, even while regarding, or affecting to regard them as little as possible, we should endeavor to make all the world see that we are trying to strengthen our union with the Mother Country—that we care far less about a mere union with neighboring provinces, which will frighten no one in the least, but that we are determined to maintain at all hazards and draw closer, that connection with the Mother Country which alone, so long as it lasts, can and will protect us from all serious aggression. (Hear, hear.) But we are told that, on account of a variety of considerations connected with the state of opinion at home, and out of deference to that opinion, we must positively carry out this scheme. Well, there are two or three questions to be answered here. What is that

opinion at home? What is it worth? And what sort of lesson does it teach us? There are some distinctions which, in my judgment, must be drawn with reference to this. There are different phases of opinion prevailing at home, which must be taken into account. I have great respect for some home opinions. Many things they know in England much better than we do. Some things they do not know so well. They do not know so much about ourselves as we do; and they do not occupy their minds so much with that class of questions which relate merely to our interests, as we at any rate ought to do; and on these matters I am not sure that we shall act wisely if we yield at once to the first expressions of opinion at home. But now, sir, what is the opinion at home, or rather, what are the opinions entertained at home, with reference to this measure? Of course, I do not intend to weary the House with a long detailed statement on this subject. But I must say this—and I do not think that any one who knows anything at all about it will contradict what I state—there is at home a considerably numerous, and much more loud-speaking than numerous, class of politicians who do not hesitate to say that it is not for the interest of England to keep her colonies at all.

MR. SCOBLE—Not numerous.

MR. DUNKIN—Well, I think they are rather numerous and pretty influential, and they make a good deal of stir; and some of them being in pretty high places, there is danger that their views may exercise a good deal of influence upon public opinion at home. There are many influences at work at home, tending to the prevalence of the idea that the sooner the colonies leave the Mother Country, the better—and especially that the sooner these colonies leave the Mother Country, the better. There is a very exaggerated notion at home of danger to the peace of the Empire from the maintenance of British supremacy in this part of the world. That is the fact; and there is no use in our shutting our eyes to it. We may just as well take it, uncomfortable and hard fact as it may be. If we choose to tell ourselves it is not the fact, we are only humbugging ourselves. (Hear, hear.) That is one point, as regards public opinion in England. Another is, as to the appreciation, at home, of this particular scheme. I take it, that what we are told on this head by those who urge this scheme upon us, about opinion at home, amounts to this—that at home this scheme is regarded

with very great favor, that we are expected to adopt it, and that if we do not adopt it, it will be the better for us with reference to home public opinion. Well, the questions for us are: What is the opinion at home about this scheme? What is the opinion entertained in high quarters as to its goodness or badness; and if there is an opinion in favor of the scheme being adopted, from what considerations does that opinion, to a great extent, prevail? I am not going into these questions minutely, but I must be allowed to make a remark or two as to the opinion expressed by Her Majesty's Government with regard to this scheme. I have already, to some extent, alluded to the dispatch of the Colonial Secretary; but in this connection, I must allude to it a little further. (Hear, hear.) It is clear from that dispatch that the Colonial Secretary wrote under these impressions: first of all, he was under the idea that this scheme had been drawn up by the representatives of every province, chosen by the respective governors, without distinction of party. That was not quite the case. There were representatives from the two leading parties in each of the other provinces, but it was not so as regarded Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) The Colonial Secretary was, besides, evidently under the impression that when these gentlemen came together, they gave the matters before them the most mature deliberation. He says:—"They have conducted their deliberations with patient sagacity, and have arrived at unanimous conclusions on questions involving many difficulties." The "patient sagacity" was exercised for seventeen or nineteen days, and the "unanimous conclusions" were, after all, certainly not unanimous. The Secretary goes on to say:—

Her Majesty's Government have given to your despatch and to the resolutions of the Conference, their most deliberate consideration. They have regarded them as a whole, and as having been designed by those who framed them, to establish as complete and perfect a union of the whole, into one government, as the circumstances of the case, and a due consideration of existing interests, would admit. They accept them, therefore, as being in the deliberate judgment of those best qualified to decide upon the subject, the best framework of a measure to be passed by the Imperial Parliament for attaining that most desirable result.

Her Majesty's Government thus take for granted a "deliberate" examination, which most unquestionably never has been given to

this crude project. Now, with all this, with the impression that men of all parties had here acted in combination, when in truth they have done no such thing; that patient sagacity had been expended on the framing of the scheme, when in truth there was nothing of the kind; that the conclusions were unanimously arrived at, which again was not the fact; with all this, Her Majesty's Government have only come to the point of giving a very general, and, as any one who reads the dispatch can see, a very qualified approval of the scheme. First, an objection is raised as to the want of accurate determination of the limits between the authority of the Central and that of the local legislatures. I will not read the words, as I read them last night, but no one can read the dispatch without seeing that the language of the Colonial Secretary on that point is the language of diplomatic disapproval. (Hear, hear.) Though he gives a general approval, he criticises and evidently does not approve. He sees an intention, but calls attention to the fact that that intention is not clearly and explicitly expressed. He then goes on and makes another objection—the financial. His language is this:—

Her Majesty's Government cannot but express the earnest hope, that the arrangements which may be adopted in this respect may not be of such a nature as to increase—at least in any considerable degree—the whole expenditure, or to make any material addition to the taxation, and thereby retard the internal industry, or tend to impose new burdens on the commerce of the country.

The hope that it will not be is the diplomatic way of hinting a fear that it may be. When Her Majesty's Government is driven to "hope" that these arrangements will not increase in any considerable degree the whole expenditure, or make any material addition to taxation, and thereby retard internal industry, or tend to impose new burdens on the commerce of the country, it is perfectly clear that they see that in the scheme which makes them tolerably sure it will. And then we have a third objection:—

Her Majesty's Government are anxious to lose no time in conveying to you their general approval of the proceedings of the Conference. There are, however, two provisions of great importance which seem to require revision. The first of these is the provision contained in the 44th resolution, with respect to the exercise of the prerogative of pardon.

That is emphatically declared to be entirely

wrong. And then comes the fourth objection : "The second point which Her Majesty's Government desire should be reconsidered"—and this phrase is positively, so far as words can give it, a command on the part of Her Majesty's Government that it shall be reconsidered :—

The second point which Her Majesty's Government desire should be reconsidered is the constitution of the Legislative Council. They appreciate the considerations which have influenced the Conference in determining the mode in which this body, so important to the constitution of the Legislature, should be composed. But it appears to them to require further consideration whether, if the members be appointed for life, and their number be fixed, there will be any sufficient means of restoring harmony between the Legislative Council and the popular Assembly, if it shall ever unfortunately happen that a decided difference of opinion shall arise between them. These two points, relating to the prerogative of the Crown and the Constitution of the Upper Chamber have appeared to require distinct and separate notice.

Is not that a pretty emphatic dissent ?

Questions of minor consequence and matters of detailed arrangement may properly be reserved for a future time, when the provisions of the bill intended to be submitted to the Imperial Parliament shall come under consideration.

So, sir, there are more objections still which the Colonial Secretary has not stated. He gives a general sanction, but specifies four matters, two of which he distinctly says must be altered, and the other two he does not approve of, and he says that other matters—too numerous, I suppose, to specify—must be reserved for remark at a future time. Well, just at the time that this despatch made its appearance, there was an article in the *London Times*, a passage from which I will read in this connection, though it may seem to bear on a somewhat different branch of the question from that with which I am just more particularly dealing. The *London Times*, referring to this despatch, makes use of these expressions, and I beg the attention of the House to them, because they give the key-note of a great deal of the public opinion at home with reference to this matter :—

It is true we are not actually giving up the American colonies,—nay, the despatch we are quoting does not contain the slightest hint that such a possibility ever crossed the mind of the writer ; but yet it is perfectly evident—and there is no use in concealing the fact—that the Confederation movement considerably diminishes the difficulty which would be felt by the colonies in

separating from the Mother Country. Even now the North American Confederation represents a state formidable from the numbers of its hardy and energetic population, and capable, if so united, of vigorously defending the territories it possesses. A few years will add greatly to that population, and place Canada, Hochelaga, Acadia, or by whatever other name the Confederacy may think fit to call itself, quite out of the reach of invasion or conquest. Such a state would not only be strong against the Mother Country under the impossible supposition of our seeking to coerce it by force, but it might be separated from us without incurring the disgrace of leaving a small and helpless community at the mercy of powerful and warlike neighbors.

Here, then, is the somewhat less diplomatic utterance of the *Times*, on the occasion of the appearance of this despatch. It is perfectly true that no hint was given officially, when this scheme was sent home, that it contemplated separation. Perfectly true, that in the answer there is no hint that separation is contemplated. But it is perfectly true, also, that the leading journal instantly sees in it, and seizes at, the possibility—first, of its greatly facilitating our going—and, secondly, of its greatly facilitating, on the part of the Mother Country, the letting of us go. I shall come back to this branch of the subject presently, after I shall have quoted from a much more important expression of public opinion than any article in the *Times*. Meantime, I must refer to the language of Her Majesty's Speech from the Throne. It has been read during this debate already, and has been read as if it contained the most emphatic approval possible of this whole scheme—so emphatic an approval, that even to assume to discuss it now would seem to amount almost to treason. This language, of course, it is needless to say, is that of Her Majesty's Imperial advisers, and is to be read in connection with what Her Majesty's Government have said about this plan in the Colonial Secretary's despatch—that before it is passed into an enactment, it will require a good deal of revision. We may be told here that the document before us is a treaty, on which not a line or letter of amendment can be made by us. But Her Majesty's Government clearly understand that they are not bound by it, and that they are to alter it as much as they please. They won't give the pardoning power to these lieutenant-governors ; they won't constitute the Legislative Council in this way ; they won't look with indifference to the incurring of unheard-of expenses, and the hampering of commerce which they

consider to be implied in this scheme. No, they are to look into this thing, to look into the details of what they evidently think to be a pretty crude scheme; while we, who are most interested, are required by our local rulers not to look into it at all, but just to accept it at their hands as a whole. The language addressed from the Throne to the Imperial Parliament is this: "Her Majesty has had great satisfaction in giving Her sanction"—to what?—"to the meeting of a conference of delegates from the several North American Provinces, who, on invitation from Her Majesty's Governor General, assembled at Quebec." Certainly; we knew that before; they assembled without Her Majesty's sanction, but they got her sanction afterwards to their having so assembled. "These delegates adopted resolutions having for their object a closer union of those provinces under a central government. If those resolutions shall be approved by the provincial legislatures, a bill will be laid before you for carrying this important measure into effect"—not for giving full effect to the details of this scheme, but for carrying the measure—the closer union—in the shape the Imperial Government may give it, into effect. That is all. (Hear, hear.) Take this along with the despatch of the Colonial Secretary. If it is a declaration that this thing is a treaty, which may not be amended by us without flying in the face of Her Majesty's Government, I do not understand the meaning of words. (Hear, hear.) In connection with the Speech from the Throne, we had, the other night, some notice taken, on the floor of this House, of language used in discussing the address in the Imperial Parliament. Lords CLAREMONT, HOUGHTON, GRANVILLE and DERBY had something to say in respect of this scheme in the House of Lords; as also, Mr. HANBURY TRACY in the House of Commons. I do not attach great weight to what was there said, because there really was little said any way, and that little could not indicate any great amount of knowledge upon the subject treated. However, I will quote first what the mover of the address, the Earl of CLAREMONT, said. After referring to the war in New Zealand, he went on:—

My Lords, although these operations in India, New Zealand, and Japan, are matters of more or less interest or concern to the nation, and, as such, are fully deserving of notice, yet they are

small in comparison to the importance of the probable change in the constitution of our North American Colonies. Since the declaration of independence by the colonies, since known as the United States of America, so great a scheme of self-government, or one shadowing forth so many similar and possible changes, has not occurred.

Now, I cannot read this sentence without asking what analogy there is between this project and the declaration of independence. Why should these resolutions suggest to any one's mind the declaration of independence? Did the gentlemen who signed these resolutions in order to authenticate them—pledge their lives and fortunes, and I don't know what besides, to anything, or risk anything, by appending their signatures to the document? Was it a great exercise of political heroism? Why, the men who signed the declaration of independence qualified themselves in the eyes of the Imperial Government for the pleasant operations of heading and hanging. They knew what they were about. They were issuing a rebel declaration of war. But this is a piece of machinery, on the face of it at least, to perpetuate our connection with the Mother Country! Why then does it suggest the idea that so great a scheme of self-government, or one shadowing forth so many similar and possible changes, "hardly ever before occurred?" It is because there is, underlying the speaker's thought, just that idea of the anti-colonial school in England, that we are going to slip away from our connection with the Mother Country; and in this respect, therefore, it seems to him that it is like the declaration of independence. The remaining sentence indicates a curious misapprehension as to the present posture of this question. "If the delegates of these several colonies finally agree to the resolutions framed by their committee, and if these resolutions be approved by the several legislatures of the several colonies, Parliament will be asked to consider and complete this federation of our Northern American possessions." The noble lord, the mover of the Address, seems to take the resolutions for a mere report of a committee which (on their way here) had yet to be submitted to the consideration of the delegates! Next, I turn to the language of Lord HOUGHTON, the seconder of the Address; and from his lips too, we have an almost distinct utterance of the idea of our coming independence. He says:—

That impulse which inclines small states to bind themselves together for the purpose of mutual protection and for the dignity of empire, has shewn itself in two remarkable examples, of which I may be permitted to say a few words. In Europe it has manifested itself in the case of Italy, which is not, indeed, alluded to in any part of Her Majesty's speech, because it is an accomplished fact of European history. A convention has lately taken place between the Emperor of the French and the King of Italy, in which England can take no other interest than to hope that it may redound to the prosperity of the one and the honor of the other. At any rate, one great advantage has been accomplished. With his capital in the centre of Italy it is no longer possible to talk of Victor Emmanuel as King of Piedmont. He is King of Italy, or nothing. On the other side of the Atlantic the same impulse—[that same impulse, which, in the case of Italy, the speaker characterizes as aiming at the dignity of empire]—the same impulse had manifested itself in the proposed amalgamation of the northern provinces of British America. I heartily concur in all—[the all being as we have just seen, not much]—that has been said by my noble friend the mover of this address in his laudation of that project. It is, my lords, a most interesting contemplation that that project has arisen, and has been approved by Her Majesty's Government. It is certainly contrary to what might be considered the old maxims of government in connection with the colonies, that we should here express—and that the Crown itself should express—satisfaction at a measure which tends to bind together, in almost independent power, our colonies in North America. We do still believe that though thus banded together, they will recognize the value of British connection, and that while they will be safer in this amalgamation, we shall be as safe in their fealty. The measure will no doubt, my lords, require much prudent consideration and great attention to provincial susceptibilities.

I repeat, Mr. SPEAKER, there is in this quotation a second pretty plainly-expressed anticipation of our nearly approaching independence. We are supposed, by one of these noble lords, to be taking a step analogous to that taken by the authors of the Declaration of Independence; and by the other, to be moved by the same impulse of empire that has been leading to the establishment of the Kingdom of Italy.

MR. SCOBLE—It is a case of want of information.

MR. DUNKIN—Yes, I have no doubt it is a case of want of correct information, and not the only one of its kind. And now, sir, for Lord DERBY's remarks, which also have been quoted here. Certainly, they are in a different, and to my mind a more satis-

factory, tone; but they are suggestive, for all that, of an idea that is unwelcome. After remarking on certain passages indicative, in his view, of unfriendly feeling on the part of the United States towards Great Britain and towards us—their threatened abrogation of the reciprocity treaty, arming on the lakes, and so forth—Lord DERBY says:—

Under these circumstances I see with additional satisfaction—[Meaning of, course, though courtesy may have disallowed the phrase, "less dissatisfaction," for he certainly did not see those other matters with any satisfaction at all]—I see with additional satisfaction the announcement of a contemplated important step. I mean the proposed Federation of the British American Provinces. (Hear, hear.) I hope I may regard that Federation as a measure tending to constitute a power strong enough, with the aid of this country, which I trust may never be withdrawn from those provinces, to acquire an importance which, separately, they could not obtain. (Hear, hear.) If I saw in this Federation a desire to separate from this country, I should think it a matter of much more doubtful policy and advantage; but I perceive with satisfaction, that no such wish is entertained. Perhaps it is premature to discuss, at present, resolutions not yet submitted to the different provincial legislatures, but I hope I see in the terms of that Federation an earnest desire on the part of the provinces to maintain for themselves the blessing of the connection with this country, and a determined and deliberate preference for monarchical over republican institutions.

(Hear, hear.) Now, what I have to say is this, that while I think no man ought to find fault with any of the sentiments here uttered, they are yet the utterances of a statesman who betrays in those utterances at least, as they sound to me, a certain amount of scarcely-concealed apprehension. When a man in the position of Lord DERBY, master of the whole art of expression, speaks at once so hypothetically and so guardedly, falls back upon "*I hope I may regard,*" "*I trust may never be,*" "*I hope I see,*" and so forth, one feels that there is an under-current of thought, not half concealed by such expressions, to the effect that there is too much danger of the very things so *hoped* and *trusted* against coming to pass at no very distant period.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—I see the reverse of that. (Hear, hear.)

MR. DUNKIN—Well, the hon. gentleman sees differently from what I do. If there had been no doubt whatever in the mind of Lord DERBY, as to our want of strength, the growth of the anti-colonial party at home, and the tendency of this

scheme towards separation, his hope and trust to the contrary, would either have been unuttered, or would have been uttered in another tone. I am well enough satisfied that Lord DERBY himself has not the most remote idea of falling in with the views of the so-called colonial reformers in England, who desire to see the colonies pay for every thing or be cast off; but he knows the hold that their views have gained at home, and he speaks accordingly. And there is no doubt, sir, that this feeling has been got up in England to an extent very much to be regretted. In this connection I have yet to notice some passages—and I shall deal with them as briefly as I can—from the very important article I quoted last night, which is contained in the *Edinburgh Review* for January, and which, I am sorry to say, expresses this feeling in the strongest possible form. But before citing them, I am bound to say that I by no means believe the views they express are universally or even generally entertained at home. I do believe, though, that they are entertained by many, and that there is much danger of their doing a vast deal of mischief. That they are loudly avowed, does not admit of doubt; and when we find them set forth in the pages of so influential an organ of opinion as the *Edinburgh Review*, the case assumes a very serious aspect. There are other passages in the article to the same effect as those I am about to read, and which might, perhaps, be quoted with advantage, did time allow. Well, here is one occurring early in the article :—

There are problems of colonial policy the solution of which cannot, without peril, be indefinitely delayed; and though Imperial England is doing her best to keep up appearances in the management of her five and forty dependencies, the political links which once bound them to each other and to their common centre are evidently worn out. Misgivings haunt the public mind as to the stability of an edifice which seems to be founded on a reciprocity of deception, and only to be shored up for the time by obsolete and meaningless traditions.

When an utterance like this finds its way into the pages of the *Edinburgh Review*, a review which more than almost any other may be held to speak in the name of a large class of the ablest statesmen of England, we have reason to ask what it is all tending to. I never in my life felt more pain in reading anything political, than I felt in reading this article; and I never discharged a more painful duty than I am endeavoring to dis-

charge at this moment, in commenting on it. But truth is truth, and must be told. A little farther on, the same writer proceeds :—

It is not unnatural that the desire to maintain a connection with the power and wealth of the Mother Country should be stronger on the side of the colonies than it is on that of the British public, for they owe almost everything to us, and we receive but little from them. Moreover, the existing system of colonial government enables them to combine all the advantages of local independence with the strength and dignity of a great empire. But the Imperial Government in the meantime has to decide, not as of old, whether Great Britain is to tax the colonies, but to what extent the colonies are to be permitted to tax Great Britain—a question which is daily becoming more urgent and less easy of solution.

Further on, the writer goes on to say :—

It might puzzle the wisest of our statesmen, if he were challenged to put his finger on any single item of material advantage resulting to ourselves from our dominions in British North America, which cost us at this moment about a million sterling a year.

They do no such thing; but that is neither here nor there. Then follow these sentences, more galling still :—

Retainers who will neither give nor accept notice to quit our service, must, it is assumed, be kept for our service. There are, nevertheless, special and exceptional difficulties which beset us in this portion of our vast field of empire.

Nearly a page follows of description of what these difficulties are, being mainly those arising out of apprehended dangers from the United States, and thereon is based this observation :—

It is scarcely surprising that any project which may offer a prospect of escape from a political situation so undignified and unsatisfactory should be hailed with a cordial welcome by all parties concerned.

But one meaning can be put upon all this. In the opinion of the writer, England does not believe that these provinces are worth anything to her, while the connection with the Mother Country is worth all to us; and she would hail with satisfaction any way of escape from the obligations and dangers that we are said to cast upon her. I go on a little further, and I find what are his views as to the undertakings that, in connection with this project, we are expected to assume. What I am next quoting forms

a foot note; but a foot note is often, like a lady's postscript, more important than the text of the letter:—

A very important question, on which these papers afford no information, is that relating to the future condition of those territories and dependencies of the Crown in North America, which are not included within the present boundaries of the five provinces. We allude more particularly to the territories now held by the Hudson's Bay Company, under the Crown, by charter or lease. The Crown is doubtless bound to take care that the interest of its grantees—[it never seems to have occurred to our friend that we, too, are grantees]—are not prejudiced by these changes; but, on the other hand, an English trading company is ill qualified to carry on the government and provide for the defence of a vast and inaccessible expanse of continental territory.

One would think so, seeing that it is just this territory which this writer has been telling us England shrinks herself from defending:—

Probably, the best and most equitable solution would be the cession of the whole region to the Northern Federation for a fair indemnity—[probably enough, from a point of view not ours—(hear, hear)]—and this would lead to the execution of the Great Northern Pacific Railway, under the auspices of the Federal power.

Would it? (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—Hear! hear!

HON. MR. HOLTON—Is that the policy?

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—Hear! hear!

MR. DUNKIN—A little further on, in the article, I find some amplification of this grand programme:—

The result of these proposals, if carried into effect, would be the creation of a new state in North America, still retaining the name of a British dependency, comprising an area about equal to that of Europe, a population of about four millions, with an aggregate revenue in sterling of about two millions and a half, and carrying on a trade (including exports, imports and inter-colonial commerce) of about twenty-eight millions sterling per annum. If we consider the relative positions of Canada and the Maritime Provinces—the former possessing good harbors, but no back country, the former an unlimited supply of cereals, but few minerals; the latter an unlimited supply of iron and coal, but little agricultural produce. The commercial advantages of union between states so circumstanced, are too obvious to need comment. The completion of the Intercolonial Railway, and the probable annexation of the fertile portions of the North-Western territory to the new Confederation,

form a portion only of the probable consequences of its formation, but in which Europe and the world at large will eventually participate. When the —

HON. MR. McDOUGALL—The hon. gentleman should do justice to the reviewer. He leaves out an important passage.

MR. DUNKIN—What is it?

HON. MR. McDOUGALL—After the word "formation," the following words are given:—"The benefits of which will not be limited to the colonies alone, but," &c. Taken with the context, these words are important.

HON. MR. MCGEE—Hear! hear!

MR. DUNKIN—An ironical cheer is an easy thing to raise; but I fancy my character hardly warrants the insinuation that I would dishonestly falsify a quotation. I wrote out these extracts hurriedly, the one procurable copy of the *Review* being sent for while I was writing, and I had no opportunity of comparing my manuscript. I am sorry if in my haste I omitted a single word. [After comparing the passage in the *Review* with his manuscript, the hon. member said]: I find I have omitted exactly one line—certainly by the merest accident; indeed, if any one can suppose I did it on purpose, he must take me for a confounded fool. (Hear, hear.) But to continue my quotation, reading again that last sentence, with its dropped line:—

The completion of the Intercolonial Railway, and the probable annexation of the fertile portions of the Great North-Western territory to the new Confederation, form a portion only of the probable consequences of its formation, the benefits of which will not be limited to the colonies alone, but in which Europe and the world at large will eventually participate. When the Valley of the Saskatchewan shall have been colonized, the communications between the Red River Settlement and Lake Superior completed, and the harbour of Halifax united by one continuous line of railway, with the shores of Lake Huron, the three missing links between the Atlantic and Pacific ocean will have been supplied.

Three pretty large links, by the way, and it would have been more correct if the writer had said "three out of four"—the trifle of the Rocky Mountains being still left for a fourth. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. McDOUGALL—That is very good.

MR. DUNKIN—I don't think so; it's rather too good. I have read these portions

of the article to show what we are expected by this writer to do. We are to buy the Hudson's Bay territory, and take care of it, and make a grand road all across the continent, which Great Britain shrinks from contemplating herself. And now I will read just two passages to show how little sanguine he is of any good to be done by the scheme as regards ourselves, and in the conduct of our own affairs. Here is one of them :—

What we have to fear, and if possible to guard against, is the constant peril of a three-fold conflict of authority implied in the very existence of a federation of dependencies retaining, as now proposed, any considerable share of intercolonial independence.

Rather a suggestive hint, and which, further on, is expanded and emphasized thus :—

If, as has been alleged, a legislative union is unattainable, because inconsistent with due securities for the rights guaranteed to the French Canadians, by treaty or by the Quebec Act, and Federation is therefore the only alternative, the vital question for the framers of this Constitution is how the inherent weakness of all federations can in this instance be cured, and the Central Government armed with a sovereignty which may be worthy of the name. It is the essence of all good governments to have somewhere a true sovereign power. A sovereignty which ever eludes your grasp, which has no local habitation, provincial or imperial, is in fact no government at all. Sooner or later the shadow of authority which is reflected from an unsubstantial political idea must cease to have power among men. It has been assumed by those who take a sanguine view of this political experiment, that its authors have steered clear of the rock on which the WASHINGTON Confederacy has split. But if the weakness of the Central Government is the rock alluded to, we fear that unless in clear water and smooth seas, the pilot who is to steer this new craft will need a more perfect chart than the resolutions of the Quebec Conference afford, to secure him against the risks of navigation.

So far, then, according to the writer of this article, we have three points settled. He considers, and those for whom he writes and speaks consider, and the *Edinburgh Review* makes known that it considers—first, that the retention of these colonies is so manifestly disadvantageous to the parent state, that it would puzzle any statesman to find any reason for keeping us; next, that a result of this measure is to be the early carrying through by us of undertakings too vast now for England not to shrink from; and thirdly, that the measure itself, viewed as a machinery of

government for ourselves, is not going to work well. There is still a fourth point. The measure embodies a proffer of fealty to the British Crown—and with no hint but that such fealty, and the correlative duty of protection, are meant both of them to be perpetual. How does our writer treat of this? He says :—

If the Quebec project were to be regarded as in any sense a final arrangement, and the equivalent in honor or power to be derived by the Crown from the acceptance of so perilous an authority, were to be weighed in the balance with the commensurate risks, the safety and dignity of the proffered position might be very questionable; but it is impossible to regard this proposed Federation in any other light than that of a transition stage to eventual independence; and in this view the precise form which Imperial sovereignty may for the time being assume, becomes a matter of comparatively secondary importance.

And, as if this was not warning plain enough, the article closes thus :—

The people of England have no desire to snap asunder abruptly the slender links which still unite them with their trans-Atlantic fellow-subjects, or to shorten by a single hour the duration of their common citizenship.

We are led irresistibly to the inference that this stage has been well nigh reached in the history of our trans-Atlantic provinces. Hence it comes to pass that we accept, not with fear and trembling, but with unmingled joy and satisfaction, a voluntary proclamation, which, though couched in the accents of loyalty, and proffering an enduring allegiance to our Queen, falls yet more welcome on our ears as the harbinger of the future and complete independence of British North America.

(Hear, hear.) Well, Mr. SPEAKER, I can only say that if these are the opinions which honorable gentlemen opposite are disposed to "hear, hear" approvingly, they are not mine. I find in them an unmistakable proof that there is an important party at home who take up this measure, and hope to see it carried through with the mere view to its being a step to absolute independence on our part, and a cutting of the tie between these provinces and the parent state. (Hear, hear.) Sir, I look upon the early cutting of that tie as a certain result of this measure; and of that again, I hold the inevitable result to be our early absorption into the republic south of us—the United States, or the Northern States, be which it may. (Hear, hear.) It cannot be, that we can form here an independent state that shall have a prosperous history. I say

again, I am far from believing that this idea of separation is by any means the dominant opinion at home; but I am sure it is entertained by a prominent school of English politicians. (Cries of "Name, name.") It is easy to call for names; but there are too many; one can't go over the names of a whole school. I indicate them well enough when I give them the well-known name of the GOLDWIN-SMITH school. There are influential men enough, and too many, among them—(Renewed cries of "Name.") Well then, I rather think Mr. COBDEN, Mr. BRIGHT, and any number more of the Liberal party, belong to this school—in fact, most of what are known as the Manchester school. But, joking apart, if honorable gentlemen in their simplicity believe that utterances of the kind I have been reading appear in the *Edinburgh Review* without significance, their simplicity passes mine. I read these utterances, in connection with those of the *Times* and of any quantity of other English journals, as representing the views of an influential portion of the British public, views which have such weight with the Imperial Government as may go some way to account for the acceptance—the qualified acceptance—which this scheme has met with at their hands. It is recommended at home—strongly recommended, just on this account, by those who there most favor it—as a great step towards the independence of this country. Now, I am not desirous that our acceptance of the scheme should go home to be cited (as it would be) to the people of England, as a proof that we so view it—a proof that we wish to be separated from the Empire. I am quite satisfied separation will never do. We are simply sure to be overwhelmed the instant our neighbors and we differ, unless we have the whole power of the Mother Country to assist us.

MR. SCOBLE—We shall have it.

MR. DUNKIN—I think we shall, if we maintain and strengthen our relations with the parent state; but I do not think we shall, if we adopt a scheme like this, which must certainly weaken the tie between us and the Empire. Our language to England had better be the plain truth—that we are no beggars, and will shirk no duty; that we do not want to go, and of ourselves will not go; that our feelings and our interests alike hold us to her; that, even apart from feeling, we are not strong enough, and know our own weakness, and the strength of the power near us; and that the only means by which we can possibly

be kept from absorption by that power, is the maintaining now—and for all time that we can look forward to—of our connection with the Mother Land. (Hear, hear.) We are told, again, that there are considerations connected with the Lower Provinces which make it necessary for us to accept this measure, that it is a solemn treaty entered into with them. Well, a treaty, I suppose, implies authority on the part of those who framed it to enter into it.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—We are asking for that authority now, but you oppose it.

HON. MR. MCGEE—Her Majesty says in her Speech from the Throne at the opening of the Imperial Parliament, that she approves of the Conference that framed the treaty. Is not the royal sanction sufficient authority?

MR. DUNKIN—Her Majesty's approval of those gentlemen having met and consulted together, is not even Her Majesty's approval—much less is it provincial approval—of what they did at that meeting. At most, the resolutions are not a treaty, but the mere draft of an agreement come to between those gentlemen.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—Oh, yes, it is a treaty, and we are now fighting to uphold it.

MR. DUNKIN—Well, it is a draft of a treaty if you like, but it is not a treaty. Plenipotentiaries, who frame treaties, have full authority to act on behalf of their respective countries.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—It is the same as any other treaty entered into under the British system. The Government is responsible for it to Parliament, and if this does not meet your approval, you can dispossess us by a vote of want of confidence.

MR. DUNKIN—The honorable gentleman may have trouble yet before he is through with it.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—Very well, we will be prepared for it.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—It is not so long since the honorable gentleman was voted out, and it may not be long before he is served the same way again. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

MR. DUNKIN—Well, I was saying that this is no treaty to which the people either of Canada or of the Lower Provinces are at all bound; and it is very doubtful whether the people of the Lower Provinces will not reject it. I am quite satisfied that the people of Canada ought not to accept it, and I am not

so very sure but that before the play is played out to the end, they will refuse to accept it, especially the people of Lower Canada, where, if it is carried at all, it will be by a very small majority. (Hear, hear.) But the honorable gentleman (Hon. Mr. CARTIER) has come over to my ground that it is not a treaty, but only the draft of a treaty, subject to the disapproval of the House and country. Taking it, however, as a treaty merely between those who entered into it, I am disposed to make one admission, that it has one quality such as often attaches to treaties entered into by duly constituted plenipotentiaries, and that is, that there seem to be some secret articles connected with it. (Hear, hear.)

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—The gentlemen who entered into it represented their governments, and the governments of all the provinces were represented. It is therefore a treaty between these provinces, which will hold good unless the Government is ousted by a vote of the House.

MR. DUNKIN—The honorable gentleman does not, I suppose, forget that when this Government was formed there was a distinct declaration made, that until the plan they might propose should have been completed in detail and laid before Parliament, Parliament was not to be held committed to it in any way. (Hear, hear.) But I was going on to something else, and I cannot allow myself to be carried back. I was saying that, assimilating this to a treaty like some other treaties, it seems to have secret articles in it. I find that one of the gentlemen who took part in the negotiations, the Hon. Mr. HATHAWAY, of New Brunswick—

HON. MR. MCGEE—Mr. HATHAWAY was not here at all.

MR. DUNKIN—I was under the impression he was; though I acknowledge I have not burdened my memory with an exact list of the thirty-three distinguished gentlemen who took part in the Conference. At all events, he was a member of the Government of New Brunswick, which was a party represented at the Conference. Mr. HATHAWAY, at a public meeting lately, said that—

He occupied a very unenviable position. He was under peculiar embarrassments, more so than any other speaker who would address them. It was well known to most of his audience that he had been one of the sworn advisers of His Excellency for the past three years. As such he could reveal no secrets of Council. It was true

His Excellency had given him permission to make public the correspondence that had taken place on the subject of his resignation, but whatever might be the effect upon himself, there were secrets connected with the scheme that he could not divulge.

There were secrets of the scheme that he was not free to speak of. And we, too, find here that there are secrets; many matters as to which we may ask as much as we like, and can get no information. But the main point I was coming to is this. Call this thing what you like—treaty or whatever you please—it is not dealt with in the Lower Provinces at all in the way in which it is proposed to deal with it here. The Lower Provinces, we think, are smaller political communities than ourselves. Their legislative councils, their Houses of Assembly, we do not call quite so considerable as our own. We are in the habit of thinking that among the legislative bodies in the British Empire, we stand number two; certainly a great way behind the House of Commons, but having no other body between us and them in point of importance. (Hear, hear.) The Lower Provinces, I say, are not so big as we are, and yet how differently has our Parliament been treated from the way in which their smaller parliaments have been. And the apology, the reason assigned why we are treated as we are, is, that this thing is a binding treaty, if not yet between the provinces, at least between the governments of the other provinces and the Government of Canada. But how does the Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia address his houses of parliament? "It is not my provinces," says he, "and I have no mission to do more than afford you the amplest and freest scope for the consideration of a proposal"—he does not call it a treaty—he calls it merely "a proposal, which seriously involves your own prospects." I suppose it does; but, so far from calling it a treaty, he does not call it even an agreement.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—But what he says implies that he so regards it.

MR. DUNKIN—Does it? Let me read the whole passage:—

It is not my province, and I have no mission to do more than afford you the amplest and freest scope for consideration of a proposal which seriously involves your own prospects, and in reference to which you should be competent to interpret the wishes and determine the true interests of the country. I feel assured, however, that whatever be the result of your deliberations, you will de-

precate attempts to treat in a narrow spirit, or otherwise than with dispassionate care and prudence, a question so broad that it in reality covers the ground of all parties, and precludes it from becoming the measure of merely one government or one party.

He gives his parliament perfect *carte blanche* to deal with it as they please.

MR. WOOD—As a whole.

MR. DUNKIN—It is a pity the same language was not addressed to us. In that case, Mr. SPEAKER, I think the motion put into your hands would have been, that you should now leave the chair, in order that we might go into committee of the whole to give the matter careful and becoming consideration. It is not pressed on in Nova Scotia, as it is here, with undue haste. The Lieutenant-Governor, in the next paragraph of his speech, goes on to say :—

I need only observe further, without in the least intending thereby to influence your ultimate determination, that it is obviously convenient, if not essential, for the legislatures of all the provinces concerned to observe uniformity in the mode of ascertaining their respective decisions on a question common to all. I have, therefore, desired to be laid before you some correspondence between the Governor General and myself on that point.

That correspondence, too, which is to be laid before the Parliament of Nova Scotia, has not been laid before us. (Hear, hear.) I have given the language addressed by this Lieutenant-Governor to his Legislature with reference to this "proposal." In what language do the Commons of Nova Scotia reply? How will they deal with it?

The report from the delegates appointed to confer upon the union of the Maritime Provinces, and the resolutions of the Conference held at Quebec, proposing a union of the different provinces of British North America, together with the correspondence upon that subject, will obtain at our hands the deliberate and attentive consideration demanded by a question of such magnitude and importance, and fraught with consequences so momentous to us and our posterity.

This, sir, is all that the Government of Nova Scotia ask the Legislature of that province to say. And I do not think that this course of theirs exactly indicates that they think they have made a treaty by which they must stand or fall, and to every letter and line of which they must force their Legislature to adhere. If they do regard it in that light, they have a very indirect way of expressing their ideas. But this is not the case merely in Nova Sco-

tia. In Prince Edward Island, every one knows the Government is not bringing this down as a treaty; in New Brunswick everybody knows that the Government has been more or less changed since the Conference, that a general election is going on, and that a great deal will depend on the doubtful result of that election. Every one knows that the matter is in a very different position in every one of the Lower Provinces from what it is in here; that there is none of this talk about a treaty anywhere but here. I would like, however, by the way, to draw the attention of the House for a moment to a case in which there undoubtedly was a treaty. I speak of the proceedings which eventuated in the union between England and Scotland. In the reign of Queen ANNE, at the instance of the two legislatures, then respectively independent—of England on the one hand, and of Scotland on the other—Her Majesty appointed commissioners to represent each of her two states, and they framed what were declared to be articles of a treaty. They took months to frame those articles; and twice in the course of their proceedings Her Majesty came down to assist personally at their deliberations. Their meeting was authorized by acts of Parliament; they were named by Her Majesty; they deliberated for months; and the Queen attended their deliberations twice. And after they had entered into this treaty—so called on the face of it—the Parliament of Scotland departed from it and insisted on changes which were approved of by the Parliament of England, and the treaty as thus changed went into operation. In both parliaments the bills to give effect to it passed through every stage; originated in Committee of the Whole, and had their first, second and third readings. All was done with the utmost formality; and yet there was there unmistakably a treaty solemnly made beforehand. Here we have an affair got up in seventeen days by thirty-three gentlemen who met without the sanction of the Crown, and only got that sanction afterwards. The document they agreed upon is full of oversights, as the Colonial Secretary states, and as everyone knows who has read it. Yet our Government regard it as a sacred treaty—though no one but themselves so regards it—and want to give it a sacredness which was not claimed even for that treaty between England and Scotland. (Hear, hear.) I am at last very near the close of the remarks I have to offer to the House; but I must say a few words as to the

domestic consideration urged to force us into this scheme. We are asked, "What are you going to do? You must do something. Are you going back to our old state of dead-lock?" At the risk of falling into an unparliamentary expression, I cannot help saying that I am reminded of a paragraph I read the other day in a Lower Province paper, in which the editor was dealing with this same cry, which seems to be raised in Nova Scotia as well as here—the cry that something must be done, that things cannot go on as they are. I have not his words here, but their general effect was this—"Whenever," says he, "I hear this cry raised, that something must be done, I suspect there is a plan on foot to get something very bad done. Things are in a bad way—desperate, may be. But the remedy proposed is sure to be desperate. I am put in mind of a story of two boys who couldn't swim, but by ill luck had upset their canoe in deep water, and by good luck had got on the bottom of it. Says the big boy to the little one, 'Tom, can you pray?' Tom confessed he could not call to mind a prayer suited to the occasion. 'No, Bill,' says he, 'I don't know how.' Bill's answer was earnest, but not parliamentary. It contained a past participle passive which I won't repeat. It was, 'Well, something must be done—and that—soon!'" (Laughter.) Now, seriously, what do honorable gentlemen mean when they raise here this cry that "something must be done?" Is it seriously meant that our past is so bad that positively, on pain of political annihilation, of utter and hopeless ruin, of the last, worst consequences, we must this instant adopt just precisely this scheme? If that is so, if really and truly those political institutions which we were in the habit of saying we enjoyed, which, at all events, we have been living under and, for that matter, are living under now, if they have worked so ill as all that comes to, or rather if we have worked them so ill, I think we hold out poor encouragement to those whom we call upon to take part with us in trying this new experiment. We Canadians have had a legislative union and worked it close upon five and twenty years, and under it have got, it is said, into such a position of embarrassment among ourselves, are working our political institutions so very badly, are in such a frightful fix, that, never mind what the prospects of this particular step may be, it must positively be taken; we cannot help it, we cannot stay as we are, nor yet go back, nor yet go forward, in any course but just this one. (Hear, hear.) If

this thing is really this last desperate remedy for a disease past praying for, then indeed I am desperately afraid, sir, that it will not succeed. The hot haste with which gentlemen are pressing it is of ill omen to the deceived Mother Country, to our deceived sister provinces, and to our most miserably deceived selves. But the truth is that we are in no such sad case; there is no fear of our having to go back to this bugbear past; we could not do it if we would. Things done cannot be undone. In a certain sense, whatever is past is irrevocable, and it is well it should be. True we are told by some of the honorable gentlemen on the Treasury benches that their present harmony is not peace, but only a sort of armed truce, that old party lines are not effaced, nor going to be. Well, sir, if so, suppose that this scheme should be ever so well dropped, and then that some day soon after these gentlemen should set themselves to the job of finding out who is cuckoo and who hedge-sparrow in the government nest that now shelters them all in such warm quiet, suppose there should thus soon be every effort made to revive old cries and feuds—what then? Would it be the old game over again, or a variation of it amounting to a new one? For a time at least, sir, a breathing time that happily cannot be got over, those old cries and old feuds will not be found to be revivable as of old. Even representation by population will be no such spell to conjure with—will fall on ears far less excitable. It has been adopted by any number of those who might otherwise be the likeliest to run it down. It will be found there might be a worse thing in the minds of many. Give it a new name and couple it with sufficient safeguard against legislation of the local stamp being put through against the vote of the local majority—the principle tacitly held so, and found to answer in the case of Scotland—and parliamentary reform may be found no such bug-bear to speak of after all. And as for the bug-bears of the personal kind, why, sir, after seeing all we have seen of the extent to which gentlemen can set aside or overcome them when occasion may require, it is too much to think they will for some little time go for so very much. Like it or not, honorable gentlemen, for a time, will have to be to some extent busy with a game that shall be not quite the old one. The friends of this project, Mr. SPEAKER, never seem to tire of prophesying to us smooth things, if only it is once first adopted. To every criticism on its many and manifest defects, the ready an-

swer is, that we do not enough count upon men's good sense, good feeling, forbearance, and all that sort of thing. But, sir, if the adoption of this scheme is so to improve our position, is to make everything so smooth, to make all our public men so wise, so prudent, and so conscientious, I should like to know why a something of the same kind may not by possibility be hoped for, even though this project should be set aside. If we are to be capable of the far harder task of working out these projected unworkable political institutions, why is it that we must be incapable of the easier task of going on without them? I know well that in all time the temper of those who do not think has been to put faith rather in the great thing one cannot do, than in the smaller thing one can. "If the prophet had bid thee do some great thing, wouldest thou not have done it?" And here too, sir, as so often before, if the truth must be told, the one thing truly needed is what one may call the smaller thing—not perhaps easy, but one must hope not impossible—the exercise by our public men and by our people of that amount of discretion, good temper and forbearance which sees something larger and higher in public life than mere party struggles and crises without end; of that political sagacity or capacity, call it which you will, with which they will surely find the institutions they have to be quite good enough for them to use and quietly make better, without which they will as surely find any that may anyhow be given them, to be quite bad enough for them to fight over and make worse. Mr. SPEAKER, I feel that I have taken up a great deal of the time of the House, and that I have presented but imperfectly the views I am anxious to impress upon it as to this great question. But for sheer want of strength, I might have felt it necessary, at whatever risk of wearying the House, to go into some matters more thoroughly, and more especially into that branch of the subject which relates to what I may call the alternative policy I myself prefer to this measure, and would wish to see adopted and carried out. As it is, I have but to say in conclusion, while warmly thanking the House for the attention and patience with which it has for so many hours listened to me, that I have said nothing but what I firmly believe, and felt myself bound to say, and that I trust the sober good sense of the people of these provinces, after full reflection and discussion, will decide rightly upon this the largest question by far that has ever been before them for decision. (Cheers.)

On motion of HON. Mr. CAUCHON, the debate was then adjourned.

—o—

THURSDAY, March 2, 1865.

Mr. ARCHAMBEAULT—In rising on this occasion, sir, my intention is not to occupy the attention of the House for a long time, nor to discuss the merits of the measure which is now before us. I intend merely to explain my own motives for the vote which I shall give, and this I shall do as briefly as possible. I am bound to acknowledge at once that when I arrived in Quebec, at the commencement of the session, I was opposed to the plan of Confederation, and so strongly opposed to it, that I was fully determined to vote against it. But after a more serious consideration of the question, and after hearing the explanations which have been afforded to us of the scheme of the Government, I have arrived at the conviction that I had decided, if not wrongly, at least hastily, and that I ought not to aid in the rejection of the measure, merely because it did not quite coincide with all my opinions. After listening to the discussion, and the explanations of the members of the Administration, I perceived that the plan was one of compromise and could not, therefore, be adapted to suit all views, nor shaped even to meet those of the men who framed it. I can understand that those persons who are opposed to any degree of Confederation, and who would rather have representation based on population or the annexation of Canada to the United States, may be opposed to the project of the Government, and reject it accordingly; but those who, like myself, are not opposed to it under any circumstances, and are capable of appreciating the necessity of it at the present conjuncture, together with the advantages it may produce to the country, ought not, cannot, I think, reject it, only because some of its details are not exactly to their mind. It is our business first to enquire whether some constitutional changes are not necessary, and none I think will deny that they are. The political leaders of the two parties into which this House is divided, have acknowledged this as a necessity. It remains, therefore, only to consider what changes should be made. The members of the Government have decided this question, and proposed a Confederation of all the Provinces

of British North America. They have come to an understanding with the sister provinces, and now lay before you their scheme of a Confederation. We are not now to inquire whether all the details of the scheme perfectly agree in every point with our particular ideas, but whether the change is necessary, whether the proposed scheme is good and fit to be accepted as a whole; for, as the scheme is a compromise between different parties, whose interests are at variance with each other, the Government who now move its adoption must be held to be responsible for all its details. Any amendment of the plan passed by this House would really be a vote of want of confidence in the Government, and you must therefore either adopt the plan as laid before you, or pass a vote of want of confidence in the present Administration. Now, I for my part am not prepared to vote a want of confidence in the men now in power. To induce me to do that, I must see in their opponents a better security for good government, and its advantages to the country, than they are able to show; I must hope to find in the latter something better than what I find in those whose measures they withstand. So far, I do not find that they have offered, nor do I find that they now offer, such security or such hope. Far from it; if we are to judge them by their former acts, we must confess that we cannot give them our confidence, that they have displayed great want of capacity for the government and management of the affairs of the country. When they were in power, they had no decided policy, they were incapable of dealing with any important question: they lived from hand to mouth. Their acts in the Administration were stamped with a spirit of resentment and injustice towards their adversaries. They instituted commissions of inquiry, for instance, against public officers, in order to get a pretext for dismissing them and making room for their hungry partisans. Again, have they any better plan to propose to us than that of the Government? No! They might offer us, perhaps, representation based on population, or annexation to the United States; but I do not think such remedies would suit our taste. In these circumstances, I have no hesitation in declaring that I shall vote for the scheme of Confederation, as presented to us by the Government, although it does not meet all my views, and does not promise all the guarantees which I should be glad to find in it, and although I

do not consider it as likely, in its present form, to afford a sufficient safeguard for the interests of the different provinces, and to secure stability in the working of the proposed union. As I am not in a position to influence public opinion, so as to oblige the Government to modify their plan to suit my views, I take sides with the men who have always had my confidence, and with whom I have always acted, because I have confidence in their honesty and their patriotism. I cherish a belief that in this all-important question, which affects our best interests and our national existence and social welfare, they have been actuated by the same love for their country which has ever guided them in times past. (Cheers.)

MR. BLANCHET said—MR. SPEAKER, as no one is disposed to take the floor just now, and it would seem as if all who intend to discuss this question are bent on having a large audience in the galleries, I shall take upon me to say a few words. Those who moved to have the speeches of this House printed in official form certainly did no good service to the country; for all are trying which shall make the longest speech, and I do not think it is altogether just to the public purse. Each one would speak at a particular hour, and to the ears of a certain audience; but the history of the Parliament of England shews that her great statesmen and orators did not concern themselves about that. The greatest and most important speeches were delivered in the House of Commons at a very late hour of the night; thus Fox delivered his great speech on the East India Bill at two o'clock in the morning; PITT his on the abolition of the slave trade at four o'clock in the morning; and we should lose nothing by speaking before half-past seven in the evening. But as the honorable member for Montmorency (Hon. Mr. CAUCHON) is to speak this evening, and I wish to explain my way of thinking on the question, I rise to do so. This question of Confederation is not a new one. It has already agitated men's minds and been a subject of debate for a great many years. Now public opinion is completely made up concerning it. I have no occasion to enter into details respecting the scheme which we have before us. It has been discussed with much more of knowledge and precision than I bring to the consideration of the subject, by the members of the Government and the honorable members on the opposite side of the House. I need not say

that the territory intended to be included in the Confederacy is nearly as large as all Europe, that it will contain four millions of souls, and that having confederation, we shall become the fourth power in the world in respect of merchant shipping. We have only to compare the statement of our present imports and exports with that of the United States a few years ago, and we shall find that our position is as good as theirs was. I hold in my hand a work lately written by Mr. BIGELOW, at present *chargé d'affaires* from the American Government to the Tuileries, containing valuable statistics of the commerce, manufactures and resources of the United States, as well as of the war at present raging in that country. In the chapter devoted to commerce, he writes as follows:—

After the reorganization of the constitutional government in 1798, commerce speedily grew to vast proportions. The tonnage, which, in 1792, was 564,437 tons, had reached 1,032,119 in 1801; the imports valued in 1792 at 31,500,000 dollars (157,500,000 francs), were in 1801, 111,363,511 dollars (556,817,555 francs); the exports had in the same period risen from 20,753,098 dollars (103,765,490 francs) to 94,115,925 dollars (470,579,625 francs). In 1807 the tonnage was 1,268,548; the imports 138,500,000 dollars (692,500,000 francs); and the exports 108,343,150 dollars (541,715,750 francs). At that period, American commerce received a blow from which it did not recover for several years. The measures of the English Parliament, followed by NAPOLEON'S decrees, issued from Berlin and Milan, and by the embargo of 1807, produced a deep stagnation in the commercial affairs of the Union, and although the amount of tonnage did not very perceptibly diminish during the fifteen following years, the imports fell in 1808 to 56,990,000 dollars (284,950,000 francs), and exports 22,430,960 dollars (112,154,000 francs). The war of 1812-'16 gave employment to the shipping which would otherwise have rotted in the docks, and occasioned some clipper privateers to be built; but the trade of the country continued to decline, so that in 1814 the imports rose only to 12,965,000 dollars (64,825,000 francs), and the exports 6,927,441 dollars (34,617,205 francs.) The ending of the war gave activity to commercial pursuits. In 1815 the imports reached 113,041,274 dollars (565,206,370 francs) and in 1816, 147,103,000 dollars (735,515,000 francs); the exports of these same years were 52,557,753 dollars (262,788,765 francs) and 81,905,452 dollars (409,602,250 francs). This amount of imports, which was in excess of the requirements of the country at that time, fell the following year to 99,250,000 dollars (496,250,000 francs), and from that period to 1830, excepting the year 1818, the average amount of the imports did not exceed 78

millions of dollars (390 millions of francs), and the exports reached about the same amount.

Thus we find that the average amount of the imports and exports did not exceed \$78,000,000 at that time. We are only a few years behind the United States in that respect. I said a moment ago that the question of a Confederation of all the Provinces of British North America was not a new one, and in fact we find that it was mooted at a somewhat remote period of the history of the country. In 1821, the leader of the Upper Canada Radicals, Mr. W. L. MACKENZIE, declared that he wished with his whole heart that there could be a Confederation of the British Provinces. Ten years later the scheme became a special question of debate, and the discussion established it as a positive fact, as it will soon be an historical one. (Hear, hear.) Others besides the members on this side of the House are in favor of a Federal union; some incline to a Confederation of all the Provinces, others to a Federal union of the two Canadas only—all are well disposed to a Federal union of one kind or other. At the time of the crisis of 1858, the BROWN-DORION Government were to settle the difficulties then besetting us, and if I understood the meaning of one of the members of that Government, who went to meet his constituents in order that they might ratify his acceptance of a portfolio in that Administration, the remedy intended to be applied to the existing evils by that Cabinet was a Federal union of the two Canadas; but he said also that, although the policy of the Government to which he belonged was not yet clearly defined, he thought they would take up, at some future day, the question of a Confederation of all the Provinces of British North America. That hon. member was the Hon. F. LEMIEUX, and he was returned by the county of Lévis immediately after making these declarations. Nearly about the same time Mr. J. C. TACHÉ, at present Secretary of the Board of Agriculture, wrote a work which was almost prophetic of the question of a Confederation of the British North American Provinces. It is unnecessary to remark that that gentleman had acquired much experience in his travels, and much information by hard study and persevering labor, and was therefore perfectly qualified to form a judgment on the question. Mr. TACHÉ has written a work of some length, in which he roughly sketches the scheme of a Confederation of the Provinces,

of which I trust the House will permit me to cite a few lines. These will show that his predictions are speedily to be realized :—

What hopes may we not be allowed to indulge respecting the material future of the immense country which includes the two Canadas, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, the Hudson's Bay Territory and Vancouver's Island, when we reflect on the wealth of a soil which is almost everywhere remarkably fertile, (we except the extreme north,) on the resources which the forests have treasured up for the settler in the lapse of ages, on the immense fisheries in the Gulf, sufficient of themselves to feed the whole world with fish of the finest quality; when we consider that the whole of this vast continent offers to us, in its various geological formations mineral wealth of the most precious kinds, and that nature has arranged for us channels of intercommunication of incredible grandeur. The fertile soil of these provinces intersected throughout their entire length by the rivers St. Lawrence and St. John, bathed by the waters of the Gulf and those of the Great Lakes, the superb forests through which flow the immense Ottawa, the St. Maurice and the Saguenay, the mines of copper bordering on lakes Superior and Huron, the iron mines of Canada, the coal measures of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, the seaports of Quebec, Halifax and St. John, the ores of all kinds dispersed throughout the provinces—all those form an aggregate of means which, if we suppose them to be turned to account by a competent population, governed by a political system based on true principles of order and liberty, justifies the most extravagant calculations of profit, the most extraordinary predictions of growth, as compared with the present state of things.

Thus spoke Mr. TACHÉ at that period. Not satisfied, moreover, with sketching with a rapid pencil the general working of this mighty organization, he entered, in a subsequent part of his work, into details which, astonishing to say—although I have no doubt that the members of the Conference had read his work—exactly coincide with the plan now submitted to us. Accordingly, in the partition of powers between the General Government and the local governments, the scheme of the Conference is nearly word or word Mr. TACHÉ's work.

HON. MR. DORION—The hon. member is mistaken, for Mr. TACHÉ assigns the ascendancy and the highest powers to the local governments, whereas the Government plan assigns them to the Central Government.

MR. BLANCHET—This is what Mr. TACHÉ says :—

These powers of the Federal Government are not, as we understand the matter, to be exercised,

except as regards the following subjects, viz., Commerce, comprising purely commercial laws, such as laws respecting banks and other institutions of a general financial character, coinage, and weights and measures; Customs, including the establishment of a uniform tariff, and the collection of the revenue resulting therefrom; great Public Works and Navigation, such as canals, railways, telegraph lines, great seaport works and the lighting of the coast; Post Office arrangements, both in their entirety and in their internal and external details; the Militia in the entirety of its organization; Criminal justice, comprising all offences which do not come under the jurisdiction of the police courts and justices of the peace. Everything else connected with civil law, education, public charities, the settlement of public lands, agriculture, city and rural police, road works, in fact, with all matters relating to the family life, so to speak, of each province, will remain under the exclusive control of the respective Local Government of each one of them, as by inherent right; the powers of the Federal Government being looked upon as merely a concession of rights, which are specially designated.

I consider that under the present plan of Confederation the local legislatures are supreme in respect of the powers which are attributed to them, that is to say, in respect of local matters. In this respect it goes even further than the honorable member for Hochelaga himself was prepared to go in 1859, for he proposed to leave to the Federal Government the right of legislating upon the French civil laws, &c., of Lower Canada; but, as his Government was not very long-lived, I know that the honorable member for Hochelaga can deny all this. Very nearly at the same time another Government addressed to the Imperial Government a memorial, in which it asked for the Confederation of the British North American Provinces; but the Imperial Government replied that it was not prepared to give a decided reply; and as there had been no agreement between the provinces, the matter remained in abeyance for the time. Thenceforward no steps were taken in the matter until last year—until the crisis, with the circumstances connected with which every one is perfectly well acquainted. Different governments had been defeated, and the country was already weary of that state of affairs, when the honorable member for Hochelaga moved his vote of censure upon the Government in relation to the \$100,000 affair, and the Government then finding itself in a minority, was compelled to seek a remedy for the existing state of affairs, and the result was the Coalition, the Quebec Confer-

ence, and finally the plan of Confederation, although he does not now choose to acknowledge his offspring. (Hear, hear.) That conduct releases the latter from any debt of gratitude. (Hear.) It is not my intention to discuss the question of Confederation in a commercial point of view, nor in a financial point of view, nor in a political point of view, for in these several aspects it has been ably discussed by those who have preceded me. I shall confine myself to making a few remarks upon the question in respect of defence. Every one acknowledges that in order to defend a country effectually there must be unity of action, uniformity of system, and a combination of the means of defence. Without uniformity, without unity, it is impossible to make any serious attempt at defence in case of attack, and the divided country falls an easy prey to the enemy. So general is this rule that history shews us that weak nations have always united together, have always coalesced when they were attacked or were in fear of being attacked by a powerful enemy. The North American colonies did so in 1775, when they wished to offer resistance to the Mother Country. They organized themselves into a Confederation, and it was in consequence of their so doing that they were able to resist what they considered as an act of oppression on the part of England. Had those colonies, instead of organizing themselves as they did, had each of them a different system of defence, and had there been no uniformity in their tactics, England would have had an easy bargain of them. And is it to be supposed, if they had not banded themselves together, so as to possess a certain amount of strength, that they would have obtained the alliance and the assistance of France? When a feeble power is attacked by a powerful enemy, it should seek to ally itself with other states which have interests in common with it, in order that they may defend themselves in common. So far as we are concerned, if we are desirous of assisting the Mother Country in offering an effectual resistance to invasions by the American people, we ought to have unity of command, in order that we might be able to send the militia from the centre and cause them to extend towards the circumference. In case of war with our neighbors, we should, of necessity, be compelled, by the very force of circumstances, to unite with the other provinces. That being the case, why not do so at once, in time of peace, while we

have time to devote to it that calm and deliberate consideration which the importance of the subject demands. Confederation is the sole means of offering resistance to attempts at invasion by our enemies. The Federal system is the normal condition of American populations; for there are very few American nations which have not a political system of that nature. The Federal system is a state of transition which allows the different races inhabiting the same part of the globe to unite, with the view of attaining national unity and homogeneity. Spain, Belgium, France, and several other European countries were formerly peopled by different races, who constituted so many different communities; but they became united, they entered into confederations, and in the course of ages all the communities were consolidated into those which we now see—into everything that is held to be beautiful, noble and great throughout the whole world. When the Federal system has been put in practice in an enlightened manner, it has always sufficed for the requirements of those who adopted it. The case of Greece has been cited by an hon. member of this House, to show the fatal nature of this system to the nations who adopted it; but he ought to know that the decadence of Greece only began from the moment when she abandoned the Federal system. The hon. member for Lotbinière sought to prove that confederations were the source of all sorts of disturbances; and in support of what he said, he read out to us the table of contents of the history of South America, in which he found a long list of *échauffourées*, movements, agitations, risings, civil wars and revolutions. It is not my wish to deny the facts quoted by the honorable member, but I must say that his conclusions are not correct, and that it is not right to draw conclusions adverse to a system from merely perusing the table of contents of any work whatsoever. The history of all nations will afford tables of contents, which, if they were taken as indicating the normal and habitual condition of a people, would cause us to make strange mistakes and to draw strange historical conclusions. Even the present history of England, the history of the reign of Her Majesty Queen VICTORIA, might afford to a person, who was desirous of forming a judgment respecting it from the table of contents alone, some facts which might induce him to believe in the complete disorganization of

the British Empire; for in it he would find allusion made to the Chinese war, the several insurrections in India, the insurrectional movement in Ireland, the Russian war, the Sepoy rebellion, and a large number of other matters; but all this would prove nothing against the prosperity of the empire under the rule of Her Majesty. (Hear, hear.) But, without losing time over the reply which may be made to this style of reasoning, I say that it does not follow that the Federal system is impracticable, because it has not succeeded among certain people who were not in a sufficiently advanced condition for the application of the system. No constitution suits every people equally well; constitutions are made for the people, and not the people for the constitution. When a people is sufficiently enlightened and sufficiently educated and civilized, a constitution ensuring their liberty may be given them; but it is necessary to wait until they are able to appreciate and enjoy it, before giving it to them. A free constitution entrusted to an unenlightened people is like an edged tool placed in the hands of a child; it is a dangerous instrument, with which it may chance to wound itself. Besides, certain forms of government are better suited to certain people than others. Thus, to endeavor to give the English Constitution to the French people would be to commit a great mistake, for the French people are not adapted to the working of the political institutions of England. Again, try to give the English people the French Constitution, and the English people will revolt. Before giving a constitution to a people, that people must be taught how to use it. It cannot be said that a table of contents is not history, but certainly one would not seek in that part of the volume for the philosophy of history. Let us suppose that some one is desirous of reading the history of the Celestial Kingdom, and that on taking up the book he finds, in the table of contents, that at a certain period there was a terrible battle between the good and the wicked angels; if he shared the ideas of the hon. member for Lotbinière, he would say to himself: "This country cannot have a good government, and it is not advisable to live in it." When a person draws historical conclusions from a table of contents, it shews that he has not derived much benefit from his studies. Those who are now opposing Confederation are not agreed as to their mode of attack, any more than they are upon the means to be adopted to meet the difficul-

ties of the position in which we are now placed. The hon. member for Hochelaga (Hon. Mr. DORION) is in favor of Confederation of the two Canadas, and the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. JOLY) is against any Confederation at all. They do not even agree as to their reasons for opposition. Some are opposed to Confederation because it grants too much to Lower Canada, and others because it grants too much to Upper Canada. Yet Confederation cannot be disadvantageous to everybody, and, for my part, I am of opinion that everyone may find something good in it, if he is only reasonable in his expectations. If the hon. member for Hochelaga were called upon to arrange the difficulties in which the country is at present situated, I am satisfied that he would not bring forward any other plan than some scheme of Confederation or other; and if he did not succeed with the scheme for the Confederation of the Canadas, he would try the more extended plan of a great Confederation of all the provinces. There is indeed, it is true, another remedy which would be more likely to meet the views of certain members—annexation to the United States; but I, for my part, am resolutely opposed to it, and am prepared to fight against it by every possible means, and to take up arms, if necessary, to resist it. If we are ever invaded by the United States, I shall ever be ready to take up arms to drive the invaders out of the country. (Hear, hear.) A great outcry which is raised against Confederation is that about direct taxation. For my part, I consider that the honorable Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. GALT) has proved clearly that we shall not require to have recourse to it. But even supposing that such should turn out to be the case, we should not be any worse off than we should be with the gentlemen on the other side of the House in power; for it is perfectly well known that the hon. member for Chateauguay's plan is to establish direct taxation. With them, therefore, we should not have to wait for Confederation before we got it. The honorable members on the other side of the House have also taken occasion to find fault with the Speech from the Throne having contained an allusion to the peace and general prosperity of the country. "Why," they say, "the Speech from the Throne states that trade is prospering, that the people are happy and contented, that the harvests have been magnificent, and that great contentment and great prosperity everywhere prevail;

and yet constitutional changes are proposed in order to soothe the discontent of the people and the agitation of the country." Well! let us suppose that the gentlemen are right—for it is true that the year has not been a good one in respect of business, and it is natural that such should be the case, in view of the position of the crisis through which America is now passing, and but little else can be expected; the harvest has not been a very good one,—however, allowing that these gentlemen are right, it is not the less true that we are relatively in a state of quietude and great prosperity, and it is just at the present time, when we are in a state of tranquillity and can do it in perfect liberty, that we should adopt means to settle our internal difficulties. It is not during a time of trouble or a civil war that we can do it, and therefore we ought to profit by the opportunity which is now offered us. A Constitution will not last unless it is elaborated with the care, the deliberation and the calm consideration which can be devoted to it only in time of peace. We are now at peace with our neighbors, our friends are in a large majority, the question is known to the country and has been considered for several months past, and our duty is to do now in time of peace, what it is impossible to do in time of trouble. We ought also to labor to enlighten public opinion on the subject of this plan of Confederation, not by appeals to its prejudices, but by free and open discussion, and by wise counsel based on that truth which should always be our guiding star. I am, therefore, disposed to vote in favor of the resolutions which are submitted to us. When I became aware that the Government were bringing forward this scheme of Confederation, I said to myself that we were about to be liberated from colonial leading-strings, and that we were about to become a people, and I expected the House would approach the question with due regard to its greatness; some hon. members have undoubtedly done so, but I regret that many others have not been able to raise themselves above the narrow considerations of party. The question has been discussed by statesmen on this side of the House at least; but on the other side it has been made a miserable question of party and of taxation. With these few remarks, I shall conclude by stating that it is my determination to vote in favor of the scheme submitted to us.—(Applause.)

Mr. BEAUBIEN—Mr. SPEAKER, I do not rise to make a long speech, for I freely acknowledge that it is not in my power to do so; and besides, the question which is submitted to us has been so well discussed by those who have preceded me, and who are in a better position than myself to judge of the condition and requirements of the country, that the subject is almost exhausted. I only wish, by rising on this occasion, to record my presence at the debates which are in progress on this question, and to state in a few words what the reasons are which induce me to support this measure. The peculiar position of the British North American colonies and their proximity to the United States, call upon them to unite together in order to form a stronger nation, and one more able to withstand the onslaught of an enemy, should it be necessary so to do, and to increase their prosperity in a material point of view. There is one fact which must not be forgotten, and which I must mention—it is that when France abandoned this country, and England took possession of it, from that moment French immigration entirely ceased and gave way to immigration of persons of foreign origin—of British origin. From that period the English population increased from day to day in this country, and at the present time the French-Canadians are in a minority in United Canada. Under these circumstances, I am of opinion that it would be at once an act of imprudence and one characterised by a lack of generosity on our parts to wish to prevent the majority of the population of the country from displaying greater aspirations for our common country, and from desiring its advancement and more rapid progress in an onward direction, at the same time drawing closer the bonds which unite us to the Mother Country. I have reflected on these matters, and although I am not disposed to submit to injustice to my country or my countrymen, yet I am ready to enter into a compromise with persons of other origins. I consider, moreover, that since we are satisfied with our position as English subjects, and with the Constitution which we are allowed freely to exercise, we should do all in our power to increase England's interest in her colonies; and for my part, I consider that the means of so doing is to accept the Confederation which is proposed to us. Not long since discontent was manifested in England among a part of the com-

mercial class, in consequence of the liberty which we took of imposing high duties on English merchandize imported into this country; but the English Government did not share that discontent, I am happy to say, and did not choose to interfere. This fact, however, was of a nature to cast a chill upon the interest with which we were regarded in England; but when the news of Confederation reached England, that interest was revived, and has ever since continued to increase. If we desire to interest England in our fate, we must draw closer the bonds that unite us to her, and we must do it by means of the Confederation now proposed to us, because that measure once carried out, she will undoubtedly put forth her whole strength for our defence if we should be attacked. Moreover, in view of the events which have recently occurred in the southern portion of this continent, if we reflect that it seems to be the policy of France and of England to establish a balance of power similar to what exists in Europe, if we consider that it is for this end that France has established an empire in Mexico, it is clear that England cannot but view with a favorable eye the movement now in progress here for the Confederation of all the British North American Provinces. It is not at such a time as this, therefore, that England would be disposed to abandon her colonies, as it has been pretended by some. I stated, a moment ago, that we should not resist the just demands of the British population of this country, provided they do not ask anything involving injustice towards French-Canadians. If we were guilty of injustice towards them, they would complain, and propose a plan of constitution humiliating to the French-Canadians, and they would no longer entertain sentiments of esteem and consideration for us. I do not refer to this matter for the purpose of discouraging my own fellow-countrymen, but because I believe it is necessary that they should take this view of the matter into account in the position in which we now find ourselves placed. To-day our position is an excellent one; we are strong as a party, we have statesmen at the head of the affairs of our country who are devoted to its interest—they have proved it again and again—and united together by the ties of interest and friendship; and above all, we have ever had confidence in those who prepared the project of a Constitu-

tion now submitted for our consideration; it is evident, then, that a more favorable opportunity could not possibly be found for effecting constitutional changes than the present circumstances afford. These men, who are surely possessed of as much diplomatic skill as the representatives of the other provinces can exhibit, will undoubtedly look after the interests of Lower Canada; and their opinion, based upon justice, will prevail with those to whom the preparation of our new Constitution is to be entrusted. Moreover, what I have just stated is perfectly understood by every influential class in the country, by all men who help to form public opinion, who are the guides of the people, and who have hitherto managed to lead them aright, and to bring them into a safe harbor at the last. To-day these men and these influences are in favor of the present plan, and all are convinced of its necessity. But, on the other hand, what are the influences opposed to Confederation in Lower Canada? They are confined to a party which has existed for the past fifteen years in Lower Canada, and which has always been remarkable for its opposition to all measures demanded and supported by the party representing in this House the vast majority of the people of Lower Canada. This persistent opposition to the measures of the Lower Canadian party savoured of revolution—for your revolutionist is by nature incapable of submitting to the majority; it is the same party which in other countries forms secret societies, by means of which society is thrown into disorder—and it is admitted that everywhere, in Europe as well as in America, these secret societies are composed of men who are invariably opposed to everything calculated to secure the peace and happiness of the people. Is it not true that in 1856 or 1857 a place in the Administration was offered to one of the leaders of that party by the present Attorney General, and that an opening was repeatedly made for them, because it was thought that they were acting in good faith? Now, did they not invariably refuse the alliance offered them? And did they not even refuse to give a cordial support to the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Administration, which was composed of Liberal-Conservatives? And the reason was, that that Administration was not exclusively composed of the democratic element.

HON. MR. DORION—Who voted against that Administration, and who defeated it?

MR. BEAUBIEN—It is true that the actual vote by which that government was upset was given by us, because there was in that Government an excess of the element I have just referred to, and for other reasons; but it was that party that betrayed and spurned those who had enabled them to carry their elections. (Hear, hear.) Is that not the truth? Then, that persistent and constant opposition to everything, shows that the members of that party were inspired by passions, not to be found in the generality of men. The Conservative party has always opposed representation by population under the present union, because under this union we are face to face with the population of a country of which the products are different from ours, and of which the interests are not always identical with ours. This question was strongly agitated. The whole people of Lower Canada resisted that demand, and the whole Conservative party firmly refused to consent to it, while the other party—the Opposition party—held out hopes to those who demanded that measure, and allied themselves with them. This is a statement, the truth of which cannot be denied, for documents proving the facts exist, and have been laid before this House and the country. This cause of dissension has always existed, and will always exist in Upper Canada, not because it is necessary to the support of such or such a party, but because it is the result of a provision of the Constitution, and because the interests of Upper Canada are not the same as ours. And if we do not effect a settlement of this question now, these dissensions will, ere long, be renewed and the difficulties increased. Here is an opportunity of removing these difficulties by uniting ourselves with the Lower Provinces; and I think Lower Canada would do well not to lose the opportunity. Under Confederation, the political parties into which the provinces will be divided will find it necessary to form alliances, and our alliance will be courted by all, so that we shall in reality hold the balance of power. Moreover, I am quite convinced that we have no grounds for fear in that respect. I have always remarked that material interests are of great weight in the formation of parties, and the conduct of the French-Canadians, with reference to their religious institutions, never inspired any uneasiness or distrust in our fellow-countrymen of a different origin from ours, when they found it their interest to form an alliance with us; and I am

certain that we shall find, under like circumstances, the same disposition among the inhabitants of the Lower Provinces. The plan proposed to us being based upon the principle of justice and equity to all, it is deserving of the support of all parties. It presents a remedy for the evils of which Upper Canada complains, at the same time that it affords guarantees for the protection of the interests of the other provinces; and inasmuch as it is founded on just bases, it will be found—more especially among a people such as that of this country, who are peaceable and well-disposed, who are, for the most part, owners of land, and have many interests to protect—it will be found, I say, that a sentiment of justice will prevail, and that every one will do his best to promote the working of the new Constitution in such a manner as to give full satisfaction to all the parties interested. Notwithstanding what the hon. member for Lotbinière has said in the course of a speech, with which he himself seemed to be so intensely amused, the sound sense and judgment of the people of Lower Canada will satisfy them that they will find in the project which has been submitted to us, guarantees for all their interests and for everything they hold dear, and that the measure will meet all their wants; and on the other hand, the sound sense and judgment of the people of the other provinces will prevent them from committing any excess or any act of injustice towards Lower Canada, if the latter should happen to be in a minority, or if the alliance I have referred to should not be made. And, moreover, as regards our being in a minority, are we not exposed to it under the present system? And I prefer facing the larger majority, since it will be less hostile to Lower Canada. As matters now stand, we should find ourselves at the mercy of the Upper Canada majority, if they wished to commit any injustice towards us; but, under the Confederation, I believe we shall have better guarantees than we now possess against any attempt at injustice on the part of the Federal Government, for the policy of England is to afford her colonies every possible reason for contentment. The hon. member for Richelieu has spoken of the events which occurred prior to 1837, to convince us that we have every reason to distrust the sentiments of the British population. Why refer to matters so long forgotten? The hon. member ought to know that the policy which circumstances have induced England to adopt, is no longer

the policy which then prevailed. Does any one believe that England would now encourage any section of the British population in doing an injustice to the inhabitants of Lower Canada? It will be said that the national life of Lower Canada is so deeply rooted, that it is impossible to destroy it; but, if we desire to secure its safety, we must accept the present scheme of Confederation, under which all the religious interests of Lower Canada, her educational institutions, her public lands, in fact everything that constitutes a people's nationality, will find protection and safety. With the control of our public lands in our own hands, we can attract the tide of emigration, retain our own people in the country, and advance in prosperity as rapidly as the other provinces. And all this is secured to us under the plan of Confederation. Every impartial man will admit that great care has been taken, in the drawing up of this project of Confederation, to protect all our interests. It may be true that it is not quite free from defect, but every one must acknowledge that it is the most perfect system that could possibly be obtained, and the system best calculated to afford us security. All the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the Opposition side say that the expenses will be extraordinary, and that the revenue will not be sufficient to support the governments of the Confederation. But they base their calculations upon the revenue as it now stands, and they do not reflect that the present debt of the province has been contracted in carrying out the vast public works we now possess, and that these public works have not as yet produced a revenue, but will hereafter do so. These public works were essentially necessary for the development of our resources; and if at this moment the Minister of Finance is able to present a budget shewing a surplus of revenue over expenditure, we are justified in hoping that within a few years our revenue will be more than sufficient to enable us to meet all the expenses of the different governments, and to extinguish our present debt. For my own part, I do not think that our expenses will be greater under Confederation than they are at present. If the Federal Government works well, our expenses will be less than they are at present, for we shall be rid of factious sectional jealousies, and the system of equivalents, which have done so much injury to the country, and which have so greatly impeded the working of the

Government in times past. It is ridiculous to fancy that the Government of Canada can continue to work and maintain itself with a majority of one or two votes in this House, as we have witnessed for some years past; for a government so placed is at the mercy of every member who has a local interest to serve, or a particular favor to obtain; and it is thus forced to grant favors which it would refuse if it were stronger. This was the cause of all the useless expenditure; and almost every one of our governments has been in that position. (Hear, hear.) But under Confederation we may hope that the Federal Government will generally have the support of a large majority, and will consequently not be compelled to yield to the demands of a small number of members. The resources at the disposal of the local governments being limited, they will practise a degree of economy which will serve as an example to the Federal Government itself. Lower Canada, when left to herself, will become highly prosperous in a few years—and perhaps Upper Canada also—provided her expenses be kept within bounds; and I am convinced that her Local Government will be a model for the Federal Government; for men formed in the school of the Local Government, and who will be habituated to the practice of economy, will exert a salutary influence on the members of the Federal Legislature, to whom they will impart, and on whom they will impress, their ideas of economy and good government. (Hear, hear.) It is well that the means at the disposal of the local governments should be limited, but at the same time amply sufficient, for they must then feel that they cannot enter into too large expenditure, and they will adopt a perfect system of economy. (Hear, hear.) Before concluding I must pay a tribute of justice to the British population of Lower Canada. We have always gone along hand in hand like good friends, acknowledging each other's rights, and each party invariably making it a rule to accede to the just claims of the other. This will be our safety also under the Federal Government. For my part I should be sorry to see the present plan of Confederation fail, at all events through any action of ours, for that would justly dissatisfy the British population of this country, who desire to see it carried out, and to whom we should not refuse it. We know that the British have always done everything in their power to promote the material prosperity of the country, and it is our duty to respect them and to accede to their just demands. With these few

remarks, Mr. SPEAKER, I shall conclude by stating that I am in favor of the present plan of Confederation, not because I trust solely to the evidence of my own judgment, but because I see at the head of the movement the most enlightened men in the country, and because all the men of influence, all the men of property in the country, are in favor of the project. (Hear, hear.) And I am convinced, notwithstanding all that may have been said, that the country is sufficiently familiar with the project, and that the people now know all they will ever know about it. In every parish there are men who are the leaders of public opinion, and we know that these men are in favor of this plan. We have all these influences with us, and for my part I attach but little importance to the opinion expressed at certain public meetings held to oppose Confederation, or to the petitions presented against the project, for it is always easy to obtain signatures to petitions. And, moreover, let any one compare the signatures to these petitions with the poll-books kept at elections, and it will be found that they are the names of those who have always been opposed to everything proposed by the great national party, which has ever represented the interests of Lower Canada. (Applause.)

MR. DUFRESNE (of Montcalm)—Mr. SPEAKER, I do not rise to speak on the question now before the House, but simply to express my surprise that after six weeks of discussion the Opposition pretend that we refuse them time to discuss the measure, and that nevertheless they refuse to discuss it during the afternoon sittings, and will only take it up in the evening. For my part, I am prepared to vote at once upon this matter, and I believe that the question is perfectly mastered and well understood by every member of this House. Why are the Opposition unwilling to speak during the afternoon sittings? Their object in speaking is to kill time, rather than to discuss the merits of the question. And why is this? Is it because they are waiting for a few more petitions, a few more names, in order to protest against Confederation? But we know the value of these petitions—we know what the *Rouges* are, and that they will sign any and every petition, provided it be against the Government and its policy. The Opposition is like a sulky child; if you refuse him a plaything he cries for it, and then if you offer it to him he refuses to take it. The Confederation is in reality the plan of those gentlemen themselves, and yet to-day they will not hear

of it; they reject it as something horrible. The country is watching them, and I hold the Opposition responsible for the loss of time we are now undergoing. If they have any reasons to advance, let them do so, but let us come to a vote. Their conduct will receive its due reward at the hands of the people. (Hear, hear.)

After the recess,—

HON. MR. CAUCHON said—Mr. SPEAKER, when so many eloquent voices have spoken on the great question which occupies us so seriously, which stands preëminent over all others in the present situation, which pre-occupies all minds, which agitates to its farthest limits all British North America, which includes within its immense scope two oceans and nearly half a continent, and which is pregnant with the destinies of a great people and a great country—when the whole of the motives which can be advanced for and against the project have been so luminously discussed, when I myself have, elsewhere, at such considerable length and so completely developed, with the feeble abilities which Providence has conferred upon me, the considerations which militate for or against the entirety and the details of the work of the Quebec Conference, I might—perhaps I should—have remained a simple spectator of these solemn debates, while awaiting the hour at which I should be permitted to record my vote in accordance with my convictions. I considered, however, that as one of the oldest representatives of the people, after having spoken elsewhere, I should speak again within the parliamentary precinct, in order to accomplish to the letter my trust, and in order to obey that voice which has a right to command me. I have therefore come this evening in order to bring my feeble tribute of ideas to the decisive ordeal which is being accomplished. For my part I should have wished for the bringing forward of fewer personal questions, fewer criminations and recriminations, fewer allusions to the past; in a word, I should have wished to see the debate rising at its very outset to the dignity of the question itself, so as to place us in a position to judge of it on its own merits, without considering the names or the antecedents of those who may defend or may oppose it; I should have wished to see the conscience of our public men in harmony with the public conscience, and that under such grave circumstances, men had forgotten that they were party men, in order to remember only their national character. (Hear, hear.) But sev-

eral of the speakers have not appreciated the situation in this manner; they have not believed that it was of such importance as to exact the development of great virtues and great sacrifices. One honorable gentleman amused himself by making *jeux de mots* of doubtful merit on the complexion of two pamphlets; another devoted a third of his long speech to the task of endeavoring to make his present position agree with his antecedents, and the other two-thirds almost entirely to an effort to make his opponents contradict themselves, without any regard to the question under discussion, imitating the Trojan hero of whom VIRGIL sings, and of whom ROUSSEAU says:

“Pouvait-elle mieux attendre
De ce pieux voyageur,
Qui, fuyant sa ville en cendre,
Et le fer du Grec vengeur,
Quitta les murs de Pergame
Tenant son fils par la main,
Sans prendre garde à sa femme,
Qui se perdit en chemin?”*

(Hear, hear, and laughter.) I scorn to defend here my past opinions on Confederation. I wrote from conviction in 1858, just as I have written from conviction in 1865. My two works are there—provoking discussion, and throwing down the gauntlet to those who may desire to take it up. It will soon be a third of a century since I commenced to write, and if I had no other recommendation to public attention than that of being the oldest journalist in the country, it appears to me that people ought, if they could, not to have allowed me to pass without asking me the reason of my present doctrines. How is it, then, that from the midst of the democratic and opposition press not a single voice has been heard against the long commentary of the *Journal* on the scheme of the Quebec Conference? (Hear, hear.) Is it inability? Is it that talent is wanting among this phalanx which believes itself to have been specially ushered into existence in order to enlighten and govern the country? Even if I had not written under a strong sense of duty, I should feel sufficiently strengthened by the high and disinterested approbation which greeted my humble work, to bear un-

disturbed the scratches and pin pricks of the honorable member for Lotbinière, and, all unworthy though it may be, I should not hesitate to place it in the balance against, I will not say the episode, but the speech by which he seems to hope to arrive at the position of a statesman, to which he aspires. It is to be regretted also that the honorable member for Hochelaga kept himself almost constantly, during three hours and a half, in the lowest level of personal recriminations. Was he unable to raise himself to a more dignified ground, or is it the natural level of his talents and his habits? It seems to me that the occasion required more serious debate, larger views, wiser appreciation drawn from more profound thoughts, a truer idea of the situation, greater truth in the statement of facts, greater exactness, more sequence, and more logic in the reasoning. But, instead of this, we have had a jumble of ideas and assertions, dates which give each other the lie, and a history sadly made and sadly told. The honorable gentleman challenged me, and I must accept this challenge before entering upon the consideration of the question which is now before us. The honorable gentleman (Hon. Mr. DORION) said the other evening:—

This speech has been tortured and twisted in every possible sense. I have seen it quoted in order to prove that I was in favor of representation by population pure and simple; I have seen it quoted in order to prove that I was in favor of the Confederation of the provinces, and, in fact, to prove many other things, according to the necessities of the moment or of those who quoted it. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) The first time the question was put to a practical test was in 1858. On the occasion of the resignation of the MACDONALD-CARTIER Government the BROWN-DORION Government was formed, and it was agreed between the members that the constitutional question should be met and settled, either by means of a Confederation of Upper and Lower Canada, or by means of representation by population, with checks and guarantees ensuring the religious faith, the laws, the language and the local institutions of each section of the country against any attack from the other. Pretended extracts from this document as of my speech have been given and falsified, in the press and elsewhere, to prove every kind of doctrine as being my views; but I can show clearly that the proposition which it contains is exactly the same as that which was made in 1858, that is to say, Confederation of the two provinces, with some joint authority for the management of affairs common to both. My speeches have been lately paraded in the ministerial journals; they have been distorted, ill translated, and even falsified, in order to induce the public to believe that I

* What conduct could she hope less flagrant
From this good, holy, pious vagrant,
Who, flying from his city's sack,
The avenging Greek upon his track,
And leading by his hand his boy,
Fled from the walls of burning Troy?
To help his wife he would not stay;
So she was lost upon the way.

formerly held opinions different from those which I now hold. A French journal has said "that I loudly called for a Confederation of the provinces." But I shall say now, as I stated in 1856, and as I stated in 1861, that I have always been and am still opposed to Confederation. I find by the *Mirror of Parliament*, which contains a report of my speech, although an exceedingly bad report, that I stated in 1861—"A time may come when it will be necessary to have a Confederation of all the provinces; . . . but the time has not yet come for such a scheme." This was the speech which was misrepresented as meaning that I was calling loudly for Confederation, and that nothing would give me greater pleasure. And yet I explicitly stated on that occasion that although a time might come when Confederation would become necessary, it was not desirable under actual circumstances.

The honorable gentleman already admits two things with which he has been charged—representation on the basis of population, with checks, guarantees and assurances, and the Confederation of Upper and Lower Canada. We shall now see if, in extending the field of my investigations, I shall not find that the honorable member for Hochelaga has—to use a felicitous expression of the honorable member for Lotbinière—occasionally enlarged the circle of his constitutional operations. Here is what the honorable gentleman stated on the 6th July, 1858; the extract is from the *Globe*, of which, at that period at least, he did not question the veracity:—

The honorable member for Brockville, the Honorable Postmaster General, the Speaker, and other members representing Lower Canadian counties in the present Parliament, have voted for representation by population. Before long, it will be impossible to resist the demands of Upper Canada in this respect. If representation by population is not granted now, it will infallibly obtain it at a later period, but then without any guarantees for the protection of the French-Canadians. The repeal of the union, a Federal union, representation based on population, or some other great change must in all necessity take place, and for my part I am disposed to consider the question of representation by population, in order to see if it may not be conceded with guarantees for the protection of the religion, the language, and the laws of Lower Canadians. I am equally ready to take into consideration the project of a Confederation of the provinces, leaving to each section the administration of its local affairs, as for example the power of regulating its own civil, municipal and educational laws; and to the General Government the administration of the public works, the public lands, the post-office department, and commerce.

I now quote the *Mirror*, the orthodoxy and

veracity of which are denied by the honorable member for Hochelaga and his organs. The date of the report in the *Mirror* is the 3rd May, 1860:—

I hope, nevertheless, that a day will come when it will be desirable for Canada to unite federally with the Lower Provinces; but the time is not yet ripe for such a project. And even if Canada should be favorable, the Maritime Provinces would not like to enter into it on account of our great debt. As to the joint authority, it ought to have the least authority. But those who are in favor of the Federal union of the provinces ought to see this Federation of Upper and Lower Canada is the best mode of creating a nucleus around which, at a later period, the Confederation of all the provinces might be formed.

Thus the honorable member for Hochelaga had all sorts of wares, just as the keeper of a "general store" possesses all sorts of merchandise, great and small, on his shelves. To some he sells lace and to others cutlery. (Laughter.)

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—It is a *pot pourri*. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. CAUCHON—The honorable gentleman calls it a *pot pourri*. I think my comparison of it as a general store is much more accurate and characteristic.

A MEMBER—Music is sold there. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. CAUCHON—Yes, on his shelves loaded with all sorts of goods, even old music is to be found. (Laughter.) Here there is a conflict of authorities as there is in relation to dogmatic questions between Protestant and Catholic writers; and the *Pays* expressed itself as follows with respect to the *Mirror of Parliament*:—

But here is the crowning of the edifice. The editor of the *Journal* finds strange things in the *Mirror of Parliament*, a publication which was never controlled by any committee of the House, and the authority of which is worth less than that of a solidly founded newspaper such as the *Globe*, the *Herald*, the *Chronicle*, or the *Journal de Québec* itself. It is notorious that the reporters for this *Mirror* were not over particular as to their correctness, and that but little importance was attached to their reports; so much so that the sheet in question had only an ephemeral existence.

Without admitting the truth of the pretensions of this organ of the honorable member for Hochelaga, I did not hesitate to follow the honorable gentleman on the ground which he himself has chosen, and I found the following in the *Morning Chronicle* of the 4th

May, 1860, to which he referred me for a more exact and veracious report—it being the same speech of the third May, a report of which I have read from the *Mirror of Parliament*. [Here the honorable gentleman read a French translation of the *Chronicle's* report.] And in order that there may be no doubt as to the exactness of the translation, with the exception of a word which I shall explain after reading the extract, I shall now quote the English text as reported in the *Chronicle*, viz.:—

Mr. DORION argued that when Lower Canada had the preponderance of population, complaints were of the inequality of the representation of that section. The union of Belgium and Holland, which was somewhat similar to that at present existing between Upper and Lower Canada was dissolved when it was found it did not work advantageously to both countries. He instanced a number of questions on which it was impossible for Upper and Lower Canada to agree; public feeling being quite dissimilar—subjects popular in one section being the reverse in the other. He warned Lower Canada members, that when the time came that the whole of the representatives from the western portion of the province would be banded together on the question, they would obtain representation by population, and secure the assistance of the Eastern Township members in so doing. He regarded a Federal union of Upper and Lower Canada as a nucleus of the great Confederation of the North American Provinces to which all looked forward. He concluded by saying he would vote for the resolution, as the only mode by which the two sections of the province could get out of the difficulties in which they now are. He thought the union ought to be dissolved, and a Federal union of the provinces would in due time follow.

The translation into French says, "*que j'appelle de mes vœux*," and the original text is "to which all looked forward." Thus, instead of rendering the desire for a Confederation of the provinces, as his own he made it general. Instead of speaking for himself, he spoke for all, and as the whole comprises the part, in expressing the general thought he had most naturally expressed his own thought. (Hear, hear.) I take this opportunity of correcting this involuntary error of translation, and of saying that the honorable gentleman affirmed then that not only himself, but that all turned their eyes from the mountain top towards the promised land of Confederation of all the British North American Provinces. Did not the honorable member for Hochelaga say in his famous manifesto of the 7th Nov., 1864:—

The union which is proposed appears to me premature, and if it is not altogether incompatible with our colonial state, it is at least without precedent in the history of the colonies.

And the other day, in this House he stated:—

Necessarily, I do not mean to say that I shall always be opposed to Confederation. The population may extend itself, and cover the virgin forests which exist between Canada and the Maritime Provinces, and commercial relations may increase in such a manner as to render Confederation necessary.

It is, therefore, in every respect merely a question of time, and of expediency as between the majority of the House and the honorable member for Hochelaga. But he has not thought proper to tell us why Confederation of all the provinces of British North America is to-day a crime, an anti-national act, yet would have at one period, been good and acceptable to Lower Canada. In the same manner he has also preserved silence on the character which Confederation should possess, in order to merit the sanction of his word and his vote. Always to condemn, always to destroy, never to build up—this appears to be the motto of the honorable member for Hochelaga, and those who follow his lead on the floor of this House. (Hear, hear.) They always keep to themselves the easiest share of sacrifice and patriotism—the task of casting blame and censure upon others. (Hear, hear.) The honorable gentleman thinks that the union proposed to us, that is to say Confederation, is without precedent in Colonial history. He has, therefore, not read the Federal history, scarcely accomplished, of the colonies of Australia. But if it be true that the Confederation of the six colonies is without precedent in Colonial history, will the honorable gentleman at least tell us where he found his precedent for the Confederation of the two provinces? (Hear, hear, and laughter.) In order to get out of the difficulty again this time, the honorable gentleman will hardly deny that which he affirmed so categorically only the other evening. It is evident that logic and a recollection of facts are not among the most prominent features of the honorable member's eloquence. Since he desires so much to establish that he was at all times in favor of a Confederation of the two Canadas as an alternative for representation by population, it appears to me, and it ought to be evident to the House and to the country which we represent, that he should have stated the motives of such a deep and constant

conviction. Why conceal from us the fruits of so many and such serious meditations? Why, setting aside the facile and convenient task of censor, does he not come forward as the architect of a political edifice capable of sheltering and protecting against tempest from without, our nationality and the institutions of which it is composed. It is because "if criticism is easy, art is difficult." This truth enunciated by a poet, nearly two thousand years ago, evidently belongs to all ages, and it finds, to-day more particularly, its application in the person of the honorable member for Hochelaga. (Hear, hear.) *Tempora mutantur et nos mutamur in illis*—and behold, the honorable gentleman told us on the 16th February, 1865:—

Representation based upon population was one of the least causes of this project. [And further on]: But, as soon as the Government found itself, after its defeat, obliged either to resign or to appeal to the people, gentlemen on the other side of the House, without there being the slightest agitation on this question, prepared to embrace their most violent adversaries, and said to themselves: "We are going to forget our past differences, provided we can preserve our portfolios."

Had the honorable gentleman, therefore, forgotten that which he stated with so much emphasis and apparently with so much conviction in 1858:—

The honorable member for Brockville, the Postmaster General, the Speaker, and other members representing Lower Canadian counties, in the present Parliament, have already voted for representation by population. Before long, it will become impossible to resist the demand of Upper Canada in this respect. If representation by population be not granted now, it will infallibly obtain it later, but then without any guarantee for the protection of the French Canadians.

Had he changed his opinion in 1859 when he wrote conjointly with Hon. Messrs. DRUMMOND, DESSAULLES and MCGEE:—

It is with the settled conviction that an inevitable constitutional crisis imposed upon the Liberal party of Lower Canada duties proportionate with the gravity of the circumstances in which the affairs of the country were, that your Committee has undertaken the task with which it is charged. It has become evident to all those who, for several years back, have given their attention to daily events; and above all to those who have had to mingle actively with public affairs, that we are rapidly reaching a state of things which will necessitate modifications in the relations existing between Upper and Lower Canada; and a

search for the means most likely to meet the difficulty; when it presents itself, has not failed to be the subject of the most serious consideration and frequent discussion in and out of Parliament.

The proposition for the formation of a Confederation of the two Canadas is not a new one. It has frequently been agitated in Parliament and in the press for several years past. The example of the neighboring states, in which the application of the Federal system has shewn us how fitting it was to the government of an immense territory, inhabited by people of different origins, creeds, laws and customs, has no doubt suggested the idea; but it was only in 1856 that this proposition was enunciated before the Legislature by the Lower Canadian Opposition, as offering, in its opinion, the only effective remedy for the abuses produced by the present system.

Lower Canada wishes to maintain intact the present union of the provinces. If she will not consent to a dissolution nor to Confederation, it is difficult to conceive what plausible reasons she can advance for refusing representation by population. Up to the present time she has opposed it by alleging the danger which might result to some of the institutions which are most dear to her; but this reason would be no longer sustainable if it resisted a proposition the effect of which would be to leave to the inhabitants of Lower Canada the absolute control of those same institutions and to surround them with the most efficient protection which it is possible to imagine—that which would procure for them the formal dispositions of a written constitution, which could not be changed without their consent.

It appears therefore that the only alternative which now offers itself to the inhabitants of Lower Canada is a choice between dissolution pure and simple, or Confederation on one side, and representation by population on the other. And however opposed Lower Canada may be to representation by population, is there not imminent danger that it may be finally imposed upon it, if it resist all measures of reform, the object of which is to leave to the local authorities of each section the control of its own interests and institutions.

We should not forget that the same authority which imposed on us the Act of Union, or which altered it without our consent, by repealing the clause which required the concurrence of two-thirds of the members of both Houses in order to change the representation respecting the two sections, may again intervene to impose upon us this new change.

The customs, postal matters, laws regulating currency, patents, copyrights, public lands, and those public works which are of common interest to all parts of the country, should be the principal if not the only subjects of which the Federal Government would have the control, while all that related to purely local improvements, to edu-

cation, to the administration of justice, to militia, to laws of property and internal policy, should be left to the local governments, the powers of which, in a word, should extend to all those subjects which do not come within the domain of the General Government.

Your Committee believes that it is easy to prove that the expenses absolutely necessary for the support of the Federal Government and the several local governments ought not to exceed those of the present system, while the enormous indirect expenses occasioned by the latter system would be avoided by the new—both on account of the additional restrictions which the Constitution would place upon all public expenditure, and of the more immediate responsibility of the several officers of the Government towards the people who are interested in restraining them.

The Federal Legislature having only to occupy itself with a limited number of affairs, might, in a short time every year, perform all necessary legislation; and, as the number of members would not be very great, the expenses of the Federal Government would not, therefore, be a fraction of the present expenses, which, added to the cost of the local governments, if they were on the plan of those of the United States, which are the best and the most economically administered, could not exceed the figure of the present budget.

The system proposed could not in any way diminish the importance of this colony, nor damage its credit, inasmuch as it offers the great advantage of being able to suit itself to any territorial extension which circumstances might, in future, render desirable, without troubling the general economy of the Confederation.

A. A. DORION,
L. T. DRUMMOND,
L. A. DESSAULLES,
T. D. MCGEE.

MR. PERREAULT—I rise to a question of order. We have listened with much pleasure to the excellent pamphlet which the honorable member has been reading out to us for half an hour past. I can understand that the honorable member having written a pamphlet in 1858 against Confederation, and another in 1865 in favor of Confederation, now feels the necessity of writing a third pamphlet to make the two others agree. But, as the honorable member for Montmorency possesses great powers of improvisation, the House, I think, ought not to be more indulgent to him than to other members, who are compelled to speak under all the disadvantages of improvisation, which is always difficult. I have, therefore, to ask whether the honorable member for Montmorency is in order in reading his magnificent speech from beginning to end?

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—I see

nothing extraordinary in this particular case. I see that my honorable friend the member for Montmorency has notes before him to which he refers, but I do not see any speech. The honorable member for Richelieu, with his eccentric genius, requires no notes when he makes those splendid speeches with which he regales us from time to time. I can easily understand that for such lucubrations no very lengthy preparation is necessary. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. CAUCHON—Every one has not the genius of the honorable member for Richelieu. I know also that he is one of those who can talk a long time, because they do not always know what they are saying. (Laughter.) The honorable member may talk as long as he likes, without being afraid of my interrupting him, for his speeches can do no harm except to the person who utters them. (Laughter.)

THE SPEAKER said it was not exactly in order for an honorable member to read a speech quite through, but he might make use of notes.

HON. MR. CAUCHON—From all these extracts one must conclude that either the honorable member for Hochelaga was ready to sacrifice everything in order to attain power in 1858, or else that in 1858, as in 1859, he was deeply convinced that nothing but representation by population or a Federal union of the two Canadas could prevent the storm then lowering on the horizon. We find therein, firstly, that we were rapidly reaching a state of things which would necessitate modifications in the relations between Upper and Lower Canada; secondly, that the proposal to form a Federation of the Canadas was not new; thirdly, that the example of the neighboring States, where the application of the Federal system shewed how suitable it was to the government of an immense territory, inhabited by people of different origin, belief, laws and customs, had suggested the idea; fourthly, that Lower Canada would not have any legitimate motive to resist representation based upon population if it refused a written Constitution, under which it would have protection for and control of its institutions; fifthly, that it would be in imminent danger of seeing imposed upon it representation based upon population, if the Confederation of the two Canadas were obstinately resisted, and that those who imposed the Union Act upon us, and afterwards altered it to our detriment, could oblige us to accept the former; sixthly, that customs, currency, patents, copyrights, public lands, public works and things of common

interest should be among the attributes of the Federal Parliament; seventhly, that the expenses of the Federal and local governments should not exceed those of the present system. The following extract, taken from the same document, must be added to those already cited:—

Your committee has therefore become convinced, that whether we consider the present wants with regard to the future of this country, the substitution of a purely Federal Government for the present legislative union, presents the true solution of our difficulties, and that such substitution would free us from the inconveniences, while at the same time securing to us all the advantages which the present union may possess.

(Hear, hear, and laughter.) At the same period the *Pays*, with a conviction as profound as that of the honorable gentleman whose organ it is, thought that if we did not make some constitutional concessions we should not be able to resist the torrent of public opinion of Upper Canada, which threatened to break through the feeble barrier opposed to it by the Union Act of 1840. The honorable member for Hochelaga went on with his fears and his convictions to the time when, by an accident unfortunate for the country, he again came into power. (Hear, hear.) It is not then merely the holding of a ministerial portfolio which is cast up to us to-day. The time has then arrived when constitutional changes become necessary—the question of Confederation under any form is, therefore, not new. (Hear, hear.) To take the United States, as the honorable member for Hochelaga has done, for example, I will say that the Federal system is suitable for the government of an immense territory, inhabited by people of different races, laws and customs, and consequently more suitable to the Confederation of the British North American Provinces than to the smaller one of Upper and Lower Canada. Lower Canada, “unless she wish representation based upon population, should not reject a written Constitution under which she has protection for and control of her peculiar institutions.” (Hear, hear.) Finally, the expenses of the federal and local governments and legislatures will not exceed those of the present system. According to the Montreal manifesto of 1859, the Federal Government and Parliament, having very little to do, ought to cost but little, so as to leave more to be done by the local legislatures. According to the scheme of the Conference held at Quebec, the tables are turned, and it will be the local legislatures that, having but local

affairs to attend to, will have to practise economy for the benefit of the General Government. It is therefore evident that the honorable member for Hochelaga is not more of a conjuror than others. It is again still more evident that the honorable member would be less hostile to this project, had he been the author of it, or if he had been sitting on the right instead of on the left side of the House; for after all it is but a question of expediency, at least as regards principle. The honorable member for Hochelaga also told us:—

I would never have attempted to make a change in the Constitution of the country without being convinced that the population of that section of province which I represented was favorable to such a scheme.

(Hear.) I do not wish to doubt his sincerity, but has he not also said, “I know that the possession of power leads to despotism?” Did he not say, before the events of 1858, that were he in power, never, no never, would he consent to govern Lower Canada with the help of an Upper Canada majority, and yet how did he act in 1862? How did he act on coming into power in 1863, after having ejected in such a loyal and sympathising manner his illustrious predecessor and chief, Hon. Mr. SICOTTE? (Hear, hear.) It was not despotism, but thirst for power, which made him adopt means to attain that end, which I shall not designate by their proper name in this solemn debate. (Hear, hear.) How did he act? Forgetting his declarations of 1858, he governed Lower Canada with a weak minority of its representatives, and as, according to his ideas, “power led to despotism,” he ruled it with that rod of iron which the radicals alone know how to wield. But happily those days of painful memories are passed, and the level of the political soil, which had sunk down, from some of those secret causes known to Providence alone, again suddenly rose up to escape from the overflowing torrents of demagogic principles which threatened society at large. What the Opposition detest the most in the project of the Quebec Conference, is its monarchical character, as also those words found at the commencement of that remarkable work:—

The best interests and present and future prosperity of British North America will be promoted by a Federal union under the Crown of Great Britain, provided such union can be effected on principles just to the several provinces.

In the Federation of the British North American Provinces, the system of government best adapted, under existing circumstances, to protect the diversified interests of the several pro-

vinces, and secure efficiency, harmony and permanency in the working of the union, would be a General Government, charged with matters of common interest to the whole country; and Local Governments for each of the Canadas, and for the Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, charged with the control of local matters in their respective sections. Provision being made for the admission into the union, on equitable terms, of Newfoundland, the North-West Territory, British Columbia, and Vancouver.

We move in a different circle of ideas from that in which the Opposition moves. We wish in America, as elsewhere, for a monarchy tempered by parliamentary system and ministerial responsibility, because, without interfering with liberty, it renders institutions more solid and secure. We have all seen British democracy holding its existence under the protection of the immutable ægis of Royal Majesty, and exercising over the destinies of the country that salutary control which has made Great Britain so rich, so powerful and so free. (Hear, hear.) We have also seen, not far from our own homes, that same democracy wrapped in the mantle of republicanism, moving at a rapid pace towards demagoguery, and from demagoguery to an intolerable despotism. (Hear, hear.) We have seen military rule extending over the entire face of the great neighboring republic, lately so proud of its popular institutions. And we have also seen that people, so proud of their liberty, humbly bend their necks to the sword of the soldier, allow their press to be muzzled, after having condemned the system of censorship legalized in France, and suffer their writers to be imprisoned without a protest. (Hear, hear.) M. DE TOCQUEVILLE has lived too long; his admirable work on democracy in America produces upon our minds, at the present day, only the effect of an heroic poem; it is the *Isle of Calypso*, so admirably sung by FENELON, but which fades away when you have closed *Telemachus*. (Laughter.) Instead of those institutions, framed with such mathematical precision, and that mechanism so finished and so regular in its course, there is to be seen but violent and jerking motions, over-turnings, and the collision and smashing of the component parts of the disconnected machinery of state; instead of peace and harmony we find civil war on a gigantic scale, universal desolation, formidable battles, and the blood of brothers mingling in streams on the soil of their common country. (Hear, hear.) What has become of that race of giants who, after seven years of a glorious

struggle, laid the foundation, in 1783, of the American republic? Disdaining to use the means employed by the smaller spirits of the age to grasp at the helm of the state, they have retired from the public arena, so as to live in an honorable and dignified manner in private retirement—for the genius of the American people is not dead, and the country which still produces great judges and learned jurists could also, under another order of things, and in a different moral condition, give birth to new WASHINGTONS, FRANKLINS, HAMILTONS, ADAMS, and MADISONS. (Hear, hear.) They did not act wrongly then, those forty chosen men of British North America who came to Quebec to erect a new nation on the monarchical basis, and as much as possible on the principles of the Parliament of Great Britain. It seems to us that that authority was imposing enough to merit the respect of men of much less experience, and much less versed in the science of government. (Hear, hear.) And yet when the honorable member for Joliette asked with much reason of the honorable member for Lotbinière why he did not speak of Confederation based upon monarchical principles, the latter gentleman answered that he could not speak of what did not exist, and of what was absurd. He was like the French *savant* who, in 1836, proved by arguments not to be refuted, that it was impossible to cross the ocean with steam as the motive power. But while he was thus floundering through his powerful and learned arguments, the *Sirius* was steaming majestically across the Atlantic as if to mock the wisdom of science. Facts are stubborn and positive things. (Hear, hear.) We are not here, like COLUMBUS, looking for an unknown world; yet the honorable member who went as far back as the heroic times of Greece to find arguments against all Confederations, who unfolded pompously to our gaze Roman history to prove to us that what was strong and durable was formed piece by piece, and that even what is actually strong must also perish, as the Roman Empire had ended by succumbing under the weight of its own power; who, bent on finding out Confederations in confusion, and in the midst of *pronunciamentos*, of *movimientos* and of *échauffourées*, travelled through without seeing them, those non-federative Spanish-American republics, so irritable and so agitated; who, to be faithful to this system, attributed the five hundred years' existence of the Swiss Confederation to every other cause than to the stability of its principle, and to the conservative and national character of its

inhabitants; and who, in his enthusiasm for his doctrines, did not see that the European equilibrium would have been secure just as well by the existence of one or more distinct states as with a Confederation in the Helvetic Mountains—he failed to see not far from the native land of his ancestors, the noble Helvetia which conquered and maintained for five centuries its independence in the midst of the most terrible conflicts which shook the soil of Europe, which overturned thrones and transformed nations—he has not seen, in flesh and blood, a Confederation resting almost entirely on the monarchical principle—the Germanic Confederation—of which Austria is the head, and for which this latter power and Prussia alone can decide questions of peace and war. (Hear, hear.) This was preceded by the Confederation of the Rhine, which had found like it its elements and its mode of being in the ancient empire founded by CHARLEMAGNE, “the strongest hand that ever existed,” to use the splendid expression of OZANAM; the Germanic Empire, a true confederation of princes, becoming really independent in the course of centuries, and kings in their respective states under the Imperial suzerainty. The Golden Bull promulgated by the Emperor CHARLES IV., in 1356, gives us some useful information on this subject. I would refer the honorable member for Lothinière to it. (Hear, hear.) But why should we ransack history to establish a fact which is as clear as day? Is it not sufficient to open the first dictionary at hand to know that the word “confederation” means simply “league,” union of states or sovereigns, of nations, or even of armies for a common object. (Hear, hear.) The honorable member has therefore ill-chosen his time to be witty at the expense of a man of sense. He declared himself by turns against the Federal principle and against legislative unity. Appealing alternately to every prejudice to attain his object, he said to the French-Canadian Catholics—“Resist Confederation, because it will leave you without protection in the Federal Government and Parliament.” Then, turning towards English Protestants, and reading complacently to them an extract from Lord DURHAM’s report, he said :—“Do not vote for Confederation; you would be at the mercy of a French and Catholic majority in the Local Government and Parliament.” (Hear, hear.) Although the direct reverse in every other respect of the honorable member for Hochelaga, his conduct proves

that he believes with that honorable gentleman “that power engenders despotism.” But, in his place, at the outset of my public career, full of youth and of the generous sentiments which it inspires, instead of setting the torch to such inflammable elements as national and religious prejudices, I should have imitated the example of the honorable member for Montreal Centre; and in order to calm mutual distrust, I should have endeavored to fulfil my duty by recalling the eminently honorable, christian and civilising history of the last quarter of a century. (Cheers.) But the honorable gentleman was evidently incapable of so doing. He had just emerged terrified from amidst the *pronunciamientos*, the *echauffourées* and the *movimientos* of the very civilized Spanish Confederations of Central America, and full of feverish agitation, he launched himself on spreading pinions towards the rainbow and the *aurora borealis*. (Laughter.) We know what the rainbow is physically. It is composed of drops of water, which, placed at a certain angle facing the sun, refract and reflect its light with all the colors of which it is composed. (Laughter.) As to the *aurora borealis*, some attribute it to the reverberations of solar light on the snows of the North Pole, whither the honorable gentleman proceeded in order to find the vast territory with which he wishes us to form the Confederation domain. But the opinion most generally accepted is that it is, in a manner, something imponderable and unsubstantial. (Laughter.) Our people, seeing them moving in all directions with the most prodigious rapidity, rising, falling, doubling backward and forward on each other with such inconceivable rapidity, have given them the true and picturesque name of dancing puppets (*marionnettes*). (Hear, and laughter.) It is, therefore, easily seen that if they hold in horror the prejudices which are productive of so much evil, their mind is at least not so torpid as the hon. member for Lothinière believes, and it is at least not necessary to arouse them in this manner. (Hear, hear.) We know what invariably happens to all these luminous meteors. Jack o’ the Lanterns and Will o’ the Wisps having complacently expanded themselves on the confines of the infinite horizon, after having gambolled at their ease, become serious and solemn—they are seized with the ambition of ascending to the zenith. But as they have, “with the stature of a giant, but the strength of a

child," they soon diminish and disappear, to be, in the words of BOSSUET, "*qu'au je ne sais quoi qui n'a plus de nom dans aucune langue* (a thing which has no name in any tongue)." (Hear, hear.) On close examination, however, it would be seen that the hon. member was not so sarcastic as might have been at first supposed, when he suggested the iris as the emblem of the new Confederation. The rainbow, from a figurative point of view, is the emblem of alliance, and consequently of strength and durability—it is the symbol of peace and calm after a long day of storm and tempest—it is the pledge of promise that, in future, the flood-gates of demagoguery will no longer be opened on the country, to leave upon its surface that morbid sediment, the fetid odors of which still offend the moral sense of the people after their unwholesome waters have retired. (Cheers.) It is the unity of many-colored rays which, combined, produces light and heat and fecundity. I should, therefore, advise those who will be charged at a future day with our new destinies to adopt the rainbow as our national emblem, and to give credit to the hon. member for Lotbinière, who will doubtless be astonished to find that he has been so wonderfully inspired. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) If there were never to be any mutual confidence among men; if we were for ever destined to fear and suspect each other reciprocally, we would be obliged to renounce all idea of government as well as all the relations of social life. The very laws which protect persons and property would be without value, because they are expounded by men. (Hear, hear.) Fortunately such is not the case, as our own history sufficiently proves. Before the union, the parliamentary majority in Lower Canada was Catholic, and although it was long involved in a struggle with power, was it ever guilty of an injustice towards the Protestant minority? (Hear, hear.) On the contrary, did it not emancipate the latter, civilly and religiously, and did it not give that minority privileges which it had not hitherto possessed? If our people are inflexibly attached to our faith, it is also full of toleration, of good-will towards those who are not of the same belief. Since the union the parts have changed. Protestantism dominates in the government and in the legislature, and yet has not Catholicity been better treated, and has it not been better developed, with more liberty and more prosperity than under the regime of the Con-

stitution of 1791. (Hear, hear.) Living and laboring together we have learned to know, to respect, to esteem each other, and to make mutual concessions for the common weal. We Catholics have therefore no fear of the ill-will of a Protestant majority in the Federal Government and Legislature, and we are certain that the Protestants of Lower Canada need not fear for themselves in the local legislature. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) The hon. member for Hochelaga has declared that he was willing to accord to the Protestants the guarantees of protection which they sought for the education of their children; but in this he has been forestalled by the Quebec Conference and by the unanimous sentiment of the Catholic population of Lower Canada. If the present law be insufficient, let it be changed. Justice demands that the Protestant minority of Lower Canada shall be protected in the same manner as the Catholic minority of Upper Canada, and that the rights acquired by the one and the other shall not be assailed either by the Federal Parliament or the local legislatures. (Hear, hear.) This is all I feel called upon to say, on this occasion, respecting a question which will again arise in the course of the debate. The hon. member for Lotbinière has attacked the scheme as being too federal, and the hon. member for Hochelaga has condemned it as not being sufficiently federal, and as tending too much towards unity. Neither one nor the other is strictly accurate—it is not absolute unity, nor the federal principle in the American sense. In the American Confederation, supreme authority proceeded at the outset from the delegation of the states, which nevertheless divested themselves of it forever—at least according to the opinion of the Northern juriconsults, who hold that no state is free to break the compact of 1788. In the scheme of the Quebec Conference there was no delegation of the supreme authority, either from above or below, inasmuch as the provinces, not being independent states, received, their political organizations from the Parliament of the Empire. There are only distinct attributes for the one and the others. (Hear, hear.) Unity does not obtain in an absolute sense, because local interests and institutions required in the local constitutions, guarantees and protections which they feared they would not find in the united Parliament and Government. But it is as complete as possible, inasmuch as unity gives to institutions chances of duration, and an initiatory force which is not given, which

cannot be given, by confederacies in which authority is scattered, and where it is consequently without value and without real existence. Every constitutional mode of existence has its advantages; but assuredly that state of existence which gives permanence and stability to institutions should be preferred to others. Let us bear in mind that the Constitution of the United States has been but a compromise between state sovereignty and the need of a supreme authority to ensure the working of the state machinery, and that it was not perfect even in the opinion of its authors. In order to prove this statement, I shall call to my assistance words of greater weight than my own—those of JOSEPH STOREY, probably the greatest constitutional authority of the United States:—

Any survey, however slight, of the Confederation will impress the mind with the intrinsic difficulties which attended the formation of its principal features. It is well known that upon three important points touching the common rights and interests of the several states, much diversity of opinion prevailed, and many animated discussions took place. The first was as to the mode of voting in Congress, whether it should be by states or according to wealth or population. The second, as to the rule by which the expenses of the Union should be apportioned among the states. And the third, as has been already seen, relative to the disposal of the vacant and unappropriated lands in the western territory. But that which strikes us with most force is the increasing jealousy and watchfulness everywhere betrayed in respect to the powers to be confided to the General Government. For this several causes may be assigned. The colonies had been long engaged in struggles against the superintending authority of the Crown, and had practically felt the inconveniences of the restrictive legislation of the parent country. These struggles had naturally led to a general feeling of resistance of all external authority, and these inconveniences to extreme doubts, if not to dread of any legislation, not exclusively originating in their domestic assemblies. They had, as yet, not felt the importance or necessity of union among themselves, having been hitherto connected with the British sovereignty in all their foreign relations. What would be their fate, as separate and independent communities; how far their interests would coincide or vary from each other as such; what would be the effects of the union upon their domestic peace, their territorial interests, their external commerce, their political security, or their civil liberty, were points to them wholly of a speculative character, in regard to which various opinions might be entertained, and various and even opposite conjectures formed, upon grounds apparently of equal plausibility.

Notwithstanding the declaration of the articles, that the union of the states was to be perpetual, an examination of the powers confided to the General Government would easily satisfy us that they looked principally to the existing revolutionary state of things. The principal powers respected the operations of war, and would be dormant in times of peace. In short, Congress in peace was possessed of but a delusive and shadowy sovereignty, with little more than the empty pageantry of office. They were indeed clothed with the authority of sending and receiving ambassadors; of entering into treaties and alliances; of appointing courts for the trial of piracies and felonies on the high seas; of regulating the public coin; of fixing the standard of weights and measures; of regulating trade with Indians, of establishing post offices; of borrowing money and emitting bills on the credit of the United States; of ascertaining and appropriating the sums necessary for defraying the public expenses, and of disposing of the western territory. And most of these powers required for their exercise the assent of nine states. But they possessed not the power to raise any revenue, to levy any tax, to enforce any law, to secure any right, to regulate any trade, or even the poor prerogative of commanding means to pay its own ministers at a foreign court. They could contract debts, but they were without means to discharge them. They could pledge the public faith, but they were incapable of redeeming it. They could enter into treaties, but every state in the union might disobey them with impunity. They could contract alliances, but could not command men or money to give them vigor. They could institute courts for piracies and felonies on the high seas, but they had no means to pay either the judges or the jurors. In short, all powers which did not execute themselves were at the mercy of the states, and might be trampled upon at will with impunity.

One of our leading writers addressed the following strong language to the public:—

By this political compact the United States in Congress have exclusive power for the following purposes, without being able to execute one of them: they may make and conclude treaties, but can only recommend the observance of them. They may appoint ambassadors, but cannot defray even the expenses of their tables. They may borrow money in their own name on the faith of the union, but cannot pay a dollar. They may coin money, but they cannot purchase an ounce of bullion. They may make war, and determine what number of troops are necessary, but cannot raise a single soldier. In short, they may declare everything, but do nothing.

Strong as this language may seem, it has no coloring beyond what the naked truth would justify. WASHINGTON himself, that patriot without stain or reproach, speaks, in 1785,

with unusual significancy on the same subject. "In a word," says he, "the Confederation appears to me to be little more than a shadow without the substance, and Congress a nugatory body, their ordinances being little attended to." The same sentiments may be found in many public documents. One of the most humiliating proofs of the utter inability of Congress to enforce even the exclusive powers vested in it, is to be found in the argumentative circular addressed by it to the several states, in April, 1787, entreating them in the most supplicating manner to repeal such of their laws as interfered with the treaties with foreign nations. "If in theory," says the biographer of WASHINGTON, "the treaties formed by Congress were obligatory, yet it had been demonstrated that in practice that body was absolutely unable to carry them into execution."—

In this state of things, the embarrassments of the country in its financial concerns, the general pecuniary distress among the people from the exhausting operations of the war, the total prostration of commerce and the languishing unthriftiness of agriculture, gave new impulses to the already marked political divisions in the Legislative Councils. Efforts were made on our side to relieve the pressure of the public calamities by a resort to the issue of paper money, to tender laws, and instalment and other laws, having for their object the postponement of the payment of private debt, and a diminution of the public taxes. On the other side, public as well as private creditors became alarmed from the increased dangers to property, and the increased facility of perpetrating frauds, to the destruction of all private faith, and credit. And they insisted strenuously upon the establishment of a government and system of laws which should preserve the public faith and redeem the country from that ruin which always follows upon the violation of the principles of justice and the moral obligation of contracts. "At length," we are told, "two great parties were formed in every state, which were distinctly marked and which pursued distinct objects with systematic arrangement." The wonder indeed is, not under such circumstances, that the constitution should have encountered the most ardent opposition, but that it should ever have been adopted at all by the majority of the states. In the convention itself which framed it, there was a great diversity of judgment, and upon some vital subjects an intense and irreconcilable hostility of opinion. It is understood that, at several periods the convention were upon the point of breaking up without accomplishing anything. On the other hand, if the votaries of the national government are fewer in number, they are likely to enlist in its favor men of ardent ambition, comprehensive views and powerful genius. A love of the union, a sense of its importance—nay, of its necessity to secure permanence and safety

to our political liberty; a consciousness that the powers of the national constitution are eminently calculated to preserve peace at home and dignity abroad, and to give value to property, and system and harmony to the great interests of agriculture, commerce and manufactures; a consciousness, too, that the restraints which it imposes upon the states are the only efficient means to preserve public and private justice, and to ensure tranquillity amidst the conflicting interests and rivalries of the states—these will doubtless combine many sober and reflecting minds in its support. If to this number we are to add those whom the larger rewards of fame or emolument or influence connected with a wider sphere of action may allure to the national councils, there is much reason to presume that the union will not be without resolute friends.

The events now occurring in the United States sufficiently prove, I think, that the fears of the illustrious founders of the Union were not without some foundation. The scheme of Constitution which is submitted to us is also a compromise, but a compromise in the best conditions of existence, and in those least dangerous to the stability and the strength of the nation to which it is to give being. Unity moves more at ease, and the checks placed therein for the benefit of the sections are placed in such a manner as not to obstruct the general action. It is not so much against the Federal principle that the greater number of the arguments of the hon. member for Hochelaga are directed. For him it is a party question which he puts to himself in this manner:—"How shall we find ourselves, my friends and myself, in this Confederation? Shall we be strong or weak? May we hope to regain power, or shall we be lost like so many drops of water in the ocean?" In order to convince the House that I have correctly appreciated the motive of the hon. gentleman's (Hon. Mr. DORION's) opposition, I shall quote from his speech of the 16th inst.:—

Hon. Mr. DORION—But, sir, I may be asked admitting all that—admitting that the scheme now submitted to us is not that which has been promised us, what difference will the immediate admission of the Provinces into the Confederation make? I will try to explain it. When the ministers consented to the votes in the Conference being taken by provinces, they gave a great advantage to the Maritime Provinces. This mode of procedure had for its result the most conservative measure that was ever submitted to the House. The members of the Upper House are no longer to be elected, but nominated—and by whom? By a Tory or Conservative Government for Canada, by a Conservative Government in Nova Scotia, by a Conservative Government in Prince Edward Island, and by a Conservative

Government in Newfoundland, the only Liberal Government concerned in the nomination of the Upper House being that of New Brunswick, where there is a Liberal Administration, whose fate depends on the result of the elections now taking place in that province. A similar scheme would never have been adopted by the Liberal members from Upper Canada, the people of which section, to the number of 1,400,000, with those in the Lower Province, making in all 2,500,000, have been controlled by the 900,000 people of the Maritime Provinces. Have we not been told in set terms that it was the Lower Provinces which did not want an elective Legislative Council? If, instead of inviting to a Conference the delegates of the Lower Provinces, our Government had done what it engaged to do, namely—had itself prepared a Constitution, it would never have dared to draw up a proposal like this now laid before us; it would never have proposed a Legislative Council nominated for life, with a limited membership, and which has to be named by four Tory Governments. Reckoning 15 to 20 years, as the average of the time each Legislative Councillor will hold his seat, a century would elapse before its composition could be entirely changed! We will have, thus, a Legislative Council lasting for ever—at least as regards this, and the next generation—controlled by the influence which to-day preponderates in our Government and in those of the Maritime Provinces; and are we going to believe, as the present document promises us, that a government like that which we possess now, will employ itself in getting the Opposition represented in the Legislative Council? (Hear, hear, and laughter.) I thank the delegates for their solicitude as regards the Opposition, but I rely but little on their promises. Did we not hear the Honorable Attorney General West say the other day, turning towards his supporters: "If I had the recommending of the nominations, I would advise the choice of the most qualified—but of course, of my own party. (Hear, hear.) It would be done in this way, sir; and, if this precious scheme is put into operation, we shall have a Legislative Council, divided in the following manner: for Upper Canada, we shall probably have Liberals in the proportion of 3 to 9, for I suppose that the honorable member for South Oxford (Honorable Mr. BROWN) has made enough sacrifices to deserve at least this concession, and as his friends constitute a fourth of the Executive Council, I suppose we shall have also one-fourth of the Executive Councillors for Upper Canada, Liberals.

Hon. Attorney General MACDONALD—Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. HOLT—Exactly 25 per cent.

Hon. Mr. DORION—Yes; precisely 25 per cent. Besides, we shall have for Nova Scotia ten Conservatives, from Prince Edward Island four more, and four from Newfoundland. Thus we are to have eighteen Conservatives from the Lower Provinces, who, added to the thirty-six from Canada, will make fifty-four Conservatives, against twenty-two Liberals, supposing that the ten

Legislative Councillors from New Brunswick will all be Liberals. Now, supposing that the average of deaths amounted to three per cent. in a year, it would need a term of thirty years to bring about a change in the character of the majority of the Council, taking it for granted that the additions which might be made to it would be taken from the ranks of the Liberal party. Yet that would be scarcely possible. In some of the Lower Provinces there would be from time to time Conservative Governments, and there might be also a Conservative Government in Canada. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) And the present generation will have passed away before the opinions of the Liberal party will have any influence in the divisions of the Legislative Council.

Mr. MACKENZIE—That makes no difference.

Hon. Mr. DORION—The hon. member for Lambton says that makes no difference! The honorable member is ready to accept everything, but for those who are not so well disposed, the difference would be that we would be bound by this constitution which will permit the Legislative Council to throw obstacles in the way of all measures of reform wished for by the Liberal party. If the hon. member for Lambton thinks that that makes no difference, I will take the liberty of differing from him, and I think that the Liberal party generally will differ from him also. The Government told us that they were obliged to consent to the introduction of certain measures in the project of Confederation which did not altogether please them, so as to come to an understanding with the Lower Province delegates, and that they bound themselves to cause the scheme to be adopted by this House without amendment. Does the hon. gentleman not see a difference now? If the two Canadas were the only interested parties, the majority would act as they pleased, would examine minutely the Constitution, and erase all measures which did not suit them, and a proposition such as that relative to the Legislative Council would have no chance of being adopted—it is too short a time ago since this House voted, by a crushing majority, the substitution of an elective Council for a Council nominated by the Crown. In fact, the Council named by the Crown had so fallen in public estimation—I do not say so on account of the men who composed it, but still such was the fact, that it exercised no influence; it was even difficult to assemble a quorum of members—a change had become absolutely necessary, and up to the present time the elective system has worked well—the elected members are equal in every respect to those nominated by the Crown. Well, it is just as public attention commences to be bestowed upon the proceedings of the Upper House, that we are to change its constitution to give it the place of the same one we so short a time ago condemned. I said same Constitution—I mistake, Mr. SPEAKER, we want to substitute for the present Constitution one much worse than the old one, and one for which it is impossible to find a precedent.

Here, then, is the solution of the enigma; here, then, is the reason why Federal union is worthless—without us there is no country—it is no longer the doctrine: "*Let the country perish rather than a principle be abandoned,*" but "*let the country perish rather than a political party should succumb.*" It is less absurd, but at the same time less noble, and if it be not cynical in words, it is so undoubtedly in conception. (Hear, hear.) What! must we resist in future all progress, all strength and national greatness, solely because a party, which exhausted itself almost at its birth, thinks it cannot discern in the new order of things the stepping stones to power? But is it our fault that the doctrines and the acts of that party are not in accordance with the feelings of the country, and that the country persists in discountenancing them? The hon. member for Hochelaga would hope more for his party in a Confederation of the two Canadas only; he has said to himself, no doubt, "In this last order of things the increase of the Upper Canadian representation would augment the Radical majority of Upper Canada, and that majority, added to the small minority I command, would have placed me in a position to rule Lower Canada as I have already done, against its will, and in spite of my former declarations." Either he must think us very blind, or else he must expect that placing the question in a party point of view, he would rally around him only those who, leaving aside all national sentiments, follow him nevertheless. (Hear, hear.) But the extract which I have just now read brings us naturally to the question of an elective Legislative Council, to which system the honorable member for Hochelaga grants a great degree of superiority over the nominative one. Just now he told us that the Council nominated by the Crown had fallen into imbecility, and had lost public respect. (Hear, hear.) Now, to prove how logical he is, he tells us:

It is true that the House of Lords, Conservative though it be, finds itself removed from all popular influence; but its numbers may be increased upon the recommendation of the responsible advisers of the Crown, if such a measure were to become necessary to obtain the concurrence of both Houses, or to prevent a collision between them. The position which its members occupy in it establishes a sort of compromise between the Crown and the popular element. But this new House, after Confederation, will be a perfectly independent body; its members will be nominated for life, and their number cannot be increased. How long will this system work

without bringing about a collision between the two branches of the Legislature? Let us suppose the Lower House composed in a great part of Liberals, for how long a time would it submit to an Upper House named by Government?

Be kind enough to observe, Mr. SPEAKER, that under the old system, the Legislative Council possessed the same elements of existence as the House of Lords, and that the Crown could increase its numbers at need; it augmented it in 1849, as it threatened to augment the House of Lords in 1832. Observe, again, that it is precisely this control exercised by the Crown over the Upper House that the hon. gentleman found so fatal to legislation previous to 1856. But there is a more rational manner of appreciating the part sustained by the House of Lords in the British Constitution. No one denies to the Sovereign the abstract right of increasing at will the House of Lords; but such right has never been exercised but for the purpose of rewarding men distinguished for great national services; and when, in 1832, WILLIAM IV. granted Earl GREY the tremendous power to swamp the representative body of the great landed nobility, it was because the country was moving with rapid strides towards revolution, and because there remained to the Sovereign but two alternatives, either to lessen the moral weight of the House of Lords, or to see his own throne knocked to pieces from under his feet. (Hear, hear.) To convince the House that I do not exaggerate, I will read an extract from LINGARD'S *History of England* :—

It is known that justice and common sense were wounded by the electoral system of England, when such a rock, such a building, such a hamlet belonging to noble families sent representatives to Parliament, where cities of 100,000 inhabitants were not represented, where corporations of twenty or thirty individuals had a right to elect members for large cities, and so forth. All this was the consequence of a social order, founded on privilege, and in which property was the mistress of all power. To reform the electoral system was then to make an attempt not only on the Constitution, but society. And the Tories offered a desperate resistance. Such was their attitude, that the Ministry proclaimed Parliament dissolved on the 11th May, 1831, a course which was joyfully welcomed by the people. New elections were had, and resulted in a ministerial majority. The Reform Bill was adopted by the Commons, but the House of Lords threw it out by a majority of forty-one votes. The intelligence of this result was received throughout the three kingdoms with the most lively agitation.

Petitions were sent in from all parts, praying for the upholding of the Ministry, and for a new creation of peers; reform associations were formed, and serious disturbances took place at London, Bristol, Nottingham, &c. Parliament was prorogued, and at its re-assembling the Reform Bill was again presented with some alterations. The Commons accepted it; it passed a first and a second reading in the House of Lords, but the third reading was adjourned, and WELLINGTON and seventy-four peers protested. Agitation became almost universal; societies met, petitions took a threatening character; everything was tending towards armed insurrection. England never before presented such a spectacle. Meantime the Ministry had demanded of the king a new creation of peers to change the majority of the Upper Chamber. It was refused,—they immediately resigned on the 9th May, 1832. The Duke of WELLINGTON and his friends were then called in to form a Ministry; he tried it several days in vain. The nation was astir; whole armies were being created; riots broke out everywhere; the lives of the principal Tories were threatened, and the House of Commons seemed disposed to support a measure which would have overturned both the Government and the aristocracy. The King called back the GREY Ministry, and the Bill was presented to the House of Lords for a third reading, on which the Tories, knowing that the Cabinet had decided to create an unlimited number of peers, so as to obtain a majority, abstained from attending the discussion, and the Bill passed by 106 votes against 22. The Parliament was immediately dissolved, and new elections took place according to the new electoral law, and on the 5th of February, 1833, the first Reformed Parliament was opened.

It must then have been a real revolution, this nomination of one hundred new peers, a revolution as real as that which menaced the Throne; and do we not feel persuaded that if one day our Federal Legislative Council were to place itself obstinately and systematically in opposition to popular will, matured and strengthened by ordeals, it would not be swept away by a revolutionary torrent such as threatened to sweep away the House of Lords in 1832? This Council, limited as to numbers, because the provinces insist on maintaining in it an equilibrium without which they would never have consented to a union, this Council, sprung from the people—having the same wants, hopes and even passions, would resist less the popular will in America, where it is so prompt and active, than could the House of Lords in England, where the masses are inert because they have not political rights; reason tells us thus because they would be a less powerful body socially or politically. The honorable member for Hochelaga has

spoken to us of the elected senate of Belgium, which he says works admirably. But let us examine the manner of its construction and the reasons of its organization. We find in a note under the 53rd article of the Belgian Constitution, section 2 of the Senate in HAVARD'S *Public and Administrative Law*, vol. I:—

89. *Elected by the People.*—Three principal opinions divided the Congress on the question of the senate. One wanted no kind of senate. Another wished the senate named with or without conditions, by the head of the state; and another wished for the senate but elected by the people. These two last opinions carried the existence of the Chamber to be admitted, but it was difficult to fix the majority on the mode of nominating the senators. Among the members who desire a senate, the greater number sustained nomination by the king, as being more in harmony with the nature of the institution; but those who wished only one Chamber directly elected being in despair, and in order to popularize an institution which they accused of not being sufficiently so, joined with those favoring senators elect, named without the intervention of the royal power, so that this opinion prevailed. The senate and its mode of existence was not, therefore, the result, either of the same opinion or of the same majority. The central section proposed, with a majority of sixteen against four, nomination by the king without presentation and in unlimited number. The question was discussed at the sitting of the 15th, 16th and 17th December. Nomination by the king was rejected by 96 against 77. Two leading opinions still divided the partisans of election. One would confide it to the ordinary electoral colleges, and others to the Provincial Council or States. "We desire," said M. BLARONIES in proposing the last mode of election "a neutral power which can resist the dangers which might result from the preponderance of the head of the state or from an elective Chamber. It is, therefore, necessary that this power should emanate neither from the same elements as the elective Chamber, nor from the chief of the state." To confide election to a particular class, was said on the other side, is to create privileged electors with a double vote, and to introduce into our country all the inconveniences of the division of electors which has just been abolished in France. Provincial Councils should, moreover, be administrative bodies. The system of article 53 was adopted by 136 votes against 40. The opinion which was in favor of only one Chamber, and consequently only one mode of election, determined the majority.

Thus we find that the constitution of this senate is a compromise similar to that of the Federal Government of the United States. But let us go on a little further:—

In order to be elected and to continue to be a senator, one qualification, among others, is to

pay, in Belgium, at least one thousand florins of direct imposts, patents included.

Is not this last provision of the Belgian Constitution a hundred times more conservative than all the provisions of this scheme, which the honorable member condemns? What! no one can be a senator in Belgium without paying \$500 direct taxes, over and above indirect taxes, municipal and local impositions of all sorts. And the honorable member for Hochelaga calls that a popular House! Who but men powerful and rich in titles and fortune can enter it? (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. DORION—What is the qualification of the electors of the Belgian House of Representatives? Is it not much higher than elsewhere?

HON. MR. CAUCHON—It is the same for both Houses. And this is an argument against the honorable member; for if, in a country like Belgium, in which every fourth person you meet is a beggar, it has been found requisite to make the elective franchise and the electoral qualification of the senators so high, it is a proof that he has made a bad selection of examples; it is a proof that the tendencies of Belgium are conservative. Why, then, should we adopt another course in Canada, where there is not one beggar in a thousand inhabitants?

HON. MR. EVANTUREL—Will the honorable member for Montmorenci allow me to interrupt him in his argument in relation to the qualifications and appointment of the legislative councillors. Like him, I am quite of opinion that the conservative element ought, of necessity, to be the basis of the Legislative Council, to counterbalance the popular element. This principle governed the constitution of the House of Lords in England, that of the Legislative Council in Belgium, and that of every well-organized representative government. It is that element of conservatism which I desire to see introduced into the Constitution of the Confederation now before us; but the honorable member for Montmorency will allow me to remark that the whole of his argument applies only to the antagonism which might arise between the two branches of the legislature, in a monarchical government like that of Belgium, which is not based on a Federative system like that now submitted to us by the Government. But we have not only to avoid the differences which might arise between the conservative and the popular elements;

we have also to protect the rights of the several provinces which are to form part of the proposed Confederation. That is the all important question we have to consider. We have accorded the principle of representation based upon population in the House of Commons of the Federal Government, and that is without doubt a great sacrifice; but we ought only to make so important a concession on the condition that we shall have equality of representation in the Legislative Council, and the right reserved to ourselves to appoint our twenty-four legislative councillors, in order that they may be responsible to the public opinion of the province and independent of the Federal Government.—Without this essential guarantee I affirm that the rights of Lower Canada are in danger. For my part I am ready, on behalf of Lower Canada, to give up her right to elect directly her twenty-four legislative councillors, although the retention of the elective principle might perhaps be the surest means of preserving our institutions; but I am anxious that the new Constitution now proposed should give us adequate guarantees that the legislative councillors to be appointed for life should, at all events, be selected by the Local Government of Lower Canada, which would be responsible to the people. These not ill-grounded sources of anxiety I should like to see removed. I would bespeak the earnest attention of the honorable member for Montmorency to this point, which is of the very highest importance to us Lower Canadians; and I hope that he will pardon me for having interrupted him, and that he will be in a position to give me such an answer as will dissipate the anxiety which I am aware has been evinced on this subject.

HON. MR. CAUCHON—The honorable gentleman has not understood me; my object has not been to attack the representative system of Belgium as being too conservative; on the contrary I use it as an argument in my favor, because the qualification there is so high, that hardly one in six thousand can be found who can aspire to the post of senator. Parties having been unable to come to any understanding at the time of the revolution of 1830, and neither the hereditary peerage or the life peerage having been able to prevail, the most conservative principle next to these was adopted, viz., that of a large property qualification. All those who have drawn up constitutions, either theoretical or for practical purposes, have never omitted to provide counterpoises to prevent, on the one hand, too

precipitate and hasty legislation, and on the other hand the encroachment of the power of the executive. In our Constitution it is the duty of the Legislative Council to exercise the conservative influence, and to modify the legislation too energetic and too full of outside effervescence, which is sent for their consideration from the House of Commons. But when public opinion gains vigor from the obstacles which it encounters, and the reforms demanded are rational and come before them in due course, there is no danger that the legislation which embodies them will be obstructed in its progress; for the people will rise in their majesty and in their sense of justice, as did the people of England in 1832, and the obstacles they might meet with on their way would be swept away as by a torrent. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. DORION—That is exactly where the danger lies.

HON. MR. CAUCHON—That is the danger which assailed the House of Lords in 1832, but no one would venture to confront to the last extremity a danger such as this. But the honorable member for Quebec tells us, if I understand him rightly, that we have not sufficient guarantees for Lower Canada in the appointment of the legislative councillors. The selection of legislative councillors has no bearing whatever on the question we are now considering, viz., whether the appointment by the Crown is or is not preferable to the elective principle. But in answer to him I will say, that the scheme before us seems to be quite clear. According to this plan the candidates for the Legislative Council will be recommended by the local governments and appointed by the General Government, and it is by this very division of powers that the selections are sure to be good, and made in conformity with the desire and sentiments of the provinces.

HON. MR. DORION—Only the first nominations are to be made in this manner, not those which may be made afterwards.

HON. MR. CAUCHON—The first nominations will be made by the present Governments, and the federal councillors will be taken from the present legislative councillors to the number prescribed, 24, provided so many can be found who will accept the post, and who possess the requisite property qualification. The Conference has engaged, by the terms of the scheme, to respect the rights of the Opposition, and any government who should fail to carry out so solemn an engagement would well deserve to lose the pub-

lic confidence. (Hear, hear.) I repeat that the mode of appointing the councillors in no wise affects the conservative principle of nomination on which the constitution of the Legislative Council ought to be based.

HON. MR. DORION—In the course of my observations the other night, I did not examine the question from the point of view from which the honorable member from Quebec is now looking at it. That honorable member, if I have understood him rightly, affirms that in the proposed constitution of the Federal Legislative Council there is no conservative principle to guarantee that the provinces will be represented in that Council, and he does so with justice. If the honorable member for Montmorenci will examine it attentively, he will see that the first nominations are to be made by the existing governments. Thus the Government of Canada, that of New Brunswick and that of Nova Scotia will appoint legislative councillors, but afterwards the Federal Government will make the appointments. The honorable member for Quebec can, with reason, draw the conclusion that there is no guarantee that the views of the provinces will be respected. I for my part have investigated the matter, more in connection with the power that will be vested in the legislative councillors. I asserted that by appointing them for life and limiting their number, an absolute authority would be created, which would be quite beyond the control of the people and even of the Executive; that the power of this body will be so great, that they will always be in a position to prevent every reform if they thought proper, and that a collision between the two branches would be inevitable and irremediable. The danger arising from the creating of such a power is exactly that of being obliged to destroy it if they resist too obstinately the popular demands. In England there is no necessity for breaking down the obstructions sometimes presented by the House of Lords, because the Crown having it in its power to appoint new peers, can overcome the difficulty. Here there will be no means of doing it, when the number of councillors is fixed. Accordingly, I have looked at the question through the medium of the powers assigned to the councillors, whereas the honorable member for the county of Quebec fears lest the Government should make choice of men who would not represent public opinion in the provinces; that they might appoint members all of French origin or all of English origin to represent Lower Canada, or take them all from among

a class of men who would not represent the province for which they are appointed, and who could give no pledge that they would maintain its institutions.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—It is evident that the honorable member for Hochelaga has not read the resolutions; but I have read them. Lower Canada is in a peculiar position. We have two races of people whose interests are distinct from each other in respect to origin, language and religion. In preparing the business of the Confederation at Quebec, we had to conciliate these two interests, and to give the country a Constitution which might reconcile the conservative with the democratic element; for the weak point in democratic institutions is the leaving of all power in the hands of the popular element. The history of the past proves that this is an evil. In order that institutions may be stable and work harmoniously, there must be a power of resistance to oppose to the democratic element. In the United States the power of resistance does not reside in the Senate, nor even in the President. The honorable member for Hochelaga says that the objection of the honorable member for the county of Quebec is well founded, because the Federal Government may appoint all English or all French-Canadians as legislative councillors for Lower Canada. If the honorable member had read the resolutions, he would have found that the appointments of legislative councillors are to be made so as to accord with the electoral divisions now existing in the province. Well, I ask whether it is probable that the Executive of the Federal Government, which will have a chief or leader as it is now—I ask whether it is very probable that he will recommend the appointment of a French-Canadian to represent divisions like Bedford or Wellington for instance?

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—You will be in a minority in the Federal Government.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—Am I not in a minority at present in appointing judges? And yet when I propose the appointment of a judge for Lower Canada, is he not appointed? Did the honorable member for Cornwall (Hon. J. S. MACDONALD), when he was in the Government, ever attempt to interfere with the appointments recommended by the honorable member for Hochelaga? And now, when a chief justice or a puisné judge is to be appointed for Lower Canada, I find myself surrounded by colleagues, a majority of whom are English and Protestants; but do they presume to interfere with my recommendations? No, no more than we Lower Canadians inter-

fere with the recommendations of my honorable friend the Attorney General for Upper Canada in making appointments to office in Upper Canada. There will be in the Federal Government a leader for Lower Canada, and do you think that the other Ministers will presume to interfere and intermeddle with his recommendations? But I am told that I am in a minority. So I am now, so I have been for eight years—

MR. GEOFFRION—You have equality between the two provinces.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—Yes, we have equality, but not as a race, nor in respect of religion. When the leader for Lower Canada shall have sixty-five members belonging to his section to support him, and command a majority of the French-Canadians and of the British from Lower Canada, will he not be able to upset the Government if his colleagues interfere with his recommendations to office? That is our security. At present, if I found unreasonable opposition to my views, my remedy would be to break up the Government by retiring, and the same thing will happen in the Federal Government.

HON. MR. DORION—The honorable member will be allowed to retire from the Government; as there will then be a sufficient number of English members to be able to do without him, he will be allowed to retire, and nobody will care.

HON. MR. CAUCHON—The honorable member for Hochelaga put a question to me relative to the constitution of the Legislative Council, and said that he had not looked at the question, while speaking the other evening, in the same light as the honorable member for the county of Quebec. He spoke of the conservatives as a party, and his fear was, not that the Upper House would not be conservative enough, but that it would be too much so.

HON. MR. DORION—I looked at it both ways, both as it involved the interests of parties, and in regard to the power which that House would exercise from the nature of its constitution.

HON. MR. CAUCHON—I did not see the two ways of looking at it. I saw but one. It is the same idea in a different form. He said that even if the Lower House were altogether liberal, the Upper House would remain composed of conservatives; this was his fear. He has been a long while trying to gain predominance for his democratic notions, but it is evident he will not succeed. I recur to the real medium through which the honorable member looks at the question, namely, his fears

that his party will sink out of sight. In the present day, parties disappear and become fused with others, while others arise from passing events. In New Brunswick, conservatives join the liberal government to carry Confederation, and we see no parties there but the partisans and the opponents of the union, as in 1788, in the United States, there were no parties but the adherents of royalty and those of Federal Government. We see the same thing in Nova Scotia. This is true patriotism and the real dignity of public men. It is unfortunate for us that we do not follow their example here.

MR. GEOFFRION—Hear!

HON. MR. CAUCHON—The honorable member from Verchères says "Hear!" Is it not a fact that the Opposition vote as a party on the present question? If it is not so, will he name a single member of the Opposition who does not vote against Confederation?

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—Hear! hear!

HON. MR. CAUCHON—The honorable member for Cornwall says "Hear! hear!" He may well say so—he who never had a party. He came into power, nobody expected he would. He will never get it again, everybody expects that. (Continued laughter.) I am bound to shew him respect because he is my senior in this House, my senior by three years. It is true he has not always represented the same county, his brother having fraternally driven him out of Glengarry, and obliged him to take refuge in the rotten borough of Cornwall. (Laughter.) But although we have almost always been unlucky enough to do duty in different camps, we have not on that account ceased to be good friends. (Laughter.) I will not look at this question in a party light, because parties expire, and we do not know whether in thirty years the present parties will exist. We ought to look at the question apart from party considerations, and on its own merits: that is to say, we ought to place in the Constitution a counterpoise to prevent any party legislation, and to moderate the precipitancy of any government which might be disposed to move too fast and go too far,—I mean a legislative body able to protect the people against itself and against the encroachments of power. (Hear, hear.) In England, the Crown has never attempted to degrade the House of Peers by submerging it, because it knows well that the nobility are a bulwark against the aggressions of the democratic element. The House of Lords, by their power, their territorial posses-

sions, and their enormous wealth, are a great defence against democratic invasion, greater than anything we can oppose to it in America. In Canada, as in the rest of North America, we have not the *castes*—classes of society—which are found in Europe, and the Federal Legislative Council, although immutable in respect of number, inasmuch as all the members belonging to it will come from the ranks of the people, without leaving them, as do the members of the House of Commons, will not be selected from a privileged class which have no existence. Here all men are alike, and are all equal; if a difference is to be found, it arises exclusively from the industry, the intelligence, and the superior education of those who have labored the most strenuously, or whom Providence has gifted with the highest faculties. (Hear, hear.) Long ago the privileges of *caste* disappeared in this country. Most of our ancient nobility left the country at the conquest, and the greater number of those who remained have sunk out of sight by inaction. Accordingly, whom do we see in the highest offices of state? The sons of the poor who have felt the necessity of study, and who have risen by the aid of their intellect and hard work. (Hear, hear.) Everything is democratic with us, because everyone can attain to everything by the efforts of a noble ambition. The legislative councillors appointed by the Crown will not be, therefore, socially speaking, persons superior to the members of the House of Commons; they will owe their elevation only to their own merit. They will live as being of the people and among the people as we do. How can it happen, then, that having no advantage over us greater than that of not being elected, they will not be subject in a legitimate degree to the influence of public opinion? There are some men who have enough patriotism to approve of everything done elsewhere, but to find fault with everything done at home—it is a pitiful crotchet in the human mind. If there had been as much danger for the liberal party in this union as you say there was, would Hon. Mr. TILLEY, the leader of the Liberal government of New Brunswick, a man of such foresight and judgment; would the honorable member for South Oxford, your former leader, whose talent and experience you will not deny, have accepted it? (Hear, hear.) But look rather at what is now passing in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia; what they have agreed to designate as the Federal electoral ticket is composed of six candidates for the town and

county of St. Johns, N.B.; and in Nova Scotia, Hon. Mr. TUPPER, the leader of a Conservative government, and Messrs. ARCHIBALD and McCULLEY, two of the chiefs of the Liberal party, are working hand in hand for Confederation. (Hear, hear.) One must be short-sighted not to see that this new order of things will produce new combinations similar to those produced by the American Constitution of 1788, when the citizens and public men divided into two camps, the camp of the supporters of national union and that of the friends of the state sovereignty. (Hear, hear.) Let us not then be anxious about the future of parties. What does it matter to this country what position the honorable member for Hochelaga or myself may occupy in this new Constitution? (Laughter.) What matters it to the country if we be above or below, the first or the last, the victors or the vanquished, so long as it is happy under the new rule, and finds happiness, greatness, power and prosperity in the free development of its resources and institutions? (Hear, hear.) The opponents of Confederation do not desire the union of the provinces for the purpose of military defence; two and two will always make four, say they, and in uniting the populations of the different provinces, you will not give us more strength to resist the common enemy, unless, as facetiously remarked the honorable member for Lotbinière, we make a treaty with the enemy, which would bind him to attack us at but one place at a time, so as to allow us to oppose all our forces to the invasion. Yes, two and two will always make four. You are right. War between England and the United States would expose us in our colonial position to the attacks of the enemy at all vulnerable points of the respective provinces. But, firstly, the union carries with it the construction of the Inter-colonial Railway, and that railway which does not particularly please the two annexationist leaders of the Opposition, would allow England and the provinces to transport troops rapidly from the furthest limits of the country to the threatened points of the national territory. Without the aid of railways how could NAPOLEON III. have been able, in a fortnight, to throw two hundred thousand men on the plains of Italy, to defeat the Austrians at Magenta and Solferino, and to gain one of the bloodiest and most glorious victories of modern times? But in the advanced condition of our civilization, our commerce and our manufactures—with so many elements of greatness, with so many prodigious

sources of prosperity and wealth—with a population of nearly four millions already—should we have so little ambition as not to aspire to take our place one day in the rank of nations? (Hear, hear.) Shall we forever remain colonists? Does the history of the world afford examples of eternal subjection? (Hear, hear.) It is not, for my part, because I do not feel myself proud and happy under the glorious flag which protects and shelters in safety one hundred and fifty millions of souls. It is not because I do not feel myself free as the bird of air in the midst of space, under the mighty ægis of the British Empire—a thousand times more free than I should be, with the name of citizen, in the grasp of the American Eagle. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) But we must not conceal from ourselves the fact that we are attracted by two centres of attraction—the opposing ideas which are developed and which make war upon each other, even within these walls, sufficiently attest the fact. Everything tells us that the day of national emancipation or of annexation to the United States is approaching, and while the statesmen of all parties in the Empire warn us affectionately to prepare for the first, a few of our own public men drive us incessantly towards the second, by propagating republican ideas, and by endeavoring by all possible means to assimilate our institutions to those of the neighboring republic. (Hear, hear.) If we remain isolated, what will happen at the moment of separation from the Mother Country; for that moment will come, whether we wish it or wish it not? Each province would form an independent state, and as to attack the one would no longer mean to attack all, inasmuch as we should have ceased to be the subjects of the same empire, the United States, if they covet them, would devour them one by one in their isolated position, following therein the able tactics of the Romans in Asia, Europe and Africa, of the English in India, and of NAPOLEON, the greatest warrior of modern times, in Europe. I understand that the annexationists insist on the *status quo* and on isolation; but others would be blind did they listen to them, inasmuch as reason commands them to organize, so as to be ready when danger comes. If we are four millions to-day, we shall probably be eight millions and over then, with proportionate means of defence, and the alliances which we would find in the necessity on the part of the European powers to keep within bounds the too extensive development of that nation which

is now struggling in the horrors of civil war. (Hear, hear.) Honorable gentlemen do not desire Confederation, because there must be an outlay for its defence. But are those, who argue thus, logical? If two and two did not make more than four a moment ago, why would they make five now? If each province, standing in an isolated position, would be obliged to expend money to organize the defence of its territory, why would the combination of all these various outlays in Confederation amount to more than the total of these same expenses otherwise added up? Would this be the case because a single organization ought to be, necessarily, less expensive than six distinct commands? The honorable member for Hochelaga has exaggerated the expenses of the Confederation, as he has everything else; as he exaggerated and perverted, the other day, the words of the Hon. President of the Council.

MR. GEOFFRION—And besides this, the Maritime Provinces have to be paid to come into the Confederation.

HON. MR. CAUCHON—That question will naturally come up in its turn. But it is not the less true that all the provinces come into the Confederation on an equal footing, as their debt is placed in equilibrium; and as, for the purposes of the union, the arrangement is strictly based on the total population of each of them. On a previous occasion, as I have elsewhere quoted, the honorable member for Hochelaga stated that the Maritime Provinces did not choose our alliance, because our debt was too great. Now he does not choose their alliance, because he is afraid we shall have to pay for them. Now that the debt is perfectly equal, in proportion to the total population, and the Conference has so equalized it in order to found Confederation on justice, the Atlantic Provinces consent to the union.

HON. MR. DORION—What provinces are those?

HON. MR. CAUCHON—I allude to New Brunswick and Newfoundland, and I am convinced that the decision of those two provinces will sufficiently influence Nova Scotia to cause her to resolve to come into the Confederation. The Nova Scotian newspapers, even those of them which are most hostile to the scheme, acknowledge that that province cannot remain isolated; and accordingly she awaits the result of the elections in New Brunswick before taking action. In the meantime the journals in question are making incredible exertions to prevail upon

New Brunswick to refuse the great Confederation, because they wish for another and a smaller one, that of the Maritime Provinces alone. Another motive which will induce Nova Scotia to accept the scheme of the Quebec Conference, if New Brunswick should declare herself in favor of it, is that the terminus of the Intercolonial Railway would be fixed at St. John instead of at Halifax; and what would become of Nova Scotia so isolated? She would not consent to it; her writers and her statesmen positively assert it. For our part, we require an outlet upon the Atlantic seaboard, and that we can only have by means of Confederation. (Hear, hear.) To those who cherish different ideas, I can conceive that this matter is not one of equal importance, for they wish to fix their terminus at another point on the Atlantic seaboard. (Hear, hear.) I feel that I have already spoken at length, and I have yet some important points of the scheme to examine. I will not, then, enter into calculations of figures to prove the extravagance and absurdity of those of the hon. member for Hochelaga, preferring, moreover, to leave them in the more skilful and powerful hands of the Hon. Minister of Finance. I shall content myself with telling the hon. member for Hochelaga—and that will suffice for myself as well as for the House and the country—that I prefer Confederation with its prospects of expense, to annexation to the United States with an actual debt of close upon three thousand millions, and with an annual tax of five hundred millions of dollars. The 34th paragraph of the 29th clause of the scheme reads thus: "The establishment of a General Court of Appeal for the Federated Provinces." What is the object—what will be the character of the tribunal? These two questions will naturally present themselves to those who have given any attention to that part of the scheme which refers to the civil and criminal law, and the working of the judiciary. The whole of the clauses which refer to the latter are as complete as the most ardent supporters of union could desire, tempered by the few exceptions by means of which the provinces have wished to shelter their local institutions from attack. (Cheers.) To convince the House of this, I need but read the following:—

31. The General Parliament may also, from time to time, establish additional courts, and the General Government may appoint judges and officers thereof, when the same shall appear

necessary or for the public advantage, in order to the due execution of the laws of Parliament.

32. All courts, judges and officers of the several provinces shall aid, assist and obey the General Government in the exercise of its rights and powers, and for such purposes shall be held to be courts, judges and officers of the General Government.

33. The General Government shall appoint and pay the judges of the Superior Courts in each province, and of the County Courts in Upper Canada, and Parliament shall fix their salaries.

35. The judges of the courts of Lower Canada shall be selected from the Bar of Lower Canada.

37. The judges of the Superior Courts shall hold their offices during good behaviour, and shall be removable only on the address of both Houses of Parliament.

45. In regard to all subjects over which jurisdiction belongs to both the General and Local Legislatures, the laws of the General Parliament shall control and supersede those made by the local legislature, and the latter shall be void so far as they are repugnant to, or inconsistent with the former.

38. For each of the provinces there shall be an executive officer, styled the lieutenant-governor, who shall be appointed by the Governor General in Council, under the great seal of the Federated Provinces, during pleasure: such pleasure not to be exercised before the expiration of the first five years, except for cause: such cause to be communicated in writing to the Lieutenant-Governor immediately after the exercise of the pleasure as aforesaid, and also by message to both Houses of Parliament, within the first week of the first session afterwards.

39. The lieutenant-governor of each province shall be paid by the General Government.

50. Any bill of the General Parliament may be reserved in the usual manner for Her Majesty's assent, and any bill of the local legislatures may, in like manner, be reserved for the consideration of the Governor General.

51. Any bill passed by the General Parliament shall be subject to disallowance by Her Majesty within two years, as in the case of bills passed by the legislatures of the said provinces hitherto, and, in like manner, any bill passed by a local legislature shall be subject to disallowance by the Governor General within one year after the passing thereof.

The evident object of this organization is to reassure the Protestant minority of Lower Canada against any apprehension for the future; it is also perhaps in the interest of national unity, to prevent local parliaments and governments from infringing the attributes of the Central Parliament. The nomination of judges, the veto, the reservation and even certain directions to be found in the project itself, tend to the same end, and must necessarily attain it. I see nothing

wrong in that, provided that this formidable engine in going out of its course does not crush the rights which we are bound to respect and maintain forever in their integrity. (Hear, hear.) I am not of the same opinion as the hon. member for Brome, who pretends to see in those clauses that the judges would be under two masters at the same time. If they could possibly be controlled at all, it would be by the Federal Government, which alone will appoint them, pay them, and have the power of dismissing them in certain cases. There is no anomaly here, because one thing follows another; all are linked together and harmonize perfectly. If anything could possibly arise, it would be danger. However, so far as we can see, there will be no danger in the administration of justice—the question of veto, and reserve with regard to legislation, being a totally different thing, and suggesting considerations of a different nature. But here is the point to which I wish to draw the attention of this House. Among all the things guaranteed to Lower Canada in the Constitution, and in fact to all the provinces, we find their own civil laws. Lower Canada has been so tenacious of its civil code, that it is laid down in the project before us that the Federal Parliament shall not even be able to suggest legislation by which it may be affected, as it will have the right to do for the other provinces. The reason is obvious—the civil laws of the other provinces are nearly similar; they breathe the same spirit and the same principles; they spring from the same source and the same ideas. But it is not so with regard to those of Lower Canada, with their origin from almost entirely Latin sources; and we hold to them as to a sacred legacy; we love them because they suit our customs, and we find under the protection for our property and our families. (Hear, hear.) The Conference has understood and respected our ideas on this point. However, if a Court of Appeal should one day be placed over the judiciary tribunals of all the provinces, without excepting those of Lower Canada, the result would be that those same laws would be explained by men who would not understand them, and who would, involuntarily perhaps, graft English jurisprudence upon a French code of laws.—(Hear, hear.) Such was the spectacle presented in Canada after the conquest, and no one, I am sure, would wish to see a repetition of the scene. (Hear, hear.) We have, it

is true, Her Majesty's Privy Council as a last resort, but we owe it to necessity; we have not asked for it ourselves. At any rate it is composed of chosen men, all or nearly all of whom are well versed in Roman law—men who, when they have a doubt upon some point, avail themselves of the counsels and advice of the most eminent jurists of France. Nor does the proposed Constitution speak of doing away with this tribunal, which will dominate by its imperial character even over the Court of Appeal which the Federal Government has the power of creating. Here the Convention had national views; it foresaw evidently in the future the day of colonial emancipation. Nevertheless, whatever the intentions of the delegates, their project does not define the attributes of this Federal court; and as there is some apprehension on this point, I would wish to put the following question to the Government:—If this Court of Appeal be established, will it be a purely civil tribunal, or a constitutional one? Or will it be at the same time civil and constitutional? If it be a civil tribunal, will it have jurisdiction over Lower Canada? (Hear, hear.)

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER.—The question put by my hon. friend the member for Montmorency is one which it is not easy for the Government to answer, inasmuch as the power conferred by that article is only that of creating a Court of Appeal at some future day, and the jurisdiction of that court will depend on the causes which lead to its creation. The hon. member has very justly remarked that it may become necessary at a future period to constitute such a tribunal. At present the several provinces which are to form part of the Confederation have the same court of final appeal. As long as we keep up our connection with the Mother Country, we shall always have our court of final appeal in Her Majesty's Privy Council. But when the British Provinces on this continent are united by the bond of Confederation, we shall have one uniform system, common to all, in regard to imports, bills of exchange and promissory notes, as well as universal jurisprudence. Accordingly, when we have lived some years under the Federal régime, the urgent need of such a Court of Appeal with jurisdiction in such matters will be felt, and, if it is created, it will be fit that its jurisdiction should extend to civil causes which might arise in the several Confederate

Provinces, because it will necessarily be composed of the most eminent judges in the different provinces, of the jurists whose reputation stands highest, of men, in short, profoundly skilled in the jurisprudence of each of the provinces which they will respectively represent. Well, if this court is called upon, for instance, to give final judgment on a judgment rendered by a Lower Canada court, there will be among the judges on the bench men perfectly versed in the knowledge of the laws of that section of the Confederation, who will be able to give the benefit of their lights to the other judges sitting with them. I must observe to my hon. friend the member for Montmorency, that he disparages the civil law of Lower Canada in the estimate he makes of it; but he need be under no uneasiness on that head. He should not forget that if, at this day, the laws of Lower Canada are so remarkably well understood in Her Majesty's Privy Council, it is because the code of equity, which is a subject of deep study and familiar knowledge among the members of the council, is based on Roman law, as our own code is. All the eminent judges, whether in England, in the Maritime Provinces or in Upper Canada, are profoundly versed in those principles of equity, which are identical with those of our civil code. Now, as to my own personal opinion, respecting the creation of that tribunal, I think that it is important not to establish it until a certain number of years shall have elapsed from the establishment of Confederation, and to make it consist of judges from the several provinces; for this court would have to give final judgment in causes pronounced upon in the courts of all the sections. Neither can I tell what functions and powers might be assigned to it by the act establishing it. Time alone can tell us that; but I do hold, and the spirit of the conference at Quebec indicated, that the appeal to the judicial committee of Her Majesty's Privy Council must always exist, even if the court in question is established.

HON. MR. EVANTUREL—I acknowledge the frankness which the Hon. Attorney General for Lower Canada has evinced in giving the explanations to the House which we have just heard; and I trust that the honorable minister will permit me to ask him one question. Paragraph 32 gives the Federal Government the power of legislating on criminal law, except that of creating

courts of criminal jurisdiction, but including rules of procedure in criminal cases. If I am not mistaken, that paragraph signifies that the General Government may establish judicial tribunals in the several Confederate Provinces. I should much like to be enlightened on this head by the Hon. Attorney General for Lower Canada.

HON. MR. CARTIER—I am very glad that the honorable member for the County of Quebec has put this question, which I shall answer as frankly as that of the hon. member for Montmorency. My hon. friend will find, if he refers to the paragraph which he has cited, that it gives the General Government simply the power of providing for the execution of the laws of the Federal Government, not of those of the local governments.

HON. MR. CAUCHON—I have listened to the explanations of my hon. friend the Attorney General for Lower Canada, and I find them perfectly satisfactory, as they regard criminal law; for that is the same or nearly the same in all the provinces. For my own part, I infinitely prefer the criminal law of England to that of any other country. It affords more protection to the party accused, than, for instance the criminal code of France does. The civil laws of the latter, by the way, have my warm admiration, as have also their administrative talent and their aptness for civilizing influences. (Hear, hear.) If the English criminal law gives the criminal too great a chance of escaping, it at least saves society the stigma of condemning the innocent. The accused is tried for the single act for which he is indicted, and is not questioned concerning his whole past life and conversation. The laws of commerce are nearly the same in all countries, and those which rule the trade of two continents may be said to be founded on an ordinance of a king of France. Accordingly, there will be no inconvenience in bringing commercial causes, as well as others, for adjudication before the Court of Appeals mentioned in the scheme of Confederation. I am convinced that if ever that tribunal comes into existence, it will be composed of the most eminent men in the several provinces, who will devote their whole energies to the causes brought before them, but the majority of whom will have studied and practised a code different from ours; although the laws of Upper Canada, for instance, have a constant tendency to coincide with our civil code:

BLACKSTONE, with his national common law which he aimed at establishing, being no longer the great authority which he was in former days, and England, like Germany, drawing rather from the pure spring of Roman law, as the most perfectly rational code in existence. We have not, however, yet come to this position of things in our provinces, and, up to the present hour, English law consists rather of precedents and decisions of eminent judges, like Lords MANSFIELD, COKE, and others; and as the scheme of a Constitution makes an exception in favor of our civil laws, it would be most prudent, in my opinion, to leave the decision of our causes to those judges who have studied and practised them. Nothing is as yet written in the Constitution concerning them, and nothing stands in the way of the desired exception. (Hear.) I am aware that it may be attended with some inconveniences and that in this behalf concessions may have been, perforce, submitted to in order to obtain others; but I think that on reflection it will be found best for all concerned to have the laws enforced rather by those who understand them than by those who do not. (Hear, hear.) I now come, Mr. SPEAKER, to the question of marriage and divorce. The word divorce has sounded strangely upon Catholic ears through the length and breadth of Lower Canada; for the Catholic, whether he live in Rome, in London, Paris, New York, Halifax or Quebec, does not recognize any authority on earth with power to sanction or legalize divorce. Such is what the Catholic believes, whether he be the Sovereign Pontiff, ruling spiritually over 200,000,000 souls, or the humblest or poorest of the faithful, with nothing to shelter him from the fury of the elements but the thatched roof of his cabin. (Hear, hear.) That is what I believe, in common with all the Catholics of the world; but here, in this House, composed of Catholics and Protestants, I feel that I need, in order to be understood, to speak in another language, which will be understood by all, because it is based upon principles anterior to Christianity and universally admitted. What is marriage, considered as a natural contract? It is the social formula; it is, as I had occasion to write elsewhere, the natural mode of transmitting property, which is the fundamental base of society, and, to go farther, society itself in its constitution. (Hear,

hear.) If we cannot suppose a body without a form, so we cannot suppose society without its formula, and in destroying its formula you destroy society. That is the reason why the marriage tie should be indissoluble; it is it which constitutes the family, and in breaking that tie you destroy the family, in breaking that tie you strike a mortal blow at society, because family ties are its only base, its only foundation, its only element of composition (Hear.) It is from those fundamental truths that spring the rights, duties and civil laws which prove their existence and at the same time protect them. (Hear.) I have heard in another place than in this House, men who, forgetting the natural law and the principles of society, become affected at the recital of the domestic miseries of one of their fellow-beings, and even invoke the Divine word to justify them in granting a divorce for cause of adultery. Let us see if the language of the Saviour of the world, who taught here upon earth a social doctrine, by preserving the inviolability of domestic ties and surrounding them with duties which rendered them still more sacred, justifies such an interpretation—"I say unto you, that he who putteth away his wife, except for adultery, and marrieth another, committeth adultery, and he who marrieth her who hath been put away also committeth adultery." Are not these words as clear as day, and do they not expressly forbid divorce, since they declare an adulterer the man who shall marry the woman separated from her husband. (Hear, hear.) These words permit the sending away, the separation of the body, but they expressly forbid divorce—that is, the rupture of family ties. (Applause.) I have said that those Divine words had a social object; in fact what other object could they have but to preserve intact the social formula for the transmission of property; and if they surround that formula with a supernatural sanction, accompanied by a prospect of reward or punishment, it is to protect it still more. It is for this reason that, in Catholicism, marriage, a natural contract, is elevated to the dignity of a sacrament, but it was inviolable and indissoluble before that sanction. (Hear, hear.) Now, if we drop the consideration of these great philosophical Christian ideas, we come to the region of material facts, and we are forcibly led to distinguish between force and right, between power and duty. The sovereign legislative authority,

as a superior power everywhere, in spite of right and duty, has ruled with a high hand questions in the social order, among which may be found divorce; everywhere, in ancient Rome, in France, in England, in the United States, and in Canada, has this authority acted, and the judiciary was bound to execute its commands. (Hear, hear.) This power is inherent to Parliament, and is exercised without opposition. Our present Parliament possessed that power, as did those of '74 and '91, and several of us have had, at some time or other, to give our vote on a bill of divorce. Catholics invariably voted against those bills, denying the right, but unable to deny the power, of Parliament, thus reconciling their consciences with their principles. (Hear, hear.) This scheme of the Conference does not ask us to-day to proclaim a principle, but simply the transposition of the exercise of a power which exists in spite of us. Now, in weighing the advantages and inconveniences, I, for my part, say—and I believe, in so speaking I express the general sentiment of Catholics—that, since the evil is a necessary one, and cannot be got rid of, I would rather see it where its consequences would be less serious, because they would be more cramped in their development, and consequently less demoralizing and less fatal in their influence. (Hear, hear.) Marriage presents itself to us here under another aspect—that is, marriage with regard to its civil effects. This project attributes the civil laws and legislation as to property to the local legislatures. Now, marriage, considered as a civil contract, becomes necessarily a part of these laws, and, I might even say, it affects the entire civil code, containing in its broadest sense all the marriage acts, all the qualities and conditions required to allow marriage to be contracted, all the formalities relative to its celebration, all its nullifying causes, all its obligations, its dissolution, the separation of the body, its causes and effects; in a word, all the possible consequences that can result from marriage to the contracting parties, their children and their estates. (Hear, hear.) If such had been the intention of the delegates, we might as well say that the civil laws will not be one of the attributes of our Local Legislature, and that these words, "Property and civil rights," have been placed ironically in the fifteenth section of the forty-third clause of the scheme. But I was sure beforehand that such could not be the case, when the Honorable Solicitor General for Lower Canada declared the other day, in the

name of the Government, that the word marriage, inserted in the project of Confederation, expresses the intention to give to the Federal Parliament the power to declare that marriages contracted in any one of the provinces, according to its laws, should be considered as valid in all the others. Then am I to understand that that part of the Constitution relating to this question will be drafted in the sense expressed in the declaration of the Honorable Solicitor General, and will be restricted to the case mentioned?

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—I made, Mr. SPEAKER, the other day, in the name of the Government, the declaration now alluded to by the honorable member for Montmorency, relative to the question of marriage. The explanation then given by me exactly accords with that which was affixed to it at the Quebec Conference. It is undoubted that the resolutions laid before this honorable House contain in all things only the principles on which the bill or measure respecting Confederation will be based. I can assure the honorable member that the explanations I gave the other evening, relative to the question of marriage, are perfectly exact, and that the Imperial Act relating to it will be drawn up in accordance with the interpretation I put upon it.

HON. MR. DORION—I thought I understood from some one, whom I had reason to consider well informed, that that article was intended to protect mixed marriages.

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—In order that I may be better understood by the hon. member, I will read the written declaration which I communicated to the House the other evening. This declaration reads as follows:

The word marriage has been placed in the draft of the proposed Constitution to invest the Federal Parliament with the right of declaring what marriages shall be held and deemed to be valid throughout the whole extent of the Confederacy, without, however, interfering in any particular with the doctrines or rites of the religious creeds to which the contracting parties may belong.

The hon. member for Hochelaga will please to remark that I have been careful in reading this declaration; and in order that no doubt may exist respecting it, I have given to the reporters the very text of the declaration.

HON. MR. DORION—I may have been mistaken; but the question on which I wish to be enlightened by the Hon. Solicitor General for Lower Canada is this: Will a Local Legislature have the right of declaring a mar-

riage between parties not professing the same religious belief invalid?

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—Has not the Legislature of Canada now the power of legislating on that matter, and yet has it ever thought of legislating in that way? (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. CAUCHON—If I understand the explanation of the Hon. Solicitor General for Lower Canada correctly, it will be nothing but the application between the provinces of public international law, namely, that a marriage lawfully contracted in one province should be equally binding in all the others. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. DORION—In that case you have no need of that clause.

HON. MR. CAUCHON—If the principle is just, I do not see what harm there can be in having it written in the Constitution, particularly as it is desired in the provinces, and we, for our part, are interested in knowing that marriages contracted in Lower Canada are valid in all parts of the Confederation. That declaration is satisfactory and reassuring. Some of the speakers, imbued with democratic-republican ideas, have gone so far as to deny one of the most essential and fundamental principles of the British Constitution—that is to say, that the Parliament may change the Constitution without special appeals to the electoral body, and without recourse to popular conventions. It is evident that they wish to lead us towards a social republic, government and legislation in full force. The Roman armies in the days of the decadence of the empire, made and unmade emperors; but it never occurred to them to make laws and administer affairs of state. This had to be reserved to our republicans, who are against Confederation because they desire annexation to the United States, and who raise all kinds of obstacles in order to attain their end. (Hear, hear.) Here there are useless debates provoked in order to kill time; there, petitions covered with false signatures or names obtained under false pretences; and the forlorn hope of democracy, who in the streets threaten with riots and gibbets all who wish for the union of the provinces, and thereby, in its time, constitutional monarchy and parliamentary government. (Hear, hear.) But for those who, like myself, move in another circle of ideas, who have other aspirations, and who are unwilling to accept on any condition their share of a debt of three thousand millions, and of an annual burthen of five hundred mil-

lions of dollars; for those the theory and practice of English constitutional law alone possess attractions. (Hear, hear.) These convictions on my part are not of yesterday. When, in 1849, after a commercial crisis, which had everywhere caused discouragement, ruined merchants sighed for annexation, because they hoped to find in it a remedy for the ills and the fortune they had lost; they supplicated Great Britain to allow them to go over, arms and baggage, to the Washington Government; to them became immediately allied the republicans by inclination and principle, among whom were the honorable members for Chateauguay and Hochelaga. (Hear, hear.) The prosperity which followed brought back the merchants to affection for British rule, but the others remained republicans and annexationists. Their leaders are here before us. Their acts betray them, and were it permitted to us to hear them in their familiar counsels, I am sure their words would also betray them. (Hear, hear.) The annexation movement had scarcely commenced in Montreal, when the two similar classes of men began to agitate in Quebec, and called an annexationist meeting in the St. George's Hotel, now occupied as the Executive Council Chamber. This meeting was inaugurated under evil auspices. It was presided over by a bankrupt merchant. It was evening, and the meeting was held by gas-light. An orator was chanting with stentorian lungs the praises of annexation and republicanism, from which we were to derive prosperity and happiness. Respectable leading citizens, indignant at what they beheld, implored me to speak, and by a spontaneous movement I was borne towards the platform. The annexationist orator, losing his balance with the shock, in order to keep himself upright, seized the gas-burner above his head, but the frail support gave way. (Laughter.) The flames ascended in a threatening manner towards the ceiling, and the terrified hotel-keeper immediately ran to the cellar and put a stop to the sources of illumination—and thus annexation was quenched in utter darkness. (Cheers and continuous laughter.) The republican annexationists, their hearts bursting with rage, in order to avenge themselves, proceeded to break my windows. This occurred nearly sixteen years ago, and time has only strengthened within me the opinion which guided my action then. It is neither hatred nor prejudice which has inspired me since I have been able to read and reflect. My opinion is the result of matured conviction. It is, therefore, in the

parliamentary history of Great Britain, and not in that of American institutions, that I shall seek a rule of conduct to guide me under the circumstances. In 1717 the British soil was invaded by the Pretender. The tories, who were not in power, but who wanted to rise to it precisely like the honorable members in opposition whom I see before me, exclaimed, like them, that the church and religion of the country were in danger. Observe well the similarity. These tories wished to elevate a Catholic prince to the throne. (Laughter.) The Whigs, who held the Government, and who saw in the approaching election the certainty of the downfall of the reigning dynasty, determined to prolong the existence of the Parliament for four years more without an appeal to the people. Their adversaries exclaimed, as do ours to-day, about violation of the Constitution, and accused them of evading, by violent means, an appeal to the people, to maintain themselves in power.

MR. GEOFFRION—In proportion to their numbers, there are more Protestants than Catholics in favor of Confederation.

HON. MR. CAUCHON—In the first place, there are a great many more Protestants in the House than Catholics—Upper Canada being entirely Protestant with the exception of two votes, and the Opposition of Lower Canada pronouncing themselves, as a party, against Confederation, it is not to be wondered at that there should be proportionably more Protestants than Catholics in favor of Confederation. (Hear, hear, from the Opposition benches.) And this leads me to say that Catholic institutions have been much better maintained by Protestant votes than by certain Catholic votes in the Legislature. If Catholicism has been insulted, the insult has come from the Opposition newspapers. (Hear.)

MR. GEOFFRION—The *Globe*, the organ of the Honorable the President of the Council!

HON. MR. CAUCHON—Yes, the *Globe* has made attacks on Catholic institutions and the Catholic clergy—it was wrong, there is no doubt, and so was its proprietor. But at that time, and more particularly when the Honorable the President of the Council accused Catholicism of demoralizing society, who was it who replied on the floor of this House, at great length, and I believe victoriously, in disproof of that assertion? (Sensation.) I am then justified in saying that the Honorable the President of the Council was wrong in speaking and writing as he did. He was unjust, but he was a Protestant, and he adhered to his opinions. What, however, has

he written in comparison with what has been written by certain newspapers of the Catholic opposition, among which the *Avenir* takes the highest place? They have ransacked the history of the world from the beginning of the Christian era in search of the calumnies of past ages, with the view of overwhelming, if it were possible, our bishops and priests. They have even gone so far as to cast their venom upon the august Pontiff who now rules over the Catholic Church; and what has not been done by the *Institut Canadien* of Montreal, which is patronized by the leaders of the Opposition? (Cheers.)

HON. MR. CARTIER—And the *Avenir*, which asserted that the Pope ought to be a schoolmaster.

HON. MR. CAUCHON—Ah! we now well know those who pretend to be the defenders of Catholicism, those former editors of the *Avenir*; we know what has been done by the *Avenir*, and the *Pays* also, in certain circumstances. (Hear, hear.) But here is what we find in a great constitutional authority, the value of which honorable gentlemen opposite will probably not contest—"HALLAM'S *History of England*":—

Upon the prevalent disaffection and the general changes of the established government was founded that measure so frequently arraigned in later times, the substitution of septennial for triennial parliaments. The Ministry deemed it too perilous to their master, certainly for themselves, to encounter a general election in 1717; but the arguments adduced for the alteration, as if it was meant to be permanent, were drawn from its permanent expediency. Nothing can be more extravagant than what is sometimes confidently pretended by the ignorant, that the legislature exceeded its rights by this enactment; or if that cannot legally be advanced, that it at least violated the trust of the people, and broke in upon the ancient Constitution. The law for triennial parliaments was of little more than twenty years' continuance. It was an experiment which, as was argued, had proved unsuccessful; it was subject, like every other law, to be repealed entirely, or to be modified at discretion. As a question of constitutional expediency, the septennial bill was doubtless open at the time to one serious objection. Everyone admitted that a parliament subsisting indefinitely during a king's life, but exposed at all times to be dissolved at his pleasure, would become far too little dependent on the people, and far too much so on the Crown. But if the period of its continuance should thus be extended from three to seven years, the natural course of encroachment of those in power, or some momentous circumstance like the present, might lead to fresh prolongations, and gradually to an entire repeal of what had been thought so important a safeguard of its

purity. Time has happily put an end to apprehensions, which are not on that account to be reckoned unreasonable.

Against those who pretended that the Parliament of England could not effect, without an appeal to the people, a legislative union with Ireland, WILLIAM PITT, that other great constitutional authority, maintained that Parliament had the right to alter even the succession to the Throne, to incorporate with itself another legislature, to deprive of the franchise those who elected it, and to create for itself other electors. To be more exact I will quote from a speech made by the illustrious Sir ROBERT PEEL, on the 27th March, 1846, on the Corn Law question. You will find there the opinion of PITT, FOX and PEEL himself, the most weighty English constitutional authority of this century. It is found in HANSARDS *Parliamentary Debates*, third series, vol. 85, pages 224, 225 and 226. Sir ROBERT PEEL said:—

But my honorable friend says he did not object to it as impeding the formation of a protection government, but as preventing a dissolution; and my honorable friend and others have blamed me for not advising a dissolution of Parliament. In my opinion, it would have been utterly inconsistent with the duty of a Minister to advise a dissolution of Parliament under the particular circumstances in which this question of the Corn Law was placed. Why should it be so utterly impossible for this Parliament to deal with the present proposition? After its election in 1841, this Parliament passed the existing Corn Law, which diminished protection; this Parliament passed the tariff destroying altogether the system of prohibition with respect to food; this Parliament passed the Canada Corn Bill; why should it exceed the functions of this Parliament to entertain the present proposition? But upon much higher ground I would not consent to a dissolution. That, indeed, I think would have been a "dangerous precedent" for a Minister to admit that the existing Legislature was incompetent to the entertainment of any question; that is a precedent which I would not establish. Whatever may have been the circumstances that may have taken place at an election, I never would sanction the view that any House of Commons is incompetent to entertain a measure that is necessary for the well-being of the community. If you were to admit that doctrine, you would shake the foundations on which many of the best laws are placed. Why, that doctrine was propounded at the time of the union between England and Ireland, as it had been previously at the time of the union between England and Scotland. It was maintained in Ireland very vehemently, but it was not maintained in this country by Mr. Fox. It was slightly adverted to by Mr. SHERIDAN at the time when the message with regard to the union

was delivered. Parliament had been elected without the slightest reason to believe it would resolve that its functions were to be fused and mixed with those of another Legislature, namely, the Irish Parliament; and Mr. SHERIDAN slightly hinted it as an objection to the competency of Parliament. Mr. PITT met that objection at the outset in the following manner. Mr. PITT said:—"The first objection is what I heard alluded to by the honorable gentleman opposite to me, when His Majesty's message was brought down, namely, that the Parliament of Ireland is incompetent to entertain and discuss the question, or rather, to act upon the measure proposed without having previously obtained the consent of the people of Ireland, their constituents. This point, sir, is of so much importance that I think I ought not to suffer the opportunity to pass without illustrating more fully what I mean. If this principle of the incompetency of Parliament to the decision of the measure be admitted, or if it be contended that Parliament has no legitimate authority to discuss and decide upon it, you will be driven to the necessity of recognizing a principle the most dangerous that ever was adopted in any civilized state, I mean the principle that Parliament cannot adopt any measure, new in its nature and of great importance, without appealing to the constituent and delegating authority for direction. If that doctrine be true, look to what an extent it will carry you. If such an argument could be set up and maintained, you acted without any legitimate authority when you created the representation of the Principality of Wales or of either of the counties palatine of England. Every law that Parliament ever made, without that appeal, either as to its own frame and constitution, as to the qualification of the electors or the elected, as to the great and fundamental point of the succession to the Crown, was a breach of treaty and an act of usurpation." Then, Mr. PITT asked, if they turned to Ireland herself, what would they say to the Protestant Parliament that destroyed the exclusive Protestant franchise, and admitted the Roman Catholics to vote without any fresh appeal? Mr. PITT went on:—

"What must be said by those who have at any time been friends to any plan of parliamentary reform, and particularly such as have been most recently brought forward, either in Great Britain or Ireland? Whatever may have been thought of the propriety of the measure, I never heard any doubt of the competency of Parliament to consider and discuss it. Yet I defy any man to maintain the principle of those plans without contending that, as a member of Parliament, he possesses a right to concur in disfranchising those who sent him to Parliament, and to select others, by whom he was not elected, in their stead. I am sure that no sufficient distinction, in point of principle, can be successfully maintained for a single moment; nor should I deem it necessary to dwell on this point in the manner that I do, were I not convinced that it is connected in part with all those false and dangerous notions on the

subject of Government which have lately become too prevalent in the world." Mr. PITT contended, therefore, that Parliament had a right to alter the succession to the Throne, to incorporate with itself another legislature, to disfranchise its constituents, or associate others with them. Why, is it possible for a Minister now to advise the Crown to dissolve Parliament on the ground that it is incompetent to entertain the question what this country shall do with the Corn Law? There could not be a more dangerous example, a more purely democratic precedent, if I may so say, than that this Parliament should be dissolved, on ground of its incompetency to decide any question of this nature. I am open to the charge, therefore, if it be one, that I did advise Her Majesty to permit this measure to be brought forward in the present Parliament.

The principle which I hold is so firmly established, that at the time of the flight of JAMES II. in 1688, the English Parliament, that is to say two branches of it only, declared the succession vacant and gave the Throne to a new dynasty.

HON. MR. DORION—Hear! hear!

HON. MR. CAUCHON—I wish to be well understood. I do not cite this example as an authority, because the Parliament was incomplete without its third legislative branch, but only for the purpose of shewing to what length the Parliament of Great Britain has carried the exercise of its great prerogative. During the illness of GEORGE III., as it had been impossible to foresee that such a misfortune would happen, and as without the action of the Sovereign, neither the administration of the government, which is conducted in the name of the king, nor legislation, which is only effectual after receiving the assent of the three branches of the legislature, were possible; under these unforeseen circumstances, the two Houses, at the suggestion of the Ministers created a mechanism to act during the illness of the king, and all that was done under its operation became law, and was regarded as such by the whole British nation and all those charged with the execution of the laws of Parliament. But setting aside these extraordinary circumstances, which demanded extraordinary remedies, we assert that Parliament in its integrity has power to alter the Constitution and even the succession to the Throne. As to us, we do not propose to go so far; we simply ask the Imperial Parliament to give us a new Constitution, and even that Parliament will only with our consent make use of that power which it has a right to exercise without our consent. (Hear, hear.) Let it be ob-

served, Mr. SPEAKER, that I am only considering now the question of power and right; the question of what is fit and expedient is quite another matter. We might do well or we might do ill by taking this course, but as we act in our capacity of representatives of the people, it is for us to decide whether it is expedient or advantageous that an appeal should be had to the people under the circumstances. (Hear, hear.) As regards the sentiments of Great Britain in relation to us, the events which have taken place since the union show that they are altogether changed. In 1840 we had a Constitution imposed upon us against our will, and by so doing Great Britain was guilty of injustice towards us. Now they await our decision before they act. In past days England looked upon the colonies as her own special markets, and fortified them by prohibitory duties against foreign trade. Now they are open to the whole world. Formerly we were under a despotism and oligarchical government, and since 1841 we have had that British Parliamentary Government which the great economist TUGGOT, more than sixty years before, had advised England to extend to her colonies. (Hear, hear.) Thus the Parliament of Great Britain, which had just proclaimed the union with Ireland, incorporated into its legislature the representation of the latter, and constituted itself, by its own authority, the first Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain, without recourse to a dissolution and new elections. At the meeting of the Houses they proceeded to the election of a new Speaker for the Commons, precisely as after a general election, and all the other formalities were observed which, according to custom, accompanied the opening of new parliaments. You will find those details in the *Parliamentary History*, vol. 35, page 857. Here is another authority which the republican-annexation adversaries of Confederation will hardly care to doubt. I find it in pages 164, 165, and 166 of SEDGWICK on *Statutory and Constitutional Law*:—

...or are these merely speculative or abstract questions. We shall find them presenting themselves in a large class of cases which I am about to examine. The difficulty, generally, seems to have arisen from a want of accurate notions as to the boundary line which, under our system, divides the legislative and judicial powers. I now turn to a more detailed consideration of the cases in this country, where these questions have been considered and which, so far as they go, tend to give a practical definition to the term *law*, and to define the boundaries which separate the legisla-

tive from the judicial power. And first, of causes where the legislature has sought to divest itself of real powers. Efforts have been made, in several cases, by the state legislatures to relieve themselves of the responsibility of their functions, by submitting statutes to the will of the people, in their primary capacity. But these proceedings have been held, and very rightly, to be entirely unconstitutional and invalid. The duties of legislation are not to be exercised by the people at large. The majority governs, but only in the prescribed form; the introduction of practices of this kind would remove all checks on hasty and improvident legislation, and greatly diminish the benefits of representative government. So where an act to establish free schools was, by its terms, directed to be submitted to the electors of the state, to become a law only in case a majority of the votes were given in its favor, it was held, in New York, that the whole proceeding was entirely void. The Legislature, said the Court of Appeals, have no power to make such submission, nor had the people the power to bind each other by acting upon it. They voluntarily surrendered that power when they adopted the constitution. The government of this state is democratic; but it is a representative democracy, and in passing general laws, the people act only through their representatives in the Legislature. And in Pennsylvania, in the case of an excise statute, the same stern and salutary doctrine has been applied. In some of the more recent state constitutions this rule has been made a part of the fundamental law. So in Indiana, the principle is now framed into a constitutional provision which vests the legislative authority in a Senate and House of Representatives, and declares that no act "shall be passed, the taking effect of which shall be made to depend upon any authority except as provided in the Constitution." And under these provisions it has been held that so much of an act as relates to its submission to the popular vote, was null and void.

HON. MR. DORION—In England there are seven or eight acts of Parliament which were submitted to the popular vote before becoming law.

HON. MR. CAUCHON—In England it is admitted that Parliament may do anything and even change the sexes if necessary, according to the doctrine of the honorable member for Brome. (Laughter.) The honorable member for Hochelaga is an admirer of written constitutions; I am citing authorities to suit him, and which it is quite impossible for him to reject. (Hear, hear.) All these authorities establish, by incontestable evidence, the power of Parliament in regard to every question that may come before it. There only remains now the question of convenience and expediency, and that question can only be considered by Parliament. In 1717, 1800,

and 1846, the British Parliament decided it without appealing to the people. In 1832 it decided the question after an appeal to the people, acting in all those circumstances under the constitutional responsibility of its trust. That is what we shall do in the present difficult conjuncture, awaiting in the approaching elections the approval or condemnation of our initiative. But let the opponents of the scheme be well convinced that we understand, quite as well as themselves, the entire importance of the vote which we are going to give. In closing, Mr. SPEAKER, I may be allowed to say to the House, that in a debate of such a solemn character, and when such great destinies as regards the future of the whole of British North America are at stake within these walls, let us have the courage to rise superior to passions, hatreds, personal enmities, and a miserable spirit of party, in order to allow our minds to soar more freely in the larger sphere of generous sentiments, and of great and noble national aspirations. We possess all that we want—all the necessary elements of greatness and prosperity to found an empire in America. Let us boldly set to work, sheltered by the flag and protected by the powerful ægis of the Empire which leads us on to undertake the task. (Prolonged applause.)

HON. MR. DORION—Mr. SPEAKER, the honorable member for Montmorency, who has just sat down, having given it as his opinion that all those who are opposed to Confederation are annexationists and infidels, I must congratulate him upon having at last opened his eyes and escaped the danger of being drawn into the vortex of the American Union, and perhaps into something worse—(laughter)—as but a short time ago he was in the bad company of those who are opposed to Confederation. He has even written a whole volume in opposition to the union of the British North American Provinces. (Hear, hear.) I suppose that at that time he did not look upon himself as an annexationist, and still less as an infidel, for the simple reason that he combatted with all the power at his command, not only Confederation, but also union of any kind with the British American Provinces. (Hear, hear.) In that book, which I have just referred to, and which was written at the end of 1858, the honorable member, after having described the different systems under which the union might be projected, says:—"We do not desire it, because we do not want union in any form, inasmuch as the same object will always be attained, no

matter under what form the union may be established." That object, according to the honorable member, was the depriving Lower Canada of the small influence which she exercises on the legislation of the existing union. It is true that the honorable gentleman has written another book lately. According to that book he no longer sees any other danger for Lower Canada than that of annexation, and invites everyone to turn round as he has done, and to follow him with the view of avoiding these dangers. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) Once more I congratulate him that he is now out of danger, and I will endeavor to follow him with his two books in his hand. As it is too late to-night, however, I will do it at the next sitting, and for that purpose I move that the debate be now adjourned.

HON. MR. CAUCHON—The honorable member for Hochelaga alludes to the two pamphlets which I have written, one in 1858, and the other in 1865, on the subject of the Confederation of the provinces. The difference between the honorable member and me is simply this, that I do not deny what I have written, whilst in order that he may enjoy greater freedom of discussion, he has thought proper to deny his actions in the past. (Hear, hear.) There is another contradiction which it is of importance to remark. After having asserted, up to 1861, that there was danger for Lower Canada in not granting to Upper Canada representation based upon population, or its substitute, the Confederation of the two Canadas, and that the danger was so menacing that it was more prudent to give way than to allow it to be forcibly taken by her—to-day he comes down and maintains that the horizon is quite serene; that there is no necessity for constitutional changes. Does he then so easily forget the days of 1858, '59, '60 and '61? (Hear, hear.) For my part, Mr. SPEAKER, I think we should be acting with more dignity, and would render more service to the country, if we devoted ourselves exclusively to the consideration of the question, setting aside those accusations of contradiction from which no one is ever exempt. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. DORION moved the adjournment of the debate to the sitting to-morrow night at half-past seven.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER moved in amendment that it be adjourned till half-past three to-morrow, to be then the first order of the day after routine business.

After some discussion, the amendment was carried, and the House adjourned.

FRIDAY, March 3, 1865.

MR. PERRAULT—MR. SPEAKER, it is not without a degree of hesitation easy to be understood that I venture to give my reasons for my vote on the question of the Confederation of the Provinces of British North America. I hesitate, because I am conscious how much I fall short in respect of solid information and political experience to enable me to form a healthy and reliable judgment of the various reasons to be alleged on both sides of that vast question, the decision of which is pregnant with such serious consequences to the future welfare of the country. A further cause of my hesitation, MR. SPEAKER, is that I see on the Ministerial benches men grown old in political warfare—men who for many years have been the leaders and guides of the majorities in the two Canadas—supporting the scheme now submitted to us, and assuring us that it is the only remedy for all the difficulties of our present position. Still another cause of my hesitation is that I am aware of the great severity with which the Ministerial press visits all the adversaries of the plan of Confederation, and of the small measure of justice which it metes out in estimating the motives of those who oppose this constitutional scheme, however upright their characters or honest the motives which actuate them. But I should consider myself wanting in my duty as a member if, swayed by these misgivings, I did not state my motives in this House for my opposition to the project of Confederation. On so important a question it is a duty to my constituents, it is a duty which I owe to myself, that I should justify the responsibility which I take upon myself in resisting a measure which is so strongly supported in this House, and I should think I failed in my duty and was unworthy of the seat which I fill in it, if I did not add force to my opposition by citing the history of the past, by portraying the prosperity of the present, and by pointing out the dangers to be feared in the future which is preparing for us. I have been long studying the general question of a Confederation, and I am of opinion that the Provinces of British North America are destined to form, at some future time which may be more or less remote, a vast Confederation, in which the two races of French and English origin will be seen struggling in the career of progress for the common

prosperity of both; and for the better convenience of studying the question, I visited the Lower Provinces in 1863, by way of the Gulf, and in 1864 by the Bay of Fundy. I am bound to say that I found the people everywhere in easy circumstances, and intelligent, and doing honor to that part of the country. I was then enabled to appreciate the advantages and the inconveniences attending on the decision of the question of Confederation generally. On my return from my last journey, which I made in the month of August, 1864, in company with a certain number of the members of both Houses, it was said by the press that I had in several companies declared myself favorable to the plan of a Confederation of all the provinces. At that time the Conference at Charlottetown had not taken place, and public opinion had already busied itself with classifying the members of this House as favorers or opponents of Confederation. I had already, at that time, publicly expressed my opinion on the question through the press, in order that I might bring it under the notice of my constituents, and I must declare that the opinion which I then expressed coincides with the line of conduct to which I still adhere, and that I have not found it necessary to alter my position in any one point from what it then was. In order that I may show this in the clearest manner, I shall read what I wrote in the month of August last, as perfectly explanatory of what I always thought of the scheme of confederating the Provinces of British North America. Here is what I wrote:—

This question of serious import, on which the minds of all our political world are so busy, in the present crisis, is so difficult of solution, that it would be an act of pre-emption in me to attempt even to discuss it, while our public men of the highest mark are still doubtful whether to favor it or not. As the *Minerve*, however, in its last number, claims me as one of the new converts to the great scheme of Confederation, I should think myself wanting to my duty and my convictions if I failed to let the world know my impressions of the present position, as I understand it. Those who consider the inexhaustible resources of the Provinces of British North America have no doubt that we possess all the elements of a great power. In territory we have a tenth part of the habitable globe, capable of supporting a population of 100,000,000 of persons. Bounded on the east by the Atlantic, on the west by the Pacific, our territory is further accessible by the navigation of the internal seas, which bound it on the south. Our rivers complete the incomparable network of communica-

tion by water, and, like vivifying arteries, bear on their bosom to the ocean and the markets of the world the heavy produce of the western plains, the lofty pines of our forests, our ores of gold and copper, our furs collected in our hunting grounds, and the produce of our fisheries in the gulf. In this vast field of productiveness, where all the materials of immense wealth exist, we need a moving power, and the inexhaustible coal fields of Nova Scotia are at hand to furnish it. British North America, therefore, looms in the future with gigantic proportions, and it depends only on ourselves to decide whether the French element shall have a large share of the power which is to grow up within its limits. With energy and union, we shall keep the ground we have gained in a struggle of a hundred years. The past is a warranty of success in the future. Yet must we not hurry matters, nor overrun the natural progress of events. While we are still too few to take the offensive, our policy should be one of resistance. Accordingly, before pledging myself to the support of Confederation, which is a total change of the basis of our present Constitution, I would be perfectly sure that we shall not lose an inch of ground. More than this; I would permit no change to be made in our present Constitution, except in as far as it would ensure a larger measure of prosperity for our country, more powerful protection for our institutions, and the absolute inviolability of our rights. For I have not deviated in the smallest degree from the terms of my address to the electors of Richelieu, when I had the honor to solicit their votes as their representative in the Legislative Assembly. In that address, I declared myself opposed to any concession whatever to Upper Canada. Accordingly, if it should appear that the scheme of Confederation, which is to be laid before the Provincial Parliament in its next session, would assure to French-Canadians greater advantages than they enjoy under the present Constitution, I should, as a thing of course, be in favor of Confederation. But if it should be otherwise; if, in however small a degree, Confederation should appear to be a concession to Upper Canada, to the detriment of our institutions, our language or our laws, I shall to the utmost extent of my power oppose any change whatever in the present Constitution. Of course I am not one of those who would bound our political horizon and place limits to our greatness as a people; on the contrary, nothing would render me happier than the creation of a vast political organization, spread over an immense territory. The heart-burnings between localities and individuals would thenceforward cease and die out from mere insignificance, as compared with the great interests which would be confided to the watchful guardianship of our statesmen, and become the subject of their deliberations in the councils of the nation. Then the laudable ambition of achieving a great name in a great country would produce a race of great men, of whom we might be justly proud. But if this glorious future is to be purchased only at the price of our absorption, of our language, and all that is dear to

us as Frenchmen, I for one could not hesitate between what we may hope for while still remaining what we are, and the bastardizing of our race paid as the price of advantages to come. To sum up all, therefore, I declare for the Constitution such as it is, which, so far, has yielded us a greater amount of advantage than all the proposed changes would; and such, I venture to say, is the opinion of the majority of our Legislative Assembly. But if the projected scheme secures to us in the convention all the privileges which the French-Canadians now enjoy in the present Parliament, and if, in the whole and in every part, it secures to us greater advantages than those which are guaranteed to us by the Constitution, I shall prefer Confederation to all other changes.

I am bound to declare that this way of looking at the question, in the month of August last, has undergone no change in my mind, since I heard the explanations given by the members of the Administration. The skill which they have evinced certainly does them great honor, but neither the arguments of Ministers, nor those of the members of the House who support the scheme, have convinced me; and I rely on being able to show in my remarks what are the grounds of my opposition, and to justify, according to my way of looking at it, the responsibility which I undertake in opposing a project which has found such powerful supporters in this House. I trust I shall be able to show, first, the inexpediency of a constitutional change; second, the hostile object of Confederation; third, the disastrous consequences of the adoption of the project of Confederation. The inexpediency of a constitutional change must be perfectly evident to any one who considers for a moment the present prosperity of Canada, and who takes the trouble to examine the progress made by United Canada since 1840. The Hon. Attorney General East says that "the union has done its work." But is that quite certain? When we compare the past with the present, have we not reason to be proud of our growth since 1840, and of the fact that within the past twenty-five years, our progress, both social and material, has kept pace with that of the first nations in the world? During the past twenty-five years we have progressed politically in a manner unprecedented in colonial history; and Canada has furnished a magnificent instance of the good result of responsible government in an English colony, notwithstanding diversity of races and religions. In 1840, we had just terminated a glorious struggle, during which, unfortunately, many lives had been lost—

struggle undertaken in order to secure responsible government, which had, up to that time, been refused, and which was then accorded us as the reward of the struggle. At that period Lower Canada was united as one man; she had forwarded to England petitions, bearing 60,000 signatures, asking for responsible government. We then had in our ranks men who did not shrink from the struggle, men accustomed to resist oppression, men who had grown up in the midst of a strife with an arrogant minority, which sought to overrule the majority; and these were the great men who secured the triumph of our nationality, and upheld the rights of Lower Canada, by securing responsible government at the same time that the union was forced upon us. Let us now see the result of their labors. Is it true that we have progressed both socially and materially since that period? Any one who reflects on what Canada was in 1840, and what it is in 1865, cannot but admit that we have progressed in a degree almost unprecedented in the history of the prosperity of nations; that we have immensely extended our territory, by clearing away the forest; that our population has increased in a wonderful manner, that that population is prosperous and contented, and that we have progressed materially and socially in a manner heretofore unprecedented under the colonial system. In the social order, let us examine, first, our legislation and system in municipal matters. Can a more perfect system be found anywhere? Has not every locality all the powers necessary for effecting all improvements of real necessity? It is since the union that we have perfected this system, and that we have endowed our rural districts with the means of effecting all improvements they may desire, and particularly as regards road matters and the making of new roads, in order to facilitate the transport of farm produce to market. (Hear, hear.) But I need not dwell on the progress we have made and the reforms we have carried out, as regards legislation. That which had chiefly contributed, from the first establishment of English rule, to arrest our progress in this respect was the Legislative Council of the former Legislature, and that which existed from the union up to 1856. Since that period have we not obtained an elective Legislative Council, and must not our greatest reforms be considered the consequence? With the union and responsible government, did we not also secure the right

of being represented by French-Canadian fellow-countrymen in the Executive Council? And since then have we not enjoyed all the advantage of a system of government under which the people can, not only express their wants, but enforce their wishes? These are reforms of the highest importance, but we have obtained yet more. When, in 1840, the union of the Canadas took place, landed property in Lower Canada was subjected to the feudal system, which had been introduced with all its features derogatory to the dignity of man, with all its charges upon property, and all its vexations for the *censitaire*. Under that system no property whatever could change hands without being submitted to a heavy charge in the form of *lods et ventes* for the benefit of the seignior, and to *cens et rentes* which considerably reduced its value. With the political rights conferred on us by the union, the seigniorial system of necessity disappeared, giving us property in freehold, the same as in the neighbouring States and in all civilized nations. It is also since the union that we have consolidated our laws; that we have created a system of public instruction which imparts the blessings of education to the most remote parts of the province. At the present moment we have a school system which does honor to the country, and the intelligent, however poor they may be, can, almost without charge, acquire an education. Now, each village, each concession has its school, and the child of the backwoodsman dwelling in the midst of the forest, can there obtain a degree of elementary instruction sufficient to enable him to enter upon a career of honor and fortune, should his talents, his industry and his energy fit him for playing a part in politics, in the sciences, in the arts or in the ranks of the clergy of his country. It is a remarkable fact, Mr. SPEAKER, and one which I deem it right to mention, that the majority of the notable men who have attained seats on the judicial bench, in the Ministry and even in the Episcopal chair, came forth from our humble country homes, and qualified themselves in our educational institutions, where instruction is afforded all but gratuitously, by dint of talent, perseverance, study and industry. It was the pressure of want in the family homestead that in many cases created in the breasts of our most eminent public men, the eager desire of attaining a high position by means of study and labor. Since the union our system and means of public

instruction have made immense progress. Before the union we had no Catholic university in the country. Young men intending to enter the liberal professions were compelled, instead of following a regular course, to content themselves with what they could acquire in the office of their patrons, who were not in all cases competent for the task they undertook, or else to go abroad at great expense for many years, in order to obtain in England or France a certificate of qualification. To-day we have in Lower and in Upper Canada universities rivalling European universities of the same class, and we have also a body of young students, who, fifteen or twenty years hence, will give proof of the excellence of our university system, and of the high curriculum of studies these institutions have now rendered universal. Now, in face of the degree of progress I have just referred to, in the social order, can it be truly said that the union has run its day, when all these marvels are its creation? When we are stronger and better educated than we were twenty years ago; when we have new political rights; when we have a free right to the soil, and when we have created a system of public instruction such as we now enjoy, can it be said that the union has done its work, and that it must be broken up? For my part, Mr. SPEAKER, I am not prepared to support that assertion. The union has been for us a great means of progress, since it has enabled us to secure all these results in the social order. The Hon. Attorney General East has told us that Confederation will procure us material advantages still greater, and that that is all we want. I deny, Mr. SPEAKER, that material interests form the sole ambition of the French-Canadian population. We attach a far higher importance to the preservation of our own institutions. But even as regards material interests, apart from the advantages, in the social order, derived from the union, we have still a vast field before us as regards the progress we have made since 1840. In order to see what the union has done in this respect, it is sufficient to look at our system of railroads, and above all, at the great Grand Trunk line from Sarnia to Rivière du Loup, which has increased our commerce tenfold, opened our dense forests to colonization, and multiplied our resources to an incalculable extent; it is sufficient to look at our ports of Montreal and Quebec during the season of navigation, filled with vast forests of shipping, to see our trans-atlantic steamers bearing off weekly

the products of our country to the most distant European markets, in exchange for the articles of import we require. And if we ascend our great River St. Lawrence, what do we see? We find canals, which in their dimensions, the materials of which they are constructed, and in their extent, are unsurpassed in any part of the world. I maintain, Mr. SPEAKER, that there is nothing to be found in Europe to compare with our artificial water communications. In England, for instance, the canals are only miserable gutters, and the little boys, in rowing their boats, can touch both sides at once with the ends of their oars. Here our canals pass through the whole country, and connect the most remote parts of it with the markets of Europe. And, in fact, a ship of four hundred tons burden can now sail from Chicago, cross the ocean, and discharge her cargo in the docks at Liverpool. The union which has given us such canals, such railways, has not run its day, has not done its work, as the Hon. Attorney General East pretends. On the contrary, with such means as these, we are justified in anticipating from the union still greater results in the future. If we look at our colonization, we behold the forest receding before the axe of the settler, the products of our land increased tenfold, and our settlers locating in advance of the surveyor on our wild lands. What the union has already done for us is certainly great, but the advantages it has in store for us are still greater, if we know how to avail ourselves of the means it places at our command. Therefore it is that I do not think the union has done its work, but that, on the contrary, it will yet secure our prosperity. And hence it is that I wish to preserve the union and remain under allegiance to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen of England, and refuse to accept constitutional changes which must of necessity imperil our future as a nation. (Hear, hear.) It has often been said that Lower Canada was a drag on Upper Canada, retarding her advancement in the march of progress, and that a new Constitution was necessary. I deny the justice of the accusation, and I maintain that such a charge could only emanate from Upper Canadian fanaticism. True, the French-Canadian race has been characterized at Toronto by a Governor General as an "inferior race," but the insult thus offered to Lower Canada has not a single fact to bear it out. Moreover,

I am happy to bring forward the testimony of the Hon. Finance Minister (Hon. Mr. GALT) to refute these assertions, to answer these insults, and to prove that the prosperity of Canada is due to the active co-operation of the French-Canadians—not only in the Executive, but in the Legislative Assembly. In a letter written from London in 1860, the Hon. Minister of Finance says :—

From 1849 up to this day, the French-Canadian majority has been fairly represented in the Ministry, and it is with its powerful co-operation and the part it has taken in initiating every measure, and the support of its votes in Parliament, that all great reforms have been realized.

Well, if it be true that the French-Canadian members of the Government, since 1849, have, by their unceasing efforts, obtained the realization of these reforms, why is it now sought to destroy the Constitution under which they were obtained, and to create a new state of things which will diminish that influence which we now enjoy? It is because, notwithstanding our material prosperity, the old aggression of race against race, the former state of antagonism and ill-will, has not disappeared. The end proposed to be attained by the Government in making these changes is a vast and noble end, I admit. It is the creation of an immense Empire, which will redound to our glory and to that of England. But it seems to me that this will not be the necessary result of the means which are being taken to attain it. (Hear, hear.) Whenever the great measures of reform to which I have already referred have been submitted to Parliament, we have seen public men devote themselves exclusively to these measures, and labor for their realization. We have seen parties arrayed for or against these great questions—the abolition of the Seigniorial Tenure, the election of the members of the Legislative Council, the construction of our railways and canals, &c. In view of these great questions, there was no room for the contemptible personal considerations, and the miserable wrangling of the church door; but as soon as these great reforms were obtained, there was no longer any ground for opposition to the Government on these subjects; yet subjects for the exhibition of discontent and opposition had to be devised, with the view of attaining power, and of satisfying individual ambition. They then addressed themselves to the prejudices of race and religion. A cry was raised in Up-

per Canada that French-Canadian domination could no longer be endured, and that an end must be put to it. No heed was taken of the progress that had yet to be made, but it seemed as though nothing required to be done in order to attain success, but to destroy the national character of a large section of Canada. They complained of French domination, the influence of the clergy, and of the great number of religious institutions in Canada; and what was the remedy proposed to put an end to all these evils which Upper Canada could no longer tolerate? The hon. member for South Oxford (Hon. Mr. BROWN) was imported, and brought out here from Scotland, to cast the flaming torch of discord between the two populations, and to inflame them one against the other. I imagine that since that time the Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN must have more than once regretted this importation, which was not quite in the regular line of his commercial operations. And when this gentleman had been imported, who has been the cause of all our dissensions up to the present time, parties were organized under his command as they are this day. To diminish or destroy the influence of the French-Canadians in Parliament, the hon. member for South Oxford raised a clamour for representation based upon population, which was echoed from one end of Upper Canada to the other. These cries, the offspring of fanaticism, were rejected by Lower Canada with unanimity on the part of our public men. The hon. member for South Oxford, finding that this cry for representation based on population was a magnificent war-horse, made use of it to form a party. Since that period he has allowed nothing to stand in his way. He has calumniated every public man and all the institutions which were held in respect by the inhabitants of Lower Canada; he has attacked, with the greatest fury, all that was dear to us as Frenchmen and Catholics; and by this means he gained his object; and we have seen all the western farmers, all the inhabitants of Canada West, cry out that here we were all under the domination of the clergy, and that the English and Protestant population ought not to submit to so heavy a yoke. He knew that the English element was fanatic and aggressive, and by means of this cry the then leader of the Opposition in Upper Canada succeeded in forming a phalanx so strong, that Lower Canada has been compelled to yield some portion of the

ground which she had conquered in her struggles of former days. I do not believe that there is a single member for Lower Canada who would wish to change our present Constitution in the manner now proposed, were he not forced to it by Upper Canada. We are, then, about to give up some of our franchises and our rights in this new struggle against the spirit of encroachment and domination manifested by the English race. Hon. members who support the measure will tell you that they are giving up a part of our rights, in order that what remains may be saved from destruction, and that they may not lose all they now enjoy, before any lengthened period shall have elapsed. But was this clamor in favor of representation based upon population sincere on the part of those who used it as a means of attacking us? Was it in reality a remedy for the evils of which they complained? No, Mr. SPEAKER, I do not think it was. It was simply an electoral platform, by which to attain power and consummate the encroachment upon our rights contemplated by the leaders of the movement. I do not deem it necessary to repeat here all the arguments brought to bear against the demand for representation by population, in eighty speeches delivered in 1860, during the discussion of that exciting question; but I remember that debate with all the more pleasure, that the French-Canadians shewed that they retained some vestiges of firmness in the day of battle, and of perseverance in the maintenance of our rights, which our fathers had so often manifested. On that occasion the Hon. Attorney General East (Hon. Mr. CARTIER) deserved the approbation of his country for the resistance he made to that unjust demand on the part of Upper Canada, with that energy and tenacity he is so well known to display; he was the champion of our rights. Why, then, does he to-day come down and propose a compromise with his opponents of those days? Is it just at the moment when the leaders of the Upper Canadian Opposition had, by entering the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Government, absolutely rejected the principle of representation based upon population, that he should abandon the struggle? Is it at the moment the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Government had obtained separate schools for the Catholics of Upper Canada, that the party led by the honorable member for South Oxford was to be derailed? Is it at the moment when the law providing separate

schools for the Catholics of Upper Canada was the subject of a triumph, which the Hon. Attorney General had never succeeded in obtaining during the whole time he has been in power, that the Hon. Attorney General should cease from further efforts, throw down his arms, and declare as a French-Canadian that we could no longer hold the breach, and that we must make concessions to Upper Canada? Did not the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Administration make a close question of representation by population? Were not all the members of that Government bound to oppose it? Yes, Mr. SPEAKER, the Hon. Attorney-General East was guilty of a grievous wrong, when he defeated that Government by a hostile majority composed of French-Canadians. It was after that hostile vote that Upper Canada insisted on her right to renew her claims to representation based on population, and that we are compelled to-day to make concessions. For my part, Mr. SPEAKER, I have never been convinced of the sincerity of those who made use of the cry for representation based on population, for I have never seen any other means employed to obtain the aid of the western farmers in securing more easily the reins of power. Has the principle of representation based on population ever served as the basis of a government having monarchical ideas, like those which actuate the existing Government? Now we are seeking for a Confederation for which there is no precedent—not a Confederation like those to be found in other countries which have adopted that form of government, but a monarchical Confederation. (Hear, hear.) It is sought to retain the English Constitution, and yet it is asserted that representation by population is a just principle, and that it must be extended to Upper Canada. Does not the Honorable Attorney General East (Hon. Mr. CARTIER) remember the arguments he urged in 1860 against this principle? Did he not then declare with the view of showing that the principle was neither a just one nor one recognized in the British Constitution, that if it were applied to the British Parliament the city of London alone would have thirty members instead of sixteen, and that Scotland would send many more members to Parliament than she does now? Did he not assert that rotten boroughs, containing only a few hundred inhabitants, had one representative, and that counties containing 100,000 inhabitants had no more? Have these argu-

ments, then so full of power, lost all their force and value to-day? Have they become futile since the alliance of the Honorable Attorney General East and the hon. member for South Oxford? Can they no longer be used to save our Constitution and our liberties? How can the party which has so long been kept together by its opposition to the principle of representation by population, say to-day that it is a just principle, and that it must be conceded? I confess, Mr. SPEAKER, that I cannot understand why we should concede to-day what we refused in 1860. It is true that I do not possess the experience of the hon. gentlemen who now occupy the Ministerial benches, and that, perhaps, it may be wiser to bend to-day than to be broken to-morrow; but when I study the history of the past, when I look at things as they are, and look forward to the future which is now proposed for us, I only see in the scheme of Confederation a remedy which is more violent than the disease, and which, instead of removing the difficulties it is proposed to eradicate, will only have the effect of producing results the most unfavorable to the peace and prosperity of our country. I stated then, Mr. SPEAKER, that the question of representation by population, which has been the principal cause of the Confederation scheme, was excluded from the political programme of the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Government, and that the Upper Canada majority, the leaders of which, throughout their whole political career, had so loudly demanded this concession in favor of Upper Canada, had bound itself not to raise that exciting question within the halls of the Legislature, at least during the existence of the MACDONALD-SICOTT Ministry. (Hear, hear.) I stated that, thanks to the patriotic firmness of that Administration, Lower Canada was enabled for two years to live in peace and enjoy the fruits of a tranquillity unknown for ten years previous, and during two sessions the question of representation based on numbers ceased to be a subject of strife and fanatical attack on the part of Upper Canada. (Hear, hear.) It was at that period that the honorable member for South Oxford asked for a committee to enquire as to the means of settling the sectional difficulties, by effecting a change in the basis of the present Constitution. (Hear, hear.) Well, Mr. SPEAKER, what took place then? We saw that able speaker, that indefatigable and powerful advocate of the

claims of Upper Canada against the Lower Canada section, unable to find in this House more than forty men prepared to support him in his unjust demand for a constitutional change which the present Administration are about to grant. (Hear, hear.) We saw that powerful politician humbled, and giving up in despair all hopes of succeeding with the House—and, for my part, Mr. SPEAKER, I must say that I felt pained at his position—asking a leave of absence in order to avoid a humiliating defeat, and returning to his home to lament his fall and the loss of an influence based solely on fanaticism and prejudice. (Hear, hear.) Subsequently, Mr. SPEAKER, the House witnessed an act which I do not desire to characterize now; we saw the Administration which had the courage to chain down the monster of representation by population, overthrown by a French-Canadian majority! (Hear, hear.) Yes, Mr. SPEAKER, that Liberal government, which had afforded so much security to our institutions by maintaining intact our present Constitution, was defeated by a French-Canadian majority of this House. I do not intend, when I say this, to attack my fellow-countrymen, far from it; but I wish to trace the parliamentary history of our country, and I do not hesitate to assert that that vote gave a fatal blow to our influence as French-Canadians, and that posterity will record that vote, which is now a matter of history, as a fatal act by which our public men sacrificed to party spirit the dearest of our interests. (Hear, hear.) I fearlessly assert, Mr. SPEAKER, that for fifteen years our affairs had not been administered by men more sincerely devoted to our interests and better able to protect the political liberties, the interests and the institutions of Lower Canada. What have we seen during the past fifteen years in this House? We have witnessed party appeals to prejudices and the most insulting personalities; and, in fact, the lowering of the moral status of our national representatives, as the natural result. We have seen the men best qualified to enforce, on the floor of this House, the rights of the people, refusing to come forward at elections, because they saw that the position of a member of Parliament no longer conferred that degree of dignity and position which made it an object of ambition in better times. We have seen men of eminence, who had labored in behalf of the interests of their constituents for many long years, abandoning their political

career in disgust, and retiring to the seclusion of their homes. Then it was that we saw a French-Canadian majority voting down a Ministry whose political programme afforded more effectual guarantees for Lower Canada interests than that of any previous government. (Hear, hear.) But a blind and paltry party spirit induced them to sacrifice, for a momentary triumph, the general interests of their country; and the majority, by its vote, decreed our national downfall. (Hear, hear.) Well, Mr. SPEAKER, under the new Government we found representation by population again made a subject of discussion in our Legislature; and now, there is no denying it, that unfortunate concession, which places us at the mercy of Upper Canada, has become an accomplished fact. (Hear, hear.) I stated, just now, Mr. SPEAKER, that the hon. member for South Oxford was unable to obtain his committee under the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Administration, an essentially liberal one. (Hear, hear.) On reference to the *Journals* of this House of that period, what do we find? The Ministry which succeeded that Government had hardly taken possession of the Treasury benches, when the Hon. Mr. BROWN again came before the House asking for a committee, and in that instance with more success. I had the honor to propose an amendment to his motion, but my amendment was rejected, and amongst the members who figure in that unfortunate division, I find the names of the Hon. Minister of Public Works, the Hon. Provincial Secretary, and the Hon. Attorney General East. Mr. SPEAKER, this is a very significant fact, and one extremely deserving of attention at the present moment. In pressing that motion upon the House, I maintained that our policy was to act on the offensive, instead of merely defending ourselves, as we had up to that time done; that we ought to unite as one man to obtain the re-enactment of the proviso to the 26th clause of the Act of Union, which had been shamefully struck out in 1856, when we obtained an elective Legislative Council. (Hear, hear.) Now, on this point, which was perfectly clear, we found these same Ministers voting for the rejection of the amendment, which asserted a right sacred to French-Canadians. Did not this vote imply that those who made this cowardly concession were prepared to yield again in the proposed constitutional changes? Yes, Mr. SPEAKER, I do not hesitate to assert, that

from that moment, Upper Canada understood that our political leaders, who, up to that time, had shown an unyielding front, were about to give way. And when the Hon. Mr. BROWN submitted his proposition to the House, all the English members united in an overwhelming majority, and he carried his point successfully, notwithstanding that all the French-Canadian members voted against it, except the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. POULIN), who displayed the questionable courage of thus committing an act I shall not attempt to qualify. (Hear, hear.) I need not dwell upon the consequences of that vote, for they are now patent to the whole country, and the hon. member for South Oxford himself has told us in this House that the scheme of Confederation was the creation of his constitutional committee; that the appointment of that committee was the first step in the direction of the object for which he had struggled during his whole political career, and that the scheme of Confederation now before the House was an ample reward for his unremitting efforts, and a complete justification of the principles he has supported in the struggle between Upper Canada and Lower Canada. Subsequently, Mr. SPEAKER, the TACHÉ-MACDONALD Government succumbed on a question of finance, and, finding that they could not sustain themselves without the assistance of the Opposition, that same Government called into the Cabinet the man who had proved most hostile to Lower Canadian interests, and with whom they had ever lived in unexampled antagonism. From that alliance resulted the scheme of Confederation which is now submitted to us, and which concedes the principle of representation based on population. Ought the Lower Canadian party to have made so important a concession to Upper Canada? I am prepared to establish by figures that that question contained within itself its own remedy; and those who voted in favor of its concession are in no way justifiable, looking at the question in any point of view whatsoever. The future held out to us a positive assurance that the grounds of this demand would no longer exist at a period which is close at hand! When we look into the question of the respective populations of the two Canadas, we shall observe at a glance that that of Upper Canada is in great part English and Protestant, and, by reference to the last census, we shall find that a very large proportion of the

annual increase in that section is the result of emigration. From 90,000, which was the total amount during the single year 1847, immigration gradually fell to 10,000 in the year 1860. But there is another important fact which it would be well to bear in mind; it is that Lower Canada, which increased slowly at first, because her material and moral development was impeded by the political institutions under which she was governed, and because she had no colonization roads through her forests, still beheld her sturdy children emigrating from their native soil to the United States in search of daily bread and liberty. The increase in the population of Lower Canada was slow and small then; but as railways were built and highways were opened, the population was found to increase in nearly the same proportion as the diminution was observed to be going on, in respect of annual increase, in Upper Canada. I maintain further, Mr. SPEAKER, that the census of 1861 is no basis from which to estimate exactly the total population of the two sections; that census is merely a tissue of errors of a serious nature, which demonstrate the inaccuracy of the whole. Thus when we find it stated that at Three Rivers there is not a single Catholic church; that at Hamilton there is but one; that in the year 1861 there were but three vessels built in Lower Canada, while we know that at Quebec alone more than sixty were constructed, we may with perfect safety assert that similar inaccuracies must needs have occurred in the totals of the populations of the two sections. We know that in Upper Canada the true total of the population has been greatly exaggerated. Did not all their journals declare that the census of 1861 must indicate a very large total population in favor of Upper Canada over Lower Canada? And, accordingly, the result shewed a majority of nearly 300,000 souls in favor of that province. To such an extent was the number of the living increased, and the number of the dead diminished, that the total number of living children under one year old was 8,000 more than the total number of births in the year. (Hear, hear.) I am quite willing to admit that the climate of Upper Canada is most salubrious and highly favorable to the development of that part of the population of a less age than one year, but even then there is some difficulty in understanding how it is that in twelve months some of them do not die, and how

there can be 8,000 more or less than a year old than were born during the preceding twelve months. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) When I observe such results accruing from our official census, I am compelled to believe that it is inaccurate, and that it may be quite as erroneous in respect of the general population. But if in the census the population of Upper Canada was exaggerated, in the case of Lower Canada, on the contrary, it has been considerably diminished. Here our farmers have always stood in dread of the census, because they have a suspicion that it is taken with the sole object of imposing some tax, or of making some draft of men for the defence of the country. Under these circumstances, I consider that the difference between the totals of the population of Upper and Lower Canada is not so well proved as it is wished to have us believe that it is. I maintain that it is less in reality than it is in appearance, and that the figures of the census are not sufficiently accurate to allow of our taking them as the basis of a demand for constitutional changes of so important a character. But if we study the increase of the French-Canadian population in America, we shall find the increase of the French-Canadians to have been 1,700,000 between the years 1760 and 1860, the total having increased tenfold two and a half times in that period, and this is equivalent to 3.40 per cent. per annum, or a doubling of the population in twenty-one years; otherwise an increase of twenty-five times their number in one hundred years. The increase, since 1860, having been 3.60 per cent. in Lower Canada, these figures shew that the natural increase in the Lower Canadian population is greater than it is anywhere else. In Upper Canada the average of births has been 3.40 per cent. per annum, and in Lower Canada it has been 4.10 per cent. per annum; this is equivalent to a greater relative increase of 20 per cent. in favor of Lower Canada over Upper Canada. If a calculation is made of the progressive increase of the French population in Lower Canada, from 1784 to 1851, the following results will be arrived at:—

Per ct. per ann.

From 1784 to 1831	the increase was equal to	2.60
do. 1831 to 1844	do.	to 3.20
do. 1844 to 1851	do.	to 4.25

But the growth of population that would have resulted from this increase has been

diminished by emigration to the United States. The difficulties between the sections of the province have, during long years, driven our youth to foreign countries, and that is why that considerable increase does not appear, by the census, so great as in reality it has been. Thus the total number of French-Canadian emigrants to the United States amounted, in 1841, to 34,000; from 1844 to 1850 the total amounted to 30,000; making, in 1850, a grand total of 64,000 of our countrymen who had passed into foreign lands. With such an emigration going on, it is clear that our population could not increase with rapidity; but now, fortunately, the movement of our population has assumed a contrary direction. Many families have already returned to us, whilst many others are only awaiting a favorable opportunity to return to the country, which they ought never to have left. The French-Canadian population in the United States is still very considerable, as the following figures will show: in the State of Vermont there are 14,000 French-Canadians; in the State of New York 20,000; in Ohio and Pennsylvania, 6,000; in Michigan, 30,000; in Illinois, 20,000; in Wisconsin, 12,000; in Indiana, 5,000; in Minnesota, 15,000—without taking into consideration the fact that nearly 35,000 of our young men, besides, are enrolled in the army of the United States. What took place in Canada also took place in Acadia, where the French population also increased in a manner which was truly astonishing. From 1707 to 1737 this increase amounted to a proportion of 6 per cent. per annum; in thirty years the total had increased fivefold. It continued to increase in nearly a like proportion up to 1755, the memorable date of the deportation of the Acadians. From 1755 to 1855 the Acadians increased tenfold by themselves, and now the French-Acadian population in the Maritime Provinces and in the State of Maine is distributed as follows:—

Newfoundland.....	15,000
Cape Breton.....	16,000
Prince Edward Island.....	15,000
Nova Scotia.....	22,000
New Brunswick.....	25,000
State of Maine.....	5,000

Giving a total of..... 98,000

Let us now enquire, Mr. SPEAKER, what the annual increase has been in Upper Canada. This consideration is an important

one, for it goes to prove that in ten years the total population of Upper and Lower Canada will be equal, and that, consequently, the constitutional changes resulting from the question of representation based on population are not called for:—

In 1830 that increase was	10 per ct.	per annum.
" 1832 do.	8.77	do.
" 1842 do.	6.42	do.
" 1852 do.	5.62	do.
" 1861 do.	4.35	do.
" 1865 it will probably be	3.00	do.

This amounts to saying that in thirty years the proportion of increase has diminished by more than 50 per cent., and that diminution of annual increase has been consequent upon the diminution of immigration. The following figures, which shew the number of immigrants who have come into Upper Canada since the year 1829, shew this clearly:—

Years.	Immigration.
1829 to 1833.....	167,697
1834 to 1838.....	96,351
1839 to 1843.....	123,860
1844.....	20,142
1845.....	25,375
1846.....	32,753
1847.....	90,150
1848.....	27,939
1849.....	33,494
1850.....	32,292
1851.....	41,076
1852.....	39,176
1853.....	36,699
1854.....	53,183
1855.....	21,274
1856.....	22,439
1857.....	32,097
1858.....	12,810
1859.....	8,778
1860.....	10,150
1861.....	19,923
1862.....	22,176
1863.....	19,419
1864.....	19,000

In 1854 we had no railways as we have today, and consequently the European emigration which was directed to the United States did not pass through Canada, as it does now, towards the Western States. In 1854 the immigration was 53,000, and all who landed in Canada settled there at once; but in 1864 the immigration fell to 19,000, of whom not more than one half remained in the country; the remainder went on to the Western States. Thus it may be said that the immigration, which numbered more than 53,000 souls in

1854, has fallen in ten years to 8,000 only for Upper Canada, whilst in Lower Canada we have increased, by natural progress, in the proportion of from 2.20 per cent. to 2.60 per cent. during the same period. And it is just at the time that our population is increasing in this proportion that it is proposed to grant to Upper Canada representation based on population. Why do we not still resist? We are told that if we wait longer the disproportion will be increased. I maintain, according to the above calculations, and in view of other considerations that I shall by and by have the honor to submit to this House, that we can only be the gainers in this matter, because the proportion of our natural increase is increasing, while that of immigration is diminishing. In thirty years, from 1829 to 1860, 942,735 immigrants landed on our shores, nearly all of whom settled in Upper Canada. And there is another fact to which I beg to call the attention of the House, and that is, that the Irish emigration, which amounted in 1851 to 22,381, diminished during the ten following years to 376 in 1861, and it is a well known fact that it was this wholesale deportation from the Emerald Isle which has made the population of Upper Canada what it is to-day. But it is not necessary to consult the census to arrive at the conclusion that the proportionate difference in the increase of the populations of the two sections of the province is only due to the arrival in the country of this million of immigrants. If we study the proportion of births, or of the natural increase, we shall see that Lower Canada has increased its population more rapidly than Upper Canada, and that there are more births in proportion in our section of the province. As these artificial sources of increase diminish in Upper Canada, we may be certain that the equilibrium will be established between the two populations. There is yet another cause which must contribute to reestablish this equilibrium, and I find it in an official report written by the present Honorable Provincial Secretary (Hon. Mr. McDougall) when he was Commissioner of Crown Lands. The cause of colonization has attracted, for several years past, the special attention of our clergy and of the influential inhabitants of the country, so soon as it became generally known that the increase of the population in Upper Canada would lead very soon to constitutional changes, having for their object representation based upon population, with all its disastrous results for the minority. Since that period new colonization

roads have been opened for the surplus population of the old counties, and our youth, instead of expatriating themselves, plunge into the forests to clear the land, and thus to increase the strength of the French element. The cause of the diminution in the increase of Upper Canada, of which I have just spoken, may be found in the important fact that the best disposable lands are nearly exhausted—I do not mean to say that they have lost their fertility, but that they are nearly all occupied. We require no better proof of my assertion than the report of the Honorable Commissioner of Crown Lands for 1862, from which I ask permission to cite the following paragraph:—

It will be observed that the whole quantity of land sold during the past year is less by 252,471 acres than in 1861. The falling off is equal to about 38½ per cent. The fact is significant, and suggests enquiry as to the cause. It may, I think, be attributed to the commercial and monetary derangements resulting from the civil war in the neighboring country; to the retarding influence of that war upon immigration, and to the diminished means of purchasers within the country by reason of the generally deficient harvest of 1862. Another cause may be mentioned, which, in an official view, is more important than either of these, because its influence is not accidental or temporary. It is the fact that the best lands of the Crown in both sections of the province have already been sold. The quantity of really good land now open for sale is, notwithstanding recent surveys, much less than formerly, and is rapidly diminishing. The new surveys in Upper Canada have added, during the last five years, no less than 2,808,172 acres to the land roll of the department. The addition during the same period, in Lower Canada, was 1,968,163 acres. Yet it may be doubted if there are to-day as many acres of wild land of the first quality at the disposal of the department as there were in 1857. The clergy, school and Crown lands of the western peninsula, the most desirable, both as to quality and situation, of all the public lands of the province, are mostly sold; the few lots that remain are generally of inferior quality. The new townships between the Ottawa and Lake Huron contain much good land, but they are separated from the settled townships on the St. Lawrence and north shore of Lake Ontario by a rocky, barren tract, which varies in width from ten to twenty miles, and presents a serious obstruction to the influx of settlers. Moreover, the good land in these new townships is composed of small tracts, here and there, separated from each other by rocky ridges, swamps and lakes, which render difficult the construction of roads, and interrupt the continuity of settlement. These unfavorable circumstances have induced the better class of settlers in Upper Canada to seek, at the hands of private owners, for lands of a better quality and more desirable

location, though the price and terms of sale are more onerous than for the lands of the Crown.

I think that this official report contains a statement of great importance to Lower Canada, and which it is desirable should be clearly demonstrated before we decide whether we ought to change the present Constitution. As the population of Upper Canada is no longer sensibly increased by immigration, and as the natural increase of the population of Lower Canada is more rapid than that of Upper Canada; as the emigration of our countrymen to the United States is ceasing, and as the best lands in Upper Canada are occupied, whilst the territory of Lower Canada is only just beginning to be opened up for settlement, I see no reason why we should make such haste to give up the struggle we have so successfully maintained up to the present time, and, without any just reason, grant representation by population. This is what is said in the same report by the present Hon. Provincial Secretary, and his words agree exactly with my statements:—

In Lower Canada the sales in 1862 reached a little more than double the quantity sold in Upper Canada. The discovery of copper and other minerals in the Eastern Townships and the opening of better means of communication have caused a considerable influx of population into that part of Lower Canada, and a corresponding increase in the demand for unsold public lands. The new surveys on the southern slope of the high lands which border the St. Lawrence between Quebec and Montreal, have developed a very considerable quantity of good land, which is being rapidly taken up.

And what is the consequence of this fact pointed out by the Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands? It is that if the public lands are sold only to settlers, so soon as it is established that the quantity of lands sold in Lower Canada is double that sold in Upper Canada, I am justified in concluding that the extent cleared is also double, and as a necessary consequence, that the population must be increasing in the same proportion. Thence I conclude that the question of representation based upon population tends every day to its own solution. Thus we have a man, who certainly cannot be accused of partiality to Lower Canada, and whose extensive knowledge no one will deny, declaring officially that we are increasing in a much greater proportion than Upper Canada. And it is at the very moment that we are on the point of turning the scale of victory, that we are about to give way and cease from further effort. Our rising generations were emi-

grating to the United States a few years ago, because we had no colonization roads to give them access to the forests of Lower Canada, as we have now; and why had we them not? Because until quite recently, the Hon. Minister of the Department of the Crown Lands, as well as the Hon. Minister of the Department of Agriculture and Emigration, were always Upper Canadians. Upper Canada always understood the importance of those departments as regards the material development of that section of the province. Accordingly, all the measures of improvement were in favor of the western section, and all the immigration was carefully directed thither. Now that we have found out the results of that cleverly devised policy, the Lower Canadian party are more attentive to the colonization of our wild lands, and we find the clergy and all our political and influential men seconding their efforts. We have colonization societies in every quarter, and the result of their labors is the settlement and occupation of our public lands as soon as they are surveyed. Frequently we even see the settlers getting ahead of the parties employed in opening the roads through the forests. These facts are important enough to deserve our serious consideration, more especially as the report of the Hon. Provincial Secretary confirms my statements in every particular. The Canadian families now in the United States are glad to return among us to aid in developing the resources of our country, and if the Government, instead of making changes in the Constitution, were to establish a vast system of colonization, to draw hither our fellow-countrymen from the United States, and an immigration from Europe of those who own a common origin with ourselves, we should have no need to trouble ourselves about the political changes now proposed to us, of which the object is evidently to destroy our influence in America. (Hear, hear.) The intention of the Confederation scheme, we are told by the Ministry, is the formation of a vast Empire, bounded by the Pacific ocean on one side, on the other by the Atlantic ocean, and on the south by the American Union, while on the north it would extend to the Pole, leaving Russian America on the west. No doubt the scheme is a grand one, magnificent in conception, and likely to take with the ambitious minds of the most aspiring men in British North America. The Opposition perfectly understands the noble object of the promoters of the Confederation, which it is proposed to establish on a monarchical basis, in opposition to the American Union,

based on the democratic and republican principle; but the Opposition is also aware that this creation of an Empire presents difficulties of an important character, not only because it is starting into existence in opposition to the neighboring powerful republic, which is essentially opposed to monarchical institutions, but also because the differences of nationality, religion and sectional interests are so many stumbling blocks with which the principal provisions of the scheme of Confederation will come in contact. It must not be believed that the Opposition only oppose the scheme because they do not understand its import. On the contrary they do understand it, and see in it nothing but provisions of a nature hostile to them. At the present day, with sectional equality, Canada constitutes but a single people, who have tendencies and aspirations in common; but under Confederation such will no longer be the case; we shall have a minority opposed to a majority, the aggressive tendencies of which have always manifested themselves whenever the power of numbers was in their favor. If the populations of all the provinces were homogeneous; if their interests, their ideas, their belief and their nationality were identical, we might perhaps be more disposed to accept the by no means judicious provisions of the scheme which is submitted to us. But as none of these are identical, we consider that we should be in danger if we did accept them. Formerly France possessed all this part of the continent; the settlers of that period, the farmers, fishermen, hunters and trappers travelled over the whole extent of those immense possessions which were known by the name of New France. At this moment what remains to her of a territory that was equal in extent to Europe itself? A wretched little island at the entrance of the Gulf, a foothold for her fisheries, and a few acres of beach on the coast of Newfoundland. When we consider that fact, when we see French power completely destroyed on this continent, are we not justified in looking closely into the project of Constitution now submitted to us, which has for its object, I repeat, simply to complete the destruction of the influence of the French race on this continent? Has not the past taught us to dread the future? Yes, Mr. SPEAKER, the policy of England has ever been aggressive, and its object has always been to annihilate us as a people. And this scheme of Confederation is but the continued application of that policy on this continent; its real object is nothing but the annihilation of French influ-

ence in Canada. If we examine history in order to ascertain whether a precedent is to be found for the course of action adopted to-day, we shall derive a valuable lesson from the experience of the past. There was a period, after the conquest of England by the Normans, when the French language was the general and official language of that country, but subsequently the conquerors were compelled to adopt the language of the vanquished. The history of the Parliament of England shews that up to 1425, every bill introduced in the Legislature, without a single exception, was in the French language. But at that date the first English bill was presented to Parliament; and twenty-five years later, in 1450, the last French bill was presented in the English Parliament. After that date we no longer find a trace of the French language in Parliament; twenty-five years had sufficed to do away with it completely. There is another historical fact connected with the political existence of a people, which it is right to recall. We know how long Scotland and Ireland resisted the encroachments of England. The struggle was protracted and obstinate. But these two nations were compelled to succumb to political encroachment, under the pressure of the powerful assimilating tendencies of the English nation. But let us see what means England used to attain her ends. Impartial history tells us, as it will tell of the means employed to-day to annihilate our race on this continent. History records, in letters of gold, the names of those who have bravely struggled for the lives and liberties of nations, but it also holds up to execration the memory of those who barter those liberties and those rights for titles, honor, power, or gold. We now enjoy responsible government, dearly earned by a century of heroic struggles, and before yielding an inch of the ground we have conquered, we should see what we are likely to gain by the proposed constitutional changes. Let us profit by the experience of the countries we now see lamenting the loss of their political rights resulting from constitutional changes similar to those now proposed to Lower Canada. I find the following with reference to the union of Scotland with England in 1706:—

Queen ANNE carried out, in 1706, a project vainly attempted by WILLIAM III., the union of England and Scotland into a single kingdom, under the dominion of Great Britain. The uncontrollable character of the Scotch, the mutual antipathy of the two people, and the constantly recurring difficulties resulting from these principles,

- rendered the measure highly useful at the same time that they increased the obstacles.

Thus, it is clear that the antipathies between the two races produced many obstacles to the English project, and, in order to remove these obstacles, England had recourse to means precisely similar to those adopted here as a preparation for Confederation, namely, the appointment of a conference of commissioners charged with the preparation of the Act of Union. Says M. EMILE DE BONNECHOSE :

These commissioners agreed on the general question, but differences arose as regards the manner in which the English proposed to constitute the new Parliament of the United Kingdom, and while the population of Scotland amounted to a sixth of the population of England, they allowed that kingdom but forty-six members in the Commons, or a thirteenth of the total representation. Sixteen peers only, out of the whole peerage of Scotland, were to be chosen by election, to sit in the English House of Lords. The stringency of these latter clauses, by which the people of Scotland felt themselves aggrieved, excited universal discontent; it was to be expected, particularly at the outset, from a treaty of union between the two nations, that there would be a clashing of material interests prejudicial to the welfare of very many persons, as occurs at the outset in every important political connection. The wounding of their national self-love would of itself have been sufficient to render the people of Scotland insensible to the remote advantages of the compact, and all parties—Whigs and Tories, Jacobites and Williamites, Presbyterians, Episcopalians and Cameronians, combined to defeat it.

Thus we have nearly the whole people uniting to oppose the union it was sought to impose upon them, and yet in face of the all but unanimous opposition of the people of Scotland, England succeeded in forcing them into the union by the use of means she never hesitates to adopt :—

The commissioners of the Government were insulted by the populace, who destroyed the dwellings of many state officials favorable to the union, while they were loud in praise of the Duke of HAMILTON, one of the chief opponents of the measure. The Dukes of QUEENSBERRY and ARGYLE, Earls of MONTROSE, STAIR, ROXBURGH and MARCHEMONT strove in vain to allay by argument and reasoning, the explosion of patriotic feeling and national fury, and what the best arguments could not obtain was carried by corruption. A portion of the gold promised by the English Commissioners as a compensation for the fresh burdens about to be imposed upon the sister kingdom, was divided amongst their Scotch colleagues and many influential members of the Parliament sitting in Edinburgh; thenceforward

all obstacles were removed; the treaty of union, which the Scotch people looked upon as an act of suicide, and which the purest and best men would not have sanctioned, received the assent of a venal majority. In fine, that famous compact, which was denounced as a dishonor to Scotland, which that country looked upon as the yielding up of her interests and her glory, and which was destined to open for her, in subsequent times, an era of unparalleled peace and prosperity, was signed on the 1st May, 1707, and was considered a great triumph by the people of England, already at that time intoxicated with joy at the success of their arms on the continent.

There, Mr. SPEAKER, is an instance of the manner in which the policy of England can overcome even the most justifiable resistance, supported by the unanimous wishes of a people. Scotland looked upon a union with England as an act of suicide, and yet the union was carried by a majority in the Parliament of Edinburgh. I need not dwell at length upon these facts; they speak eloquently for themselves. (Hear, hear.) There is another fact in the parliamentary history of England, of which it is well to remind the House—I mean the abolition of the Irish Parliament. The Honorable Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. McGEE) has told us, in that flowery language which characterises the children of his native soil, that he himself, when scarce twenty years of age, struggled to emancipate his country from the tyranny of England, and not succeeding in his noble undertaking, preferred to exile himself to American soil rather than remain to be a daily spectator of the misfortunes and sufferings of his native land. And yet, what is he now doing? He is trying, with the help of a hostile majority, to thrust upon Lower Canada, his adopted country, a union which is repugnant to her, and to revive here the system of oppression over which he wept in Ireland. (Hear, hear.) Let us see what the means were which were employed to impose upon Ireland that union which was destined to entail the wholesale exodus of her population :—

In the case of Ireland, the contest was a longer one, but England was ultimately triumphant. After the crisis of 1798, (says M. GUSTAVE DE BEAUMONT,) England, holding down rebellious and vanquished Ireland, chastised her unrelentingly and pitilessly. Twenty years previously Ireland again came into possession of her political liberties; England preserved a bitter recollection of this success of Ireland, and took advantage of the depression of the latter to replace her under an absolute yoke. The Irish Parliament, after recovering its independence, became troublesome

to England; it was necessary, in order to master it, to take great pains in corruption, in spite of which great resistance on the part of the Irish Parliament was met with; the opportunity was favorable to suppress it, and in consequence the English Government abolished it.

On the reception of this news, poor Ireland was in an instant in agitation, just as a body which has just been deprived of life stirs again under the steel which mutilates and rends it. Of thirty-two counties, twenty-one loudly exclaimed against the destruction of the Irish Parliament. That Parliament, from whom an act of suicide had necessarily to be asked, refused to consummate it, and by its vote maintained its constitutional existence.

Indignant at the servility which it was dared to ask for from the body of which he formed part, GRATTAN vehemently opposed the Ministerial scheme. But all this resistance was in vain. The only resistance which definitively opposed a serious obstacle to the views of England, was that of the Irish Parliament, which would not vote its own abolition. Hitherto its acts had been bought, and now its death was in like manner purchased. Corruption was at once made use of on an enormous scale; places, pensions and favors of all kinds were lavished in every direction, and the same men who, in 1799, rejected the scheme of union, adopted it on the 26th May, 1800, by a majority of a hundred and eighteen votes against seventy-three, and that majority consisted of either state pensioners or public functionaries. And so, through violence, aided by corruption, was accomplished the destructive act of the Irish Parliament, not without stirring up in Ireland all that remained of national passion and feelings of patriotism.

MR. SPEAKER, when we have such acts as these from which to form an opinion of the politics of England, it is reasonable that those who have not the same reasons for desiring constitutional changes as the hon. members who sit on the Ministerial benches, should, at least, have an opportunity of carefully studying all the details of the measure which is submitted to us. For my part, I am satisfied with the present Constitution, and am ready to defend it against every enemy which may come forward to attack our territory. But I am bound to declare that if that Constitution is changed despite the will of the people, we shall no longer find among the Lower Canadians that impulse for which they have always been distinguished in days gone by, and which enabled them to vanquish a hostile force of double their number. (Hear, hear.) There would appear to have been no reason why the antagonism between the English and French races, to which I alluded as existing in Europe, should have been carried into

America; and yet the strife was continued in the New World, after it had arisen in the old hemisphere. At the present day that strife continues, and despite the protestations of sincere friendship interchanged between Paris and London, we see France and England continually facing each other, sword in hand, feeling for each other that respect which mutual fear alone can inspire. And could it be expected that those feelings of rivalry and antagonism which have always existed, and which still exist at the present day, between the two races, would be effaced from among their Canadian descendants, that we may be fused into one nation? It is an impossibility! Do what you may, the same feelings will always exist. They are blameable, perhaps, but the fact remains—they exist, and form part of the very nature of the two races. The language, the religion, the institutions and the customs of a people are so many obstacles to its union with another people, whose language, religion, institutions and customs are different from theirs. And is it supposed that these feelings of rivalry and these causes of estrangement will be removed on the adoption of the scheme of Confederation which is proposed to us? For my part, I would wish in Canada to see the two nationalities rival each other in progress in the useful works of peace. This rivalry, not of strife hand to hand, but a rivalry in the laudable ambition which has for its object the realizing of the greatest prosperity known, the attaining of the highest excellence in the sciences, and of the most profound secrets of art, would confer upon our country a degree of power equal to what has resulted from the combined strength of England and France, which has, up to the present, been employed to impel the world towards the prodigies which have been realized in the nineteenth century. With equality of numbers, and of sectional representation, the two nationalities cannot fall foul of each other; but with Confederation, as we shall be in a great minority in the General Parliament, which has all the important powers in relation to legislation, we shall have to carry on a constant contest for the defence and preservation of our political rights and of our liberty. Under the union the French Canadians are divided in this House into two camps, opposed the one to the other, because they have nothing to fear in regard to their national interests; but under Confederation, as we shall have but forty-eight

French members against one hundred and forty-six in the Federal Legislature, those members will have to go together like one man to maintain their influence, and the simple fact of that union of the French-Canadians into a solid phalanx will cause the English element to unite on its side to crush and vanquish it. It is because I fear such a strife that I cannot approve of a Constitution which does not secure our political rights, and the working of which will necessarily entail disastrous consequences to our race. (Hear, hear.) The strife of nationalities which has been too long maintained in Europe appeared to have no cause of existence in America. It appeared that there was on this continent room enough and prospects enough to allow everybody, of all principles and of all nationalities, to live in peace upon it, without jostling and falling foul of each other. It appeared that those who had emigrated from the old world should have at heart the formation of powerful nations on this continent, without introducing the religious and national hatred which had for so long a time divided Europe, and deluged her in blood. And yet what do we see here? We have seen France, who first of all despatched the apostles of Christianity into the vast solitudes of North America—France, who first planted her noble flag on the Island of Montreal and the heights of Quebec—we have seen France deprived of the last inch of the soil which she had conquered on this continent, bequeathing to her children, abandoned in Canada, but a future of struggles and contests against the encroaching spirit of her powerful rival. (Hear, hear.) From the commencement of the French domination in America, we have seen reproduced here the strifes which divided the European continent. Towns and villages were destroyed as though there was not room enough in this new world for the few handfuls of men who came to inhabit it. The first scene of this inexcusable description occurred in Acadia, in 1613. GARNEAU makes the following remarks on this subject:—

In 1612 LA SAUSSAYE began, on the left bank of the Penobscot river, a settlement which he called St. Sauveur. All went well at first, and flattering hopes were entertained at once of success beyond all expectation, when an unlooked for storm burst over the colony and stifled it in its cradle.

England claimed the country as far as the 45th degree of north latitude—that is to say, all the

continent to the northward as far as the heart of Acadia. France, on the other hand, maintained that her boundary ran southward as far as the 40th degree. From this dispute it resulted that, while LA SAUSSAYE thought himself within the boundary of New France at St. Sauveur, the English declared that he was deep in their territory. To maintain the claim, Captain ARGALL of Virginia resolved to go and dislodge him, incited by the hope of obtaining a rich booty, and by his prejudices against Catholics, who had been the cause of the ruin of POUTRINCOURT.

Thus in 1612, in other words only two or three years after the founding of Quebec, we already find religious and national strife beginning their work of exclusiveness on our continent, and that strife we shall again have to engage in, disagreeable as it may be. I proceed:—

He appeared suddenly before St. Sauveur with a vessel mounting 14 guns, and spread dismay among the defenceless inhabitants, who took him at first for a pirate. Father GILBERT DU THET vainly endeavored to offer a slight resistance; he was killed, and the settlement given up to pillage. Everything was carried off or sacked, ARGALL himself setting the example.

To legalize this act of piracy (for such it was), he stole LA SAUSSAYE's commission, and pretended to look upon him and his people as unaccredited adventurers. Gradually, however, he seemed to soften, and proposed to those who had trades to follow him to Jamestown, from whence, after having worked for one year, they should be sent back to their native land. The offer was accepted by a dozen of them. The remainder, with LA SAUSSAYE and Father MASSE, preferred to risk themselves in a frail vessel with the object of reaching La Hève, where they found a vessel of St. Malo, which conveyed them to France.

Those who trusted to ARGALL's word were greatly surprised, on their arrival at Jamestown, to find that they were thrown into prison and treated as pirates. In vain they claimed the fulfilment of the treaty which they had made with him; they were condemned to death. ARGALL, who had not supposed that the abstraction of LA SAUSSAYE's commission would have such serious results, did not think that he ought to carry dissimulation any further, and gave up the commission to the Governor, Sir THOMAS DALE, and confessed all. That document, and information which was obtained in the course of the enquiry into the matter, caused the government of Virginia to resolve to drive the French from all the places occupied by them to the south of the line 45. A squadron of three vessels was placed under the command of the same man, ARGALL, in order to put that resolution in execution.

The fleet began by destroying all that remained of the old habitation of Ste. Croix—a useless vengeance, as it had been abandoned for several years; its course was then directed towards Port

Royal, where nobody was found (all the people being in the fields, two leagues away), and in less than two hours all the houses, together with the fort, were reduced to ashes.

Well, Mr. SPEAKER, this scene of devastation and vandalism on our continent, which at that period contained hardly a thousand white inhabitants, gives the clue to all the events which followed from that date up to the conquest of Canada by the English. This fact is a corroboration of the principle that provides that the stronger nation shall oppress the weaker, unless by special circumstances the one is protected against the other. This is the proof that the sectional equality secured by the system of government which we now possess has alone been effective in Canada to enable different nationalities to live together on terms of equality, and to labor successfully for the advancement of the common prosperity. (Hear, hear.) But the strife which began in 1613, between France and England, became more deadly after a century and a half of occupation; it spread along the whole frontier of New France. At the instigation of the rival race, Indian tribes fell upon all the French settlements in the country, and an incessant and vindictive war was kept up with the sole object of driving the French off the continent. We know at the present day what the result of that contest was. We are told that we have no reason to complain of the system of government which we now have. That is true. But if we have that government it is because, ever since the conquest, the remnant of the French nation which remained in the land have striven bravely to obtain it. Had it not been for the American revolution, we too would have had our large share of suffering and humiliation, similar to that which the Acadians were made to undergo. The treatment to which they were subjected by England is an example of what might have happened to us, but for our number, and, subsequently, but for the vicinity to us of the American Republic. There was in Acadia a nucleus of French people, who lived peaceably and happily, and who had submitted to English domination without a murmur; and yet, because they were weak and had no longer the arm of France to protect them, they were transported, like negroes on the coast of Africa, by philanthropic England. This is an important historical fact which must not be forgotten, and the details of which it is well to set before the eyes of our population, at a time when the

English element is pursuing, with a persistence worthy of a better cause, the aggressive and encroaching policy concealed under the scheme of Confederation which is submitted to us. The hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. MORRIS) told us the other day that we ought to thank England, and be most grateful to her for the system of government which we received from her. But to whom do we owe that system? Do we owe it to the liberality of England? Did we not obtain our political rights only at the time when she could no longer refuse them to us with safety? No, Mr. SPEAKER, our gratitude and our thanks are only due to those fellow-countrymen of ours who at all times bravely strove to obtain them. When we see French colonies which still groan under the English colonial system, and which complain to Europe of the treatment to which they are subjected, the conclusion must be come to that we owe nothing to England, but that on the contrary we owe all to those who, after an age of strife, obtained for us that governmental reform which we enjoy. In order that our people may form a correct opinion of that liberality which is so highly vaunted to us, allow me here, Mr. SPEAKER, to quote a few pages of the history of the Acadian people:—

The war of 1774 began their misfortunes; that of the seven years completed its total ruin. For some time the English agents acted with the greatest severity; the courts, by the most flagrant violation of the law, by systematic denial of justice, had become to the poor inhabitants an object at once of terror and of hatred. The most subordinate official insisted on obedience to his will. "If you do not supply wood to my troops," said a certain Captain MURRAY, "I will tear down your houses and use them for fuel." "If you will not take the oath of fidelity," added Governor Hopson, "I will turn my cannon against your villages." Nothing could induce these honorable men to do an act against which their consciences exclaimed, and which, in the opinion of many people, England had no right to demand from them. "The Acadians," observes Mr. HALIBURTON, "were not British subjects, as they had not taken the oath of allegiance, and they could not, therefore, be considered rebels; nor were they to be looked upon as prisoners of war, nor to be sent to France, as for nearly half a century they had been allowed to retain their possessions, on the simple condition of remaining neutral." But many schemers and adventurers looked at their fine farms with an envious eye. What fine inheritances, and, consequently, what a bait! It was not difficult for them to find political reasons to justify the expulsion of the Acadians. By far the

greater number had committed no act whatever inconsistent with neutrality; but, in the great catastrophe which was impending, the innocent were to be placed in the same category with the guilty. Not one inhabitant had been deserving of mercy. Their fate was decided in Governor LAWRENCE'S Council, at which were present Admirals BOSCAWEN and MOSTYN, whose fleets were cruising on the coast. It was resolved to disperse through the English colonies the remnant of this unfortunate people; and in order that none might escape, the most profound secrecy was enjoined up to the moment fixed for the removal, which was to take place on the same day and at the same hour in all parts of Acadia at once. It was decided also, in order to make the success more complete, to bring together the inhabitants of the principal places. Proclamations, prepared with perfidious skill, invited them to meet in certain places under the most severe penalties. Four hundred and eighteen heads of families, relying on the British faith, so assembled on the 6th of September in the Church of Grand-Pré. Colonel WINSLOW went thither with a large attendance. There he showed them the commission which he held from the Governor, and informed them that they had been called together to hear the final decision of the King with respect to them. He declared to them that, although the duty which he had to perform was a most painful one to him, he was compelled, in obedience to his orders, to inform them "that their lands and their cattle, of all kinds, were confiscated to the Crown, together with all their other property, except their money and their clothing, and that they themselves were to be deported from the province." No motive was assigned for this decision, and none could be assigned. In full civilization and in a time of political and religious quiet, such an act of spoliation was inexcusable, and, like the usurper, had to conceal its criminality by silence. A body of troops which had been kept concealed up to that point, emerged from their ambush and surrounded the church. The inhabitants, taken by surprise and unarmed, offered no resistance. The soldiers collected the women and children; 1,023 men, women and children were collected at Grand-Pré alone. Their cattle consisted of 1,269 oxen, 1,557 cows, 5,007 calves, 493 horses, 3,690 sheep, and 4,197 swine. A few Acadians having escaped into the woods, the country was devastated to prevent their obtaining subsistence. At Les Mines, 275 barns, 155 other small buildings, 12 mills and one church were burned. Those who had rendered the greatest services to the Government, such as the old notary LE BLANC, who died at Philadelphia of grief and misery, while seeking his sons scattered through the English provinces, were no better treated than those who had favored the French. No distinction was made. The men included in both classes were allowed, and it was the only consolation allowed them, before their embarkation to visit, in parties of ten, their families, and to gaze for the last time on that country which was once so calm and happy, in which they were

born, and which they were never to see again. The 10th was the day fixed for their embarkation. A calm resignation had succeeded to their first despair. But when the time came for them to bid a last adieu to their country, to go and live dispersed in the midst of a people foreign in language, in customs, in manners and in religion, the courage of these unfortunate people gave way, and they gave themselves up to the most profound grief. In violation of the promise which had been made them, and by an unexampled refinement of barbarity, families were separated and dispersed throughout different vessels. In order to put them on board, the prisoners were arranged in sixes, with the young people in front. These having refused to march, and having claimed the fulfilment of the promise made them, that they should be put on board with their relatives, they were replied to by the advance of soldiers with their bayonets crossed. The road from the Grand-Pré chapel to the river Gaspereaux was a mile in length; it was lined on both sides by women and children, who, on their knees and bathed in tears, encouraged them by calling down blessings on their heads. The sad procession moved slowly along, praying, and singing hymns. The heads of families walked after the youth; at last the procession reached the shore, the men were put into some vessels and the women and children into others, pell-mell, without any regard whatever for their comfort. Governments have committed acts of cruelty under the impulse of unreflecting anger, but they had been provoked and irritated by aggression and repeated attacks. There is no example in modern days of chastisement inflicted on a peaceable and inoffensive people with so much premeditation, barbarity and coolness as that to which allusion is now being made.

On the same day and at the same hour, all the other Acadian settlements presented the same spectacle of desolation. The vessels, laden with the numerous victims, sailed for the different provinces where they were to be dispersed. They were thrust ashore on the coast between Boston and Carolina, without bread and without protection, and were left to the charity of the inhabitants of the country in which they might happen to be.

For many days after their departure, their cattle might be seen collecting around the ruins of their dwellings, and their dogs passed the nights in pitiful howlings at the absence of their masters. Happy even in their grief, they did not know to what extremes avarice and ambition can impel mankind.

Well, Mr. SPEAKER, these are facts which it is important to remember. Here is a French colony, situated a few hundred leagues from Canada, deported in a body, and the remnant of which long after returned to the same territory. Still more, it is with the descendants of a small part of these exiles that it is now proposed to unite us. But a few months ago, I went among those people, and when I saw the magnificent

properties of which they had been so brutally despoiled, in order that they might be conferred upon their executioners, in spite of myself, I remembered their moving history, and that sight, I must say, did not tend to induce me to accept the scheme of Confederation without carefully considering all its details. I repeat, Mr. SPEAKER, these are facts which must not be forgotten. (Laughter, and whispering on the right.) To see the manner, Mr. SPEAKER, in which certain members of this House receive the account contained in one of the saddest pages of the history of New France, one would really believe that the facts which I have cited never occurred, and do not convey any instruction for the future. However, I am not surprised at such conduct on their part, when they can approve of a plan of a Constitution which contains a clause by which the Imperial Government is enabled even to change our name of Canadians to give us any one they may think proper. The recollection of our struggles cannot be very vivid in their memory, and the love of their nationality must be very weakly rooted in their hearts, to allow of their consenting to lose, with the name of Canadians, the memory of an heroic past. (Hear, hear.) Under Confederation, Canada will be no longer a country possessing a distinct individuality, and her own history and customs, but she will be a state in the Confederacy, the general name of which will cause the special name of each province of which it is composed to disappear. Look at the states of the American Union; the name of the United States does away with that of the individual states. So with Canada; the name of the Confederacy will be that by which we shall be known in foreign lands. For my part, I am proud of our history and of my designation of Canadian, and I wish to keep it. I am not one of those who can listen without interest to the recital of the heroic struggles of the French race in America, as the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. POULIN) can do; for I am of opinion that considerations of nationality, of family, of language, and of origin ought to be most dear to a people, although they would appear to possess no importance or interest whatever in the eyes of the hon. member. (Hear, hear.)

[It being six o'clock, the House rose, to resume at half-past seven, P.M. At that hour Mr. PERRAULT continued.]

Mr. SPEAKER, at the time when I broke

off in my observations in consequence of the adjournment at six o'clock, I was engaged in shewing what was the spirit of antagonism and strife which prevailed on the American continent up to 1755. We saw Acadia made a prey to the attacks of New England, and lastly, we saw her population dispersed over the inhospitable shores of this continent which border on the Atlantic ocean. New France had thus lost the greater part of her territory in America. The seven years' war advanced with the strides of a giant, and every day saw the French element confined within narrower boundaries. After a prolonged contest, during which handfuls of men struggled with armies of ten times their number, when they were without bread, without munitions of war and almost without hope, the battle of the Plains of Abraham struck the last blow to the French power in America. In the following year the battle of Ste. Foye, which took place on the 28th April, 1760, soon compelled the Canadians to capitulate, although they were the victors in that battle, and the English were compelled to take shelter behind the walls of Quebec. In the treaty of capitulation, England guaranteed to the French-Canadians the free exercise of their form of worship, the preservation of their institutions, the use of their language and the maintenance of their laws. After this struggle on the field of honor, which called down upon the French-Canadians a most magnificent tribute of praise from their Governor, we shall find them engaged in a new struggle, a political struggle, yet more glorious than that which had preceded the cession of Canada to England. But permit me here, Mr. SPEAKER, to quote the eulogium pronounced on the Canadians by Governor VAUDREUIL in a letter which he wrote to the ministers of LOUIS XIV. :—"With this beautiful and extensive country France loses 70,000 souls, who are of a nature so seldom found, that never yet were people so docile, so brave, and so attached to their prince." These qualities, for which the French-Canadians were distinguished at that period, still exist in the hearts of the population at the present day. At the present day still they are loyal, brave and attached to monarchical institutions; they love firmly-established institutions, and the guarantees of peace accorded by a great power, and the struggles through which they have had to pass under English domination have been the best proofs of their loyalty. If we study the history of our struggles since the cession of Canada, we

shall find that our public men were always attached to the Crown of England up to the time when they were compelled by the arbitrary and unjust conduct of the Imperial Government to have recourse to arms to obtain respect for our political rights and our liberties; and it was thus in 1837 that we gained responsible government. (Hear, hear.) But in order to hold up to view the spirit of aggression and encroachment which has always characterised the English population in America, I shall give an historical sketch of the struggles through which we had to pass, in the course of a century, to attain at last our present Constitution, which it is my wish to preserve, but which our Ministers wish to destroy in order to substitute for it the scheme of Confederation. This historical sketch will demonstrate to us that we owe no gratitude to England for those political reforms which were obtained for us only through the unyielding patriotism of our great men, who, with intelligence, energy and perseverance, valiantly strove for the constant defence of our rights. We shall also see that, if they obtained the system of government and the political liberty for which they struggled, it was because we had for our neighbors the states of the American Union, and that side by side with the evil was its remedy. We shall see that whenever England stood in need of us to defend her power, she made concessions to us; but that when the danger was once over, colonial fanaticism always attempted to withdraw those concessions and to destroy the influence and the liberties of the French race. Each page of the parliamentary history of our country offers a fresh proof of this. But we then had men who knew how to struggle for a noble cause, and who did not shrink from the danger which that struggle entailed. I hope, Mr. SPEAKER, that we have still some of those men without fear and without reproach in Lower Canada; I hope the present Ministry are sincere at the moment when they are giving up the guarantees of the existing Constitution. If they can arrive at a happy conclusion with their scheme of Confederation, I shall be the first to congratulate them, and posterity will thank them for having had the hardihood to propose so vast a scheme. But I must say that there are men as intelligent and as devoted to the dearest interests of our country as the hon. gentlemen who are sitting on the Ministerial benches, who are

convinced that this scheme, far from being a remedy for existing difficulties, is but a new engine prepared by our natural adversaries more easily to destroy the influence of the French race in America, an influence for the preservation of which we have had to fight step by step ever since the commencement of English domination in Canada. (Hear, hear.) The first political struggle between the French and the English elements in the country occurred only a few years after the treaty of capitulation had been signed. The general then commanding in Canada established a system of military government. There may have been ground for such a system after so long and bloody a war as that which was just over, and which had left behind it so much legitimate animosity in the hearts of the conqueror and the conquered. However, the treaty of capitulation declared that the Canadians should be "subjects of the king," and as such they were entitled to representative government. The faith of treaty was therefore violated from the commencement of the English domination in Canada, and as I shall have the honor of shewing, this was but the first link in the long chain of arbitrary acts to which we have been subjected since that period. The following, Mr. SPEAKER, is the first aggressive act that I shall cite in support of my statement:—

In 1764 General MURRAY, in accordance with his instructions, formed a new council, uniting the executive, legislative and judicial power, and composed of the lieutenant-governors of Montreal and Three Rivers, the chief justice, the inspector of customs, and eight influential persons. But one obscure man of the country was taken to make up the number.

This was the first act that had to be complained of.—

It was proposed to take possession of the bishopric of Quebec, together with the property attached to it, and to confer it on the Bishop of London, and to grant to the Catholics only limited toleration, to exact from them the oath of allegiance, and to declare them incapable, as Catholics, of holding any public office. Justice was administered by men ignorant of the laws of the country, and in a language with which the Canadians were unacquainted.

It is unnecessary to make any lengthened comments on the entirely unjust manner in which the Canadians were thus treated, and on the flagrant violations of the conditions of the treaty of capitulation of Montreal.

But we shall soon see that the fear of impending danger was alone effective to obtain for us political liberty, for at that time the French element alone could sustain the English power in America :—

The English partisans assembled at Quebec in October, 1773, to prepare an address with the view of obtaining a House of Assembly.

And this was the reply made to them by the Imperial Government through one of the Ministry :—

As to an Assembly of Protestants only, I see no objection to the establishment of one ; but the danger of disobliging the Catholics of the Province, who are so much superior in number. * * *

This was the sole consideration which was effective to prevent the carrying out of the proposition of 1773, to establish a Canadian House of Assembly composed of Protestants only, and yet out of a population of 80,000 souls, 500 families only were at the time English and Protestants. What greater injustice could be done us ? But the English element made yet other propositions to the Imperial Government :—

Six different suggestions were made in relation to the new forms of government which it was wished to introduce : 1st—The establishment of a House of Assembly composed exclusively of Protestants, as the English understood the proclamation of the month of October, 1873, to provide, was asked for. 2nd—An Assembly composed of equal numbers of Catholics and Protestants. 3rd—An Assembly composed almost entirely of Protestants, with a limited number of Catholics. 4th—To delegate to the Governor and his council sufficient power to control the province by increasing the number of the members who should be all Protestants ; or, 5th—Protestants and Catholics. 6th—Or again, Protestants with a restricted and limited number of Catholics.

Thus, from the very first attempt made to give to French Canada a political organization, we find the most shameless exclusiveness forming the basis of the propositions suggested. There were hardly 3,000 English colonists against 75,000 French, and already we were denied any representation in the Governor's Council, there to set forth the requirements of the country and to watch over the defence of our rights.—

The Cursitor Baron (MASERES) prepared a bill by which he suggested the raising of the number of the members of the Council to thirty-one ; that the latter should be independent of the governor, instead of being subject to suspension ; that the quorum should be fixed at seventeen ; and further that it should not have the power of imposing

taxes ; that it should be appointed for seven years, and should be composed of Protestants ; provisions which were calculated to exclude from the management of affairs and from office the French and Catholic element.

Always exclusion of Catholics, and consequently of the French element. But what resulted ? Did the French remain unmoved in view of the danger which was impending over them ? No ! On the receipt of the news they signed petitions, and obtained from England the justice which was refused to them here :—

Our unfortunate ancestors, however, did not remain idle under the threats and injustice of their adversaries—the colonies were possessed of men capable of judging and of foreseeing events. Petitions were prepared and signed, in the month of December, 1773, of which the tenor was as follows : “ In the year 1764 Your Majesty was pleased to terminate the military government in this colony and to introduce civil government into it, and from the date of those changes we began to be aware of the inconveniences resulting from the British laws, which up to that time had been unknown to us. Our old citizens who had, without cost, settled our difficulties, were thanked ; that militia, which considered it glorious to bear that great name, was suppressed. We were, indeed, allowed the right of being jurors, but at the same time we were shewn that there were obstacles to our holding office. The introduction of the laws of England was talked of—laws which are infinitely wise and useful for the Mother Country, but which could not be made to coincide with our customs without overturning our fortunes and entirely destroying our possessions. * * * Deign, illustrious and gracious Sovereign, to remove these fears by granting us our ancient laws, privileges and customs, with the limits of Canada such as they used to be. * * * Deign to distribute equally your benefits to all your subjects, without distinction. * * * And to grant us in common with the rest, the rights and privileges of English citizens ; then * * * we shall be always ready to sacrifice them for the glory of our prince and the well-being of our country.”

And such has always been the sentiment of the French population in America ; it has always been loyal to authority, from the moment of obtaining that protection to which it was entitled. In view of the difficult position in which England was placed, the requests of the Canadians having been favorably received, constituted the basis of the Act of 1774. Circumstances were indeed difficult. The policy of the Mother Country had alienated her subjects in New England. The idea of taxing the colonies to provide

for the requirements of the Imperial Treasury had given rise to deep indignation on this side of the Atlantic. And that ill-advised colonial policy it was that lost to England her American colonies. Taught by this revolt, England perceived that she must grant greater political liberties to her French colonists in Canada. They would not withdraw themselves from English domination; on the contrary, they wished to remain under her flag, for they feared being drawn into the neighboring republic, the future greatness of which was not at the time foreseen. Impelled by the dread of losing what possessions remained to her in America, England had to yield the concessions which Canada asked for from her at a time when the war of independence called for the coöperation of the French element. GARNEAU says:—

When war with the English colonies in America was apprehended, prejudice was overcome in order to make the Canadians favorably disposed, by granting them the Act of 1774, known as the "Act of Quebec." This imperial statute, establishing a Legislative Council, entrusted, together with the Governor, with the duty of making laws, again guaranteed to us the free exercise of our religion, maintained our laws and our customs, and released the Catholics from the necessity, in order to become members of the Council, of taking an oath contrary to their religion.

This was what the war of the independence of the United States was worth to us. England saw that if she dissatisfied the Canadians there would be an end to her power in America, and then only did she grant to French Canada the Quebec Act, which was a step towards the obtaining of greater liberties. The other day, the Hon. Attorney General for Lower Canada read us several passages from our history, to prove to us that French-Canadian hands had alone prevented the annihilation of English domination on this continent. But he did not draw all the conclusions which he might have derived from the premises which he adduced, and the facts which he cited. He ought to have told us whether, in the face of those services valiantly rendered, it is just that the English element, supported by its number, should to-day impose upon us representation based on population; ought the English element, by this aggressive measure, to shake our loyalty to England by creating a system of government which is repugnant to us, and in which the French

element will lose its just share of influence in the administration of the affairs of our country? At this period it was that an address was sent to the Canadians by the American Congress, calling upon them to unite with them in the insurrection against the Mother Country:—"Seize," said the Congress, "seize the opportunity which Providence itself affords you; if you act in such way as to preserve your liberty, you will be effectually free." Mr. SPEAKER, everyone knows the reply made by the Canadians to this appeal. Armies invaded our territory, and took possession of a part of the country. Quebec alone held out, thanks to a garrison composed in part of French-Canadians. And if we are now sheltered beneath the folds of the British flag, it is to French-Canadians that we owe it, and it is them that England ought to thank. But if it is proposed now to thrust upon us a political system, the sole object of which is to submerge us in a hostile majority, we have to thank the English for it—the English for whom our fathers saved the country in 1775. After the defeat of the Americans before Quebec, Congress did not lose courage. A second manifesto was despatched to Canada, promising fresh reinforcements; eminent men even came into the country; FRANKLIN, CHASE and CARROLL in vain solicited the Canadians to unite with them. Dr. CARROLL, who died in 1815 Bishop of Baltimore, was sent among the Canadian clergy with no better success, and all hope of obtaining possession of this important colony had at last to be relinquished. These facts necessarily tended to enlighten public opinion, and England perceived that it would be better for her to comply with the just demands of the Canadian people, in order that reliance might be placed upon them in the day of danger, and that they might be used as a rampart against the United States. Then it was that a more liberal Constitution was granted to us, that of 1791:—

PITT, taught by the former faults of England in the administration of the United States, and by the great example of his father, Lord CHATHAM, presented to the House of Commons a bill for granting to Canada a new Constitution, sanctioning the elective principle and dividing the colony into two distinct provinces, Upper and Lower Canada. The bill, after undergoing some amendments (one of which was to increase the representation from thirty to fifty members), passed on a division in both Houses. The celebrated statesman BURKE, when giving in his assent to the bill,

said: "To attempt to unite people who differ in language, in laws and in manners, is very absurd. To do so is to sow the seeds of discord, a thing most undoubtedly fatal to the establishment of a new government. Let their Constitution be adapted to their nature, the only solid basis of every government." The no less celebrated leader of the Whig party, Fox, opposed to the division of the provinces, spoke to obtain an elective Legislative Council for Canada. "With such a colony as this," observed that orator, "which is susceptible of progress, it is important that no ground should be given her to envy her neighbors. Canada ought to remain attached to Great Britain by the choice of her inhabitants; it cannot be preserved in any other way. But that this may be so, the inhabitants must feel that their situation is not worse than that of the Americans."

This Constitution of 1791 was a great concession to Lower Canada. At last it had an elective chamber, in which the people might express their views, and through which they could convey their wishes to the foot of the Throne. And also at once was seen a generation of eminent men, of whom history will honorably preserve the sainted names, representing the interests which were entrusted to them with wonderful skill and most uncommon success:—

The elections were fixed for the month of July, and the meeting of the Houses for the month of December. Of the fifty members elected sixteen were English, notwithstanding the constant opposition which these latter had displayed to French-Canadian interests.

Thus on the organizing of the first elective chamber, and in spite of all the opposition which the French-Canadian party had met with from the English party, we find sixteen English members elected in great part by the votes of individuals of our nationality. In this House, some days since, we heard Upper Canadian members, praising our liberality, and acknowledging that never had national or religious fanaticism been displayed by us. That is true; we are essentially liberal and tolerant, and a sufficient proof of it, is given in the most striking manner, by the number of members of this House who, although of religion and origin differing from ours, yet represent counties in great part or exclusively French and Catholic. This is a subject of pride for us. Unfortunately we have no return in kind made to us, and we do not meet with the like liberality from the English population. Whenever it is in a majority, it closes to us the door of honors and of office; it excludes us everywhere, where it is powerful enough to do so. From

the very first Parliament of Lower Canada, the English, although in an insignificant minority, endeavored to proscribe the use of the French language, and from that day began between the two races the same contests of which we are to-day witnesses. We are told that times have changed; it is true, but if the attempts at oppression are less barefaced, if they are concealed under an exterior better calculated to deceive us, it is only because we are more numerous now than we were then, and that greater dread than ever is entertained of the vicinity of the American Union, in which, now more than ever, it would be easy for our population to find a powerful remedy for the evils of which it might have to complain. But let us see, Mr. SPEAKER, what occurred at the opening of our first House of Assembly. I quote an author who has always supported the party of the Honorable Attorney General East:—

Parliament opened on the 17th December, in the Episcopal Palace, which had been occupied by the Government since the conquest. A Speaker had to be chosen, and Mr. J. PANET was proposed. Then it was that the English members were found to renew their attempts to obtain the supremacy and to slight the interests of those by whom they had been elected. Without the least delicacy and in spite of their being in a minority, they proposed in opposition to Mr. PANET, Messrs. GRANT, MCGILL and JORDAN. Mr. PANET's election was carried by a majority of 28 to 18, two Canadians having voted against him. The hatred which the English party bore to the name of Canadian manifested itself again when a proposition was made that the minutes of the proceedings of the House should be prepared in both languages. A lively and animated debate arose between the two opposite parties, and this very reasonable demand was treated as a species of rebellion against the Mother Country. The French members were accused of insubordination; the motives which induced the act seemed to be misunderstood, and attempts were even made to intimidate them; but it was in vain. The unassailable arguments upon which the Canadians rested their claim, and their words, like their eloquence, bearing the stamp of dignity, finally triumphed over the attacks of their fanatical opponents.

Thus the French element demanded the preparation of the proceedings of the House in its own language, but we find that the English element opposed it with all the power at its command. This was regarded as rebellion against the Mother Country! It can hardly be believed. Here was a legislative body almost entirely French in its com-

position, and at the very first sitting the few English members which it contained, after having attempted to force on the very great majority a Speaker of their own origin, subsequently refused to nine-tenths of the population of the country the imprescriptible right to their language as the official language. But they were counting without taking into consideration the resolute firmness of which the Canadians of old so often gave proof in the defence of their rights; and I can convey to the honorable members of this House no higher opinion of the lofty sentiments of these great patriots of the olden time, than by quoting the remarks made by one of the members, Mr. DE LOTBINIÈRE, during the debate in question:—

The second reason, which is to assimilate and attach more promptly the Canadian race to the Mother Country, ought to set aside every other consideration, if we were not certain of the fidelity of the people of this province; but let us do justice to their conduct at all times, and especially let us remember the year 1775. These Canadians, who spoke nothing but French, showed their attachment to their sovereign in a manner which admitted of no doubt being cast upon it. They assisted in the defence of the province. This city, these walls, this very House in which I have the honor to raise my voice, were, in part, saved by their zeal and their courage. We saw them unite with the faithful subjects of His Majesty and repulse the attacks made by people who spoke very good English, upon this town. It is not uniformity of language, therefore, Mr. SPEAKER, that makes people more faithful or more united among themselves. To convince ourselves of this, let us glance at France at this moment and at all the kingdoms of Europe. No, I repeat, it is not uniformity of language that maintains and ensures the fidelity of a people; it is the certainty of its present good fortune, and of this our people are at present perfectly convinced. They know that they have a good king—the best of kings. They know that they are under a just and liberal government; and, lastly, they know that a change or a revolution would entail certain loss upon them, and they will ever be prepared to oppose any such proceeding with vigor and courage.

MR. DUFRESNE (Montcalm) — Mr. SPEAKER, I hope the honorable member for Richelieu will excuse my interrupting him for a moment. I wish to ask a simple question. Will the hon. member inform me what difference there is between a member who reads his speech and another who reads the history of Canada to the House?

MR. PERRAULT—I reply to the hon. member for Montcalm, that the speech read

to us by the hon. member for Montmorency, the other evening, was written out from the first line to the last. Not only did he read to us the passages which he took from history or the quotations which he made from the speeches of other members of this House, but also his own remarks on those extracts. I only read here quotations from authors, which serve as vouchers upon which to base my arguments. If I did not read them, it might be supposed that I only expressed my own private opinions, whereas they are those of a friend of the present Government. Although I coincide in the ideas and opinions which I quote, yet I do not choose to appropriate them as my own, but wish to leave all the merit and the responsibility of them to the author of them.

MR. DUFRESNE (Montcalm) — The only difference I can discover between the hon. member for Montmorency and the hon. member for Richelieu, is that the former read his own work, and that the latter is rendering himself guilty of plagiarism. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

MR. PERRAULT — Everyone knows, Mr. SPEAKER, that the hon. member for Montcalm has no reason to fear a similar accusation, for the excellent reason that his writings and his speeches are nowhere to be found. At the time when the member for Montcalm interrupted me so very inoffensively, Mr. SPEAKER, I was quoting a passage from M. DE LOTBINIÈRE's speech on the subject of the opposition offered to the publication of the proceedings of the House of Assembly in 1791 in French, in order to demonstrate the spirit of exclusiveness which animated the English element from the commencement of our parliamentary system, notwithstanding the insignificant minority in which they were at the time. But that barefaced attempt was unsuccessful, and the amendment proposed, having for its object the proscription of the French language, was refused by two-thirds of the House. It was finally resolved that the minutes of the proceedings of the House should be in both languages, and that the English or the French version should be the text of the Legislative acts according as they related to the English or the French laws. Thus opposition to the French element manifested itself from the commencement of our parliamentary system in this country, by the refusal to adopt the French as the official language. But, thanks to our sturdy resistance, the use of that language has always been one of our privileges, a privilege which has

always been preserved in all its integrity until its introduction into the scheme of Confederation which is proposed to us. Had it not been for the courage and energy displayed by the men of those days, the French element would have lost ground, and its importance would have diminished, so that at last it would have been assimilated by the English element. At that time, our public men already wished for responsible government, and we shall see that the struggle which they carried on for half a century in order to obtain it, was productive of no important result, until they had recourse to rebellion; and it is since that gloomy period of our history that we have our present Constitution and responsible government. Now that we have obtained our most sacred political rights after passing through a century of persecution and through rivers of blood, shed on honorable fields of battle and on the scaffold, are we going to relinquish them in order to accept a new Constitution, the evident object of which is to do away with our influence as a race in this country? Has not the French majority, for fifteen years, always carried its point in the Executive and in the Legislature, thanks to sectional equality in the representation? Why should we then relinquish the advantages conferred upon us by our present Constitution, for a scheme of Confederation in which we shall be in a minority, and which is fraught with danger to us and to our institutions? The responsibility assumed by the French section of the Ministry in uniting the whole of Upper Canada with the English minority of Lower Canada is enormous. And now, at this very time, should that section wish to withdraw from the struggle, perceiving the danger for the future, it could not do so; it would be carried away by the torrent of the English element. It is to shew the danger that exists for the future, Mr. SPEAKER, that I am now presenting a sketch of the struggles of the past. The circumstances which gave rise to them still exist, and will entail the same attempts at aggression; I must say this to stay my countrymen, while there is yet time, on the verge of the abyss towards which they are allowing themselves to be drawn. From 1809 *Le Canadien* discussed, in an animated manner, the question of responsible government, and took to heart the interests of its fellow-countrymen. A cry of violence and treason was raised. But, says GARNEAU the historian:—

We have carefully perused the journal in ques-

tion, page by page, up to the time of its seizure by the authorities, and we found combined with a demand for rights which were perfectly constitutional, an ever-recurring expression of the most unbounded loyalty and attachment to the English monarchy.

The important question of the voting of the supplies was also the subject of the most violent debates. Mr. BÉDARD insisted on this imprescriptible right of every legislative body under the Crown of England. But it was constantly refused by the English minority in the House and by the Mother Country. Led with greater strength by Mr. BÉDARD, the House by a large majority declared itself in favor of the voting of the supplies by the representatives of the people. In the division which was taken, we find the English element on one side, and the French element on the other. I ask you, Mr. SPEAKER, what rights are left to the British subject if that of voting the supplies is taken from him; if he has not the control of the funds levied from the people for the administration of the affairs of state,—if he is thus deprived of the most important of the privileges which are secured by constitutional government? Is this great injustice to be consummated? Shall the most precious of their rights be refused to the representatives of the people? Yes, Mr. SPEAKER, there will be no shrinking from this infamous proceeding. Our most eminent patriots, those whose eloquent voice on every occasion demanded our threatened liberties, were the first to be accused of treason for having made such a demand, and then confined for fourteen months in the gloomy cells of a prison, regardless of the articles of the capitulation of Montreal, which guaranteed to us the rights and liberties of British subjects. That proposal to vote our public expenditure, which now appears to us so simple, then raised throughout the country a violent tempest, which was never entirely allayed until the annihilation of the existing Constitution. In spite of the rage and calumny which was displayed, Mr. BÉDARD's proposition was carried, and the following is the division upon it:—

IN FAVOR.—Messrs. Bédard, Durocher, T. L. Papineau, LEE, Borgia, Meunier, Taschereau, Viger, Drapeau, Bernier, St. Julien, Hébert, Duclos, Robitaille, Huot, Caron, C. Panet, Le Roi, Blanchet, Debartzch, and Beauchamp—21.

AGAINST.—Messrs. McCord, Bowen, Mure, Bell, DENECHAUD, Jones of Bedford, Blackwood, Gugsy, and Ross Cuthbert—9.

A single English name, that of Mr. LEE,

appears among the French-Canadian phalanx, but in compensation we find a French-Canadian name in the list of those who voted for that inexcusable denial of a right which we were to purchase so dearly. It is not my desire, Mr. SPEAKER, to make any comments on this division, but I cannot refrain from observing that it demonstrates that on every occasion we have had to struggle against the encroachments and antagonism of the English element in Canada. Yet there was no cessation in the demand for the voting of the supplies so long as it was not obtained, and it is a remarkable fact that during the whole time that the French-Canadians were in a majority in our country. England systematically refused us our most just demands and the control of the general administration. Still more, the most arbitrary acts were thrust upon us by the Mother Country, aided in every way, moreover, by colonial English fanaticism, which lost no opportunity of turning its well-known exclusiveness to our disadvantage. But so soon as their countrymen exceeded us in number, so soon as the English element obtained a preponderance in the House of Assembly by means of the union of 1840, the English authorities granted us all the political rights for which we had asked in vain for a century. They perfectly well knew that those rights would be controlled, and in case of need utilised against us by an essentially hostile representative majority. But, thanks to the patriotism of our men of that day, we succeeded in baffling the schemes of the British Government. Up to the union those men had had to keep up a constant struggle, marked by a degree of heroism worthy of the cause which they served, against the English autocracy, which was banded together against our countrymen. We, their descendants, are ready to recommence the same struggle with the same energy, to maintain our rights so dearly purchased, and to preserve the inheritance which we have received and which it is our wish to transmit intact to the children of the soil. (Hear, hear.) Let us now see what was the condition of the liberty of the press and of the liberty of the subject at this gloomy period of our parliamentary history. The *Canadien* having dared to ask for responsible government, and Mr. BÉDARD having obtained in the House a majority of twenty-one against nine in favor of the voting of the supplies, the Executive Council resolved at any cost to injure the influence of the *Canadien*, and to paralyze the efforts

of the Canadian leaders. It kept a watch on the *Canadien* to find grounds of accusation, and on the deposition of two individuals, caused the printing office to be seized by a squad of soldiers, its contents to be conveyed to the vaults of the court, and Mr. BÉDARD to be imprisoned on a charge of treasonable practices. And this act of tyranny was grounded on the fact that these political martyrs had had the courage to demand for Canada the right of voting the supplies! The *Canadien* gave an account of this atrocious imprisonment in the following paragraph:—

The infamous conduct of the Council did not end here. The latter, with the view of striking terror into the great national party, caused Messrs. LAFORE, PAPINEAU (of Chambly), CORBEIL, TACHÉREAU and BLANCHET to be imprisoned.

Thus, Mr. SPEAKER, at this period a representative of the people was cast into prison for having asked for the granting of a right which was unjustly withheld, and to crown the act of tyranny, he was left to rot in his cell for fourteen months, and was refused a trial before the courts in which he could have easily justified himself, and proved that he had acted in a constitutional manner. I cannot pass over this page of our parliamentary history without quoting it:—

The leaders, however, who had been basely imprisoned, did not stoop before the storm. Mr. BÉDARD, from the depths of his cell, braved the fury of the enemies of his country; his great soul remained calm and undisturbed, and he did not give way to despair. Proud of his rights and confident of the justice of his cause, he in vain demanded from his persecutors a justification of their conduct. The ears of his jailers were deaf to his demand, and refusing the liberty which they wished to grant him, he even insisted on being brought to trial. The new elections caused no change in the national representation. The Governor, in his speech, made no allusion to the severe measures which he had taken with respect to Mr. BÉDARD and his companions, and the session passed over without the noble prisoner having been liberated. It was not until after a captivity of thirteen months, and after having contracted a mortal disease, that this great man left the prison to go and rejoin a beloved family, who were deprived of their all and who were indebted for their means of existence to the honorable generosity of the citizens of Quebec.

Notwithstanding these crying injustices, Mr. BÉDARD did not complain; he considered that it was not too high a price to pay for the liberties of the people, and that a few months' imprisonment was a mere nothing in view of

the great liberties for which he struggled and suffered. Listen to the noble utterances of that great patriot, in presence of his electors, after regaining his liberty :—

The past must not discourage us, or diminish our veneration for our Constitution. Any other form of government would be subject to the same drawback, and in fact to drawbacks far greater ; the peculiarity of our present system is, that it furnishes the means of remedying its own defects. [And he added] : We must, moreover, be prepared to make some sacrifices for the securing of these great advantages."

Such was the language of that great patriot ; not a word of bitterness, complaint, or re- crimination, but dignity of expression and a sincere conviction of the advantages of the Constitution. What a contrast, alas ! between those days of devotedness and civic courage, and the egotism and frigid indifference of our own, in which self-interest overrides everything, and patriotism has ceased to exist. The page of our history I have just read, is one which certainly should not remain unnoticed ; it is a page which our legislators would do well to consult. They would there find an example of patriotism well deserving of imitation. It is well to contemplate and study the great struggles of our forefathers, to see how victory crowned the efforts of those noble patriots—a victory dearly purchased, and of which we have up to our own day preserved the precious fruits. (Hear, hear.) But the war of 1812 broke out, and England—who has never granted us any liberties or privileges except when she needed us for her own defence on this continent—changed her tactics. She trembled for her supremacy in these British provinces, and immediately she deemed it prudent to secure our good-will, and coöperation in the struggle then about to commence—in the first place, by calling Mr. BÉDARD to a seat on the judicial bench. She understood clearly that she could do nothing against the United States without the assistance of the French-Canadian element. And the Imperial Government also hoped to recover the control of the influence and the services of the race it had treated so tyrannically. Thus it was that the man who had been cast into prison, and whom the Government had accused of treason, became the judge of the highest court in the country. The adoption of every base means of gaining adherents constituted the tactics of the Government at that period. They hoped that by thus giving a place to the man who had been the most valiant defender of our rights and of our

nationality, they would secure the adherence of the children of the soil, and they were not mistaken. In adopting that means, Mr. SPEAKER, the Imperial Government showed that they understood the character of the nation they thus sought to gain over to their cause. For it must be admitted—and it is perhaps our misfortune—that it is the peculiar characteristic of the French element, that they very often too soon forget the persecutions of which they have been the victims, and which ought to inspire them with an honest indignation when they reflect on the past. Over-confident of the sincere good will of our adversaries, we are always taken unawares at each new attempt at aggression. And even now, a few years of prosperity has been enough to dazzle us and make us anticipate a brilliant prospect in a measure which involves nothing short of the annihilation of our influence as a race, which is in fact decreed in the scheme of Confederation now sought to be forced upon the people. (Hear, hear.) But the American army threatened the frontier, and it was necessary to think of defence. With a view of being prepared for an attack, the Governor assembled Parliament twice in 1812, and measures were taken for arming the militia and voting the sums required for the organization and defence of the province. Sir GEORGE PREVOST, at the opening of Parliament in 1813, complimented the people for their courage and energy, and the proceedings were less stormy than usual ; fresh supplies were voted for the war, and a good understanding subsisted between the Government and the two Houses during the session. At that heroic period of our history, we find our French-Canadian fellow-countrymen, to whom fresh concessions had been made, obedient to the voice of their chiefs, rushing to the frontier and driving back the invader. But in 1812, as in 1775, the devotedness and patriotism of our people were destined soon to be forgotten. The moment of danger had scarcely passed away when those who had saved the power of England in America, at the price of their blood, were once more made the object of incessant attacks on the part of the English oligarchy, as I shall shortly shew. GARNEAU gives the following graphic sketch of the conduct of his countrymen at that critical period of our history :—

A second time was Canada preserved for England by the very people whom it was sought to annihilate ; by their bravery the colony was pre-

served from the inevitable woes of a frightful war. For a moment the hatred entertained towards the Canadian name was stifled; the Colonial Office, sensible of the difficulties of the moment, silenced the fanatical yells of its trans-atlantic minions; but once the danger over and Canada safe, the old antipathies were soon again to burst forth, the war upon our language, our institutions and our laws to recommence, and ingratitude to take the place of gratitude in the hearts of the children of Albion.

Forbearance, it was evident, had been thus used solely because circumstances rendered it impossible to give grounds of discontent to so important a portion of the population, by whom alone the country could be saved. England has never been liberal except in presence of danger. At this moment she is endeavoring to attain the same end by attempting to destroy our nationality by means of the Federation scheme submitted to us. But she finds at her back now an element of strength which she did not then possess, to aid her in the task—the support of a French-Canadian majority. (Hear, hear.) In the following year occurred the glorious battle of Chateauguay. On that memorable day a handful of brave men, commanded by DESAULNERIES, confronted an enemy thirty times superior in number to themselves, arrested the advance of the invader, and by their devotedness and bravery saved this rich province for the Crown of England. Now, Mr. SPEAKER, what the French-Canadians did in the war of 1812, that they are once more prepared to do under the Constitution as it is at this moment. It was because they felt at that time that they had something more precious to defend than a Confederation which can afford no better protection to their material interests than to their institutions, their language, their laws, and their nationality, that they took no account of the numbers of the enemy, but fought valiantly when they were outnumbered in the proportion of ten to one. And now again, in defending the Constitution as it is, with the rights and privileges it guarantees to us, the Canadians will not hesitate a moment to sacrifice themselves for the safety of the precious deposit entrusted to their keeping. Surely, Mr. SPEAKER, it is not necessary to go far back into our history for an instance of this. In 1862, at the time of the affair of the *Trent*, when a rupture with our neighbors seemed imminent, the French-Canadians rushed to arms with the eagerness and irresistible impulse of the heroes of New France. It is not, Mr. SPEAKER, that the French-Canadian

desires war, but he loves to nerve his arm by calling to mind the battle-fields of former days; and if the present generation were called upon to meet the enemy, they would show the whole world that their blood has not degenerated, and that they are worthy in every respect of their heroic ancestors. (Hear, hear.) After the war of 1812, which had so greatly imperilled the possessions of England on this continent, the same attempts at aggression were renewed without delay; so true is it that danger alone could interrupt them. The troops having gone into winter quarters, the Governor, Sir G. PREVOST, went down to Quebec to open Parliament, and the disagreements between the popular branch and the Legislative Council soon broke forth again little by little. STUART again brought up the question of the rules of practice, and made the most serious accusations against Judge SEWELL—charging him, for instance, with having attempted to enforce his rules of practice without the authority of Parliament; with having dismissed the Solicitor General from his place in order to instal therein his own brother, E. SEWELL; with having violated the liberty of the press, by causing the *Canadien* to be seized without any plausible grounds; and the liberty of Parliament, by imprisoning several of its members. These accusations, some of which were true, were transmitted to England, but STUART having been unable to cross the sea in order to follow them up, SEWELL got rid of the charges. The same occurred as regards Judge MONK, who was accused at the same time of sundry malversations; and, as Mr. F. X. GARNEAU remarks, Judge SEWELL determined that the best revenge he could take for the accusations brought against him was to suggest to the Prince Regent the union of all the British provinces, with a view to compass the destruction of French-Canadian nationality. Such, Mr. SPEAKER, were the circumstances under which the scheme of Confederation was first proposed. And it must be admitted that, bearing in mind the recommendation of Mr. SEWELL, it ought to excite many fears on the part of every true French-Canadian. Who was the first man to pronounce the word "Confederation"? A man who violated the liberty of the press and the liberty of Parliament! A man who had for years longed for the destruction of the French-Canadian race! At a subsequent period, after the revolution of 1837, Lord DURHAM proposed Confederation as the political organization best adapted for our annihilation. And at this moment our

fellow-countrymen in office submit, nay, propose, to the people this scheme of annihilation, specially prepared for our destruction, and which must destroy us, Mr. SPEAKER, if the people outside this House do not protest in every constitutional way against the political suicide of the French race in Canada. At the prorogation of Parliament in 1814, the Speaker, L. J. PAPINEAU, addressed the Governor, Sir GEORGE PREVOST, in the following words:—

The events of the late war have drawn closer the bonds of connection between Great Britain and Canada. These provinces have been preserved for England under circumstances of great difficulty.

These words are, in many respects, deserving of serious consideration; and I call the attention of honorable members of this House to this remarkable passage:—

When the war broke out—continued Mr. PAPINEAU—this country had neither troops nor money, and Your Excellency commanded a people in whom, it was said, the habits acquired during more than half a century of peace had destroyed all military spirit. Despite these predictions, you succeeded in deriving from the devotedness of a brave and faithful, though calumniated people, sufficient resources to defeat the plans of conquest of an enemy great in numbers and full of confidence in his own strength. The blood of the children of Canada was shed, mingled with that of the brave men sent here to assist in our defence. The repeated proofs of the powerful protection of England and of the inviolable fidelity of her colonies, constitute for the latter fresh titles, in virtue of which they claim to enjoy the free exercise of all the rights and advantages guaranteed to them by the Constitution and the laws.

The Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, then twenty-six years of age, who struggled so heroically to secure our political rights and liberties, is the same whose name, during a recent sitting of this House, was ignominiously dragged forward by the hon. member for Montmorency and the Honorable Attorney General East (Hon. Mr. CARTIER). His name, venerated by the entire country as that of its liberator, has been cast as an insult in the teeth of honorable members of this House, who deem it an honor to own his leadership, and who still continue to carry on his work—the protection of our political rights against the underhand plots of a hostile majority. But, Mr. SPEAKER, that venerable old man, who has grown grey in the service of his country, is sheltered from base insinuations, which can as little penetrate his peaceful retirement

as they can the hearts of the sincere friends of our country. In that quiet retreat the great patriot of our evil days, after having nobly fulfilled his task, enjoys in peace and with pride the esteem of those he successfully defended with his powerful voice in the darkest hour of our political history. Gross insults, shameless calumnies, when uttered against such a man, redound with double weight upon those who thus basely vilify a citizen justly admitted to be an honor to our country. The name of the Hon. L. J. PAPINEAU is surrounded with a luminous halo which malignant calumny can never succeed in tarnishing. His memory is safe from these envious assaults, for it is under the protection of the people whom he rescued from the systematic colonial oppression which I am attempting to describe. Really, Mr. SPEAKER, the cause of the Honorable Attorney General East must be in very great straits when he is compelled to resort to such means in order to save it. The Honorable Attorney General East must have very little confidence in the success of that cause, when he endeavors to excite the prejudices of his supporters by heaping insults on one of the greatest names in our history. Such language on the part of the Honorable Attorney General East is the more culpable in that he himself was one of the rebels of 1837-'8, and one of the most zealous partisans of that great patriot whom he now insults. Did he not himself vote in favor of the ninety-two resolutions—that imperishable monument of Canadian rights? Yes, Mr. SPEAKER, the man upon whose head a price was set, the man who was compelled to fly from his country and to seek from a neighboring country that right of asylum, which he refuses to-day to the Southern refugee, has the audacity, now that he is Attorney General, to call that great statesman "Old Mr. PAPINEAU," and the opposition in this House, "Old Mr. PAPINEAU's tail." I do not hesitate to assert, Mr. SPEAKER, that such expressions are unworthy of this House, and unworthy of the position occupied by the Honorable Attorney General East, who has had the questionable courage to pronounce them. (Hear, hear.) Such expressions, if they are to be tolerated anywhere, find their proper place in the common streets, and the standard of this House must have fallen very low, when such language is permitted here. All sense of dignity must be lost, when the Hon. Attorney General is permitted to insult, on the floor of this House, the name of a man whom every true French

Canadian holds in veneration. Let the honorable gentleman not deceive himself—opinions and ideas tending to promote the happiness of the people, and the men who sustain and struggle for their interests, will ever be victorious over the assault of calumny and envy. And what has been the aim of the Hon. Attorney General and the honorable member for Montmorency, in their attack upon the Hon. Mr. PAPINEAU? Their object, in the first place, was to injure the Opposition, who represent him; and next, to elevate themselves, by dragging down to their own level one of the great men of our history, beside whom they are but pigmies. For there are two ways of being great: the first is by rendering to one's country eminent services, and by exhibiting undeniable superiority; but inasmuch as the Hon. Attorney General and the honorable member for Montmorency possess neither the material nor the superiority that go to make great men, they adopt the second mode of attaining greatness. It consists in depreciating and crushing all those who are superior to one's self. Thus they hope to rise over the ruined reputation of those they enviously calumniate and unceasingly attack. They recklessly carry on their work of demolition; they are not arrested in their course even by the names that personify a whole epoch in our history, and when one of the great figures of the past confronts them in all its dignity, like a statue of glory, their sacrilegious hands are eagerly raised to mutilate it; then, standing alone upon its scattered fragments, they contemplate with pride the prostrate victim of their vandal labors! Such, Mr. SPEAKER, are the motives which explain the efforts made by those who thus attempt to injure one of the greatest men of our race. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) But we have not yet reached the termination of our struggles. At the opening of Parliament in 1816, a message was communicated to the House stating that the charges brought against Judges SEWELL and MONK had been dismissed. The bitter words in which the message was couched greatly incensed the House, and a proper answer was just about to be adopted, when a dissolution was resorted to in order to prevent a manifestation of the feelings of the House. And what was the position taken by the Imperial Government with reference to those difficulties? We find it stated in the letter written by Lord BATHURST to Governor SHERBROOKE, who pointed out to them the false step taken by the Colonial Office in thus oppressing our race:—

Hitherto the Government has found, on all ordinary occasions, an abiding resource in the firmness and disposition of the Legislative Council, and there is no reason to doubt that the Council will continue to counteract the most injudicious and violent measures of the Legislative Assembly.

In truth, the measures of the Legislative Assembly of that day were very injudicious, very violent! They demanded that the people should have a voice in the disposal of the moneys contributed by themselves! And hence it was that the Legislative Council counteracted all the measures demanded by the people. I continue the quotation:—

It is therefore in every way desirable that you should avail yourself of its assistance to counteract any measures of the Assembly you may deem objectionable, instead of placing your own authority or that of the Government in direct opposition to that of the House, and thus affording them a pretext for refusing the supplies necessary for the service of the colony.

Yes, Mr. SPEAKER, the nominative Legislative Council was always the stumbling-block in the way of the French-Canadians whenever they endeavored to carry any measure of reform. The elective House invariably met, on the part of that body, a systematic opposition to every measure desired by the people—an opposition it was impossible to overcome. It was in 1856 that we succeeded, after a constant struggle of fifty years, in introducing the elective principle into the Upper House. At this moment, despite the lessons of the past, recorded unfortunately in letters of blood, an attempt is made to return to the old system; we are about basely to abandon a privilege, a political right, which was the reward of so many struggles and so many woes. Yes, Mr. SPEAKER, such is the scheme of the present Government; they intend that in the Confederation the members of the Legislative Council shall be appointed by the Crown, as in the darkest period of our history. Happily, the people thoroughly understand the value and bearing of life nominations. They know that the great majority of the men so appointed by a General Government, numerically hostile to our race, would ever be ready to reject measures the most favorable to our interests as a nation. The Legislative Council under Confederation will be what it was in the days of oppression, when Lord BATHURST, in pursuance of the instructions of the Imperial Government, said to Governor SHERBROOKE—"Be careful to make use of the Legislative Council to counteract the measures of the elective

body." That is just it—they shield themselves behind a Legislative Council composed of their own creatures brought back to life, and then while lauding to the skies the colonial liberality of England, they pull the strings and make their puppets play the part of oppressors. It is precisely the same political organization that is proposed in the scheme of Confederation. In a Legislative Council composed of life-members, we shall have men prepared invariably to refuse the people the measures they require, if such measures in any way affect the privileges of the aristocratic classes. However eager may be the efforts of the members of the elective body, it will be constitutionally impossible for us to obtain such measures. Moreover, these councillors, of whom the majority will be hostile to us, will do everything in their power to gratify the Imperial Government, by whom they are to be appointed—a Government which has ever liberally subsidised its creatures. Such, Mr. SPEAKER, are the dangers in our path if we return to the old system of life-appointments proposed by the Government in the Confederation scheme. (Hear, hear.) But the first instructions given by Lord BATHURST to Governor SHELBROOKE were not sufficiently explicit, apparently; for shortly afterwards he transmitted the following—"I strongly recommend you to see that the Legislative Assembly does not dispose of public moneys without the consent of the Legislative Council,"—thus unscrupulously violating the very essence of the Constitution, evidently under the impulse of rabid national feelings. It is a principle of the Constitution of England that the popular House, which represents the opinions of the people, has alone the right of voting supplies for the administration of the government, and that moneys levied for that purpose from the people can be expended only with the consent of that House and not otherwise. Well, Mr. SPEAKER, what do we find in this instance? We find the Imperial Government expressly instructing Her Majesty's representative in Canada not to allow the supplies to be voted without the consent of the Legislative Council, appointed for life by the Crown, and whose constant efforts were directed to resisting the just demands of the French-Canadians. This question of the supplies, the chief cause of all the difficulties by which we have been beset, both previous to and since that period, was not to be thus disposed of. We then had men who were not to be baffled by

difficulties or rebuffs. And thus it is that we find those noble champions of our rights and liberties coming forward, year after year, with the same demands; never disheartened by defeat, and struggling on until at last their legitimate claims were acceded to. In January, 1819, the Houses were opened, and the first question which brought on an animated debate was, once more, the question of the finances. A discussion arose as to whether the Lower House, after having obtained the annual vote of supply, could moreover obtain a detailed civil list and vote on each item separately. The majority desired this in order to assure themselves of the integrity of the public officials, and to hold in check the members of the Executive Council, over whom they had no control. Others opposed it strongly, as a new principle and violating the rights of the Crown. A committee, appointed to examine into the question, reported in favor of a reduction of the expenditure—which they declared to be far too great in proportion to the revenue—and the abolition of pensions, which tended to grave abuses. Adopting a middle course between the two extremes, some wished to vote the supplies under certain heads, giving a gross sum for each department. But the supporters of a detailed vote carried the day. The bill was passed, sent up to the Council, and, as was anticipated, rejected by that body in the following terms:—

That the mode adopted for the granting of the civil list was unconstitutional, unprecedented, and involved a direct violation of the rights and prerogatives of the Crown; that if the bill became law, it would not only give the Commons the privilege of voting supplies, but also of prescribing to the Crown the number and character of its servants, by regulating and rewarding their services as they thought proper, which would render them independent of their electors, and might lead to their rejecting the authority of the Crown, which their oath of allegiance bound them to sustain.

Thus, Mr. SPEAKER, the Council nominated for life rejected that eminently just measure—the voting, item by item, of the supplies by the Lower House; that is to say, the distribution of the moneys levied from the people—and even went the length of declaring the measure unconstitutional. Is it possible at this time to understand how servility could be carried to such an excess? At that period the population of Upper Canada had increased to a proportionately considerable extent, and the British population of Lower

Canada was sufficiently numerous to suggest the scheme of uniting the two Canadas under one government, and in 1823 the proposal was made in England. It was, therefore, at that period of trouble and agitation, and rivalry between the Houses, that a plot was entered into in England to annihilate at one blow French-Canadian nationality. The war only postponed the scheme for the union of the two provinces; for the assistance of the French-Canadian people was needed. Peace having been established, it was resolved to carry out the measure, and a bill for the purpose was presented to the Imperial Legislature, unknown to the parties whose fate was being decided, and without their being consulted, for it was known that they were opposed to that act of oppression. Yes, without consulting the people of Lower Canada, it was sought to force upon them a Constitution under which they were to have a smaller representation than Upper Canada; moreover, Lower Canada was to be charged with the debt of the other province, which was a considerable debt, and the language of Lower Canada was to be banished from the Legislature. Happily, the scheme found opponents in the Imperial Parliament, and, despite all the intrigues and efforts of our enemies, the bill was thrown out at the second reading. Then, as at the present day, those who aimed at our destruction were loud in favor of passing the bill, at any price, before the people had an opportunity of protesting. At the present moment, those who desire to force us into Confederation, in the face of the petitions against the scheme, tell us that we must accept the new Constitution before the people are made aware of its monstrous details. "I beg of you to pass this bill at once," said Mr. WILMOTT; "if you wait until next year you will receive so many petitions protesting against the measure, that it will be very difficult to adopt it, however useful it may be to those who oppose it through ignorance or through prejudice; moreover, it is essential to the removal of the difficulties existing between the Executive and the Assembly." When the news of those unjust, but happily abortive, attempts reached Canada, the greatest agitation was produced, and the whole Canadian people felt indignant at such proceedings. Several meetings were held at Montreal and Quebec to protest against the bill, and petitions to the English Government were signed by 60,000 persons. At that period, as in this instance, the union was to be carried without consulting the people, and the Imperial Parliament submitted to the

Legislature a measure against which 60,000 French-Canadians protested. Mr. SPEAKER, I have no hesitation in asserting it, the scheme of Confederation which it is now attempted to force upon the people is destined to be rejected, not by 60,000 French-Canadian signatures merely, but by 100,000. Yes, our people are waking up, and in this united and general protest we shall not lag behind those who showed us the example of an effective protest whenever it was sought to inflict injustice upon them. We will send to England thousands of signatures to protest against the Constitution we do not desire, and if justice is then refused, well "*fiat justitia ruat cælum*," we shall have employed every constitutional means, and the responsibility for the consequences of that refusal of justice will fall on the heads of those who labor to bring about such a state of things. The Hon. DENIS BENJAMIN VIGER, one of the boldest champions of our rights, said of the bringing forward of the scheme of union in the Imperial Parliament, without consulting the people:—

After fifty years of peace and prosperity, when the generation that witnessed the conquest has passed away; when there remains hardly a living witness of that event among the present generation; when the memory and the impression of it has died out in the breast of French-Canadians; when, in fine, there no longer remains in the Province any but British born subjects, enjoying all their rights in that capacity alone—now it is that a scheme is concocted under which we are to be treated—I will not say as a conquered people, for the public laws of civilized nations no longer permit the vanquished to be robbed of their institutions and laws, any more than of their property—but like a barbarous race to whom the enlightenment and the arts, the principles and the duties of social life, are unknown.

And in truth, Mr. SPEAKER, those words were not too strong to qualify justly the conduct of the Imperial Government at that period. Blood had to be shed at St. Denis and St. Charles, and heads to fall by the axe of the executioner, before justice could be obtained. It was only then, when it was found that the people did not hesitate to sacrifice the lives of their noblest children, in order to secure their political rights and liberties, that we received responsible government as we now enjoy it and as we desire to preserve it. At the opening of the ensuing Session it was expected that the debate on the finances would be resumed; but the Governor having separated, in the estimates, the civil list from the other expenses, the supplies were voted.

Thus it was that whenever the struggle for rights was persevered in, the result was success; and why is it, I ask, that our statesmen who have struggled since the union to preserve the Constitution as it is, with such signal success, now give way to the demands of Upper Canada? Let us, then, maintain our present position, the most fruitful in advantages to French-Canadians. The question of finance had been for some time looked upon as disposed of, but on DALHOUSIE's return the question arose again in a more threatening form than ever, and the supplies were refused (1827). The Governor on the following day prorogued Parliament, insulting the dignity of the Commons and eulogizing the Legislative Council. This act of tyranny caused great excitement amongst the people. The press attacked the Government, and in order to show the exasperation of men's minds at the time, I quote an extract from one of the newspapers of that period:—

Canadians, chains are being forged to bind you; it would seem that we are to be annihilated or ruled with a rod of iron. Our liberties are invaded, our rights violated, our privileges abolished, our complaints despised, our political existence menaced with utter and complete ruin. The time has now come to put forth all your resources and to display all your energy, so as to convince the Mother Country and the horde who for half a century have tyrannized over you in your own homes, that if you are subjects you are not slaves.

The elections resulted favorably for the popular party. At the meeting of Parliament, Mr. PAPINEAU was elected Speaker, but the Governor refused to sanction the choice, and told the Legislative Assembly to elect another. What was the proper course for the House of Assembly to pursue in the face of such conduct? To give way? No, Mr. SPEAKER; there were at that time men in our House of Assembly, men who did not shrink from their duty, nor from the responsibility of their just opposition. On motion of Mr. CUVILLIER, it was resolved that the election of the Speaker must be made freely and independently of the Governor; that Mr. PAPINEAU had been so elected; that under the law, no confirmation was needed, the latter being, like the presentation, a simple matter of form and usage. Mr. PAPINEAU having been reinstated in the chair, the Governor refused to approve the selection made, and the same evening Parliament was dissolved. Thus, Mr. SPEAKER, Parliament existed but one day, because the Speaker was a man who valued his independence too highly to sub-

mit to the dictates of an ill-advised government. In truth, if these are the liberties we owe to the colonial system, I need not stop to prove their utter hollowness. The people understood the position in which it was sought to place them, and took steps to repel these fresh attempts at aggression. The question created increased agitation; public meetings were held in city, town and country; the speeches made betokened the disturbed state of the public mind; proceedings were taken against the press, and Mr. WALLER, editor of the *Spectateur*, of Montreal, was arrested for the second time. Addresses, bearing over 80,000 signatures, were forwarded to England in the hands of Messrs. NELSON, CUVILLIER and D. B. VIGER. Mr. GALE took the petition of the partisans of the oligarchy. A great meeting of the inhabitants of the counties of Verchères, Chambly, Rouville and St. Hyacinthe was held at St. Charles; the people protested energetically against the existing state of things, and in fact it was broadly declared that the natural consequences must be expected to follow upon so flagrant a violation of the most sacred rights of the French-Canadians. Mr. SPEAKER, the Canadian people, in the person of their leaders, at that period traversed the ocean in order to obtain justice from the British Government, and laid at the foot of the Throne the protest of 80,000 of our fellow-countrymen, a people who, in the trying days of our history, had not hesitated to sacrifice their lives to maintain British power on this continent; and once more, in this instance, when an attempt is made to force upon us a Constitution we have never asked for and which the people of Lower Canada energetically condemn, the same means of protesting is open to us, and the Government may rely upon it that we shall be as firm in defence of our political rights and liberties as were the representatives of the people in former days. Our protest will be, if anything, still more energetic against the proposed scheme of Confederation which it is sought to impose on us:

The Houses met in 1831, and the Governor, in the course of the session, communicated to Parliament the reply from England relative to the question of the supplies. The Imperial Government gave to the representatives of the people the control of the revenue, with the exception of the casual and territorial items, consisting of the Jesuits' Estates, the King's Posts, the *droit du quint*, the *lods et ventes*, woods and forests, &c., for a civil list of £19,000 voted for the lifetime of the king.

In 1831 power was granted for voting, item by

item, a part only of the supplies. The restriction was not consented to by those who represented the people in the Legislative Assembly. Such a state of things could not continue without leading to a collision; and the events of 1837 justified the apprehension of those who had all along warned the Government that it was impossible for the people any longer to endure so flagrant a violation of their rights, and that there was imminent danger of exhausting their patience. Events followed each other rapidly, and the clergy then, as at this time, were opposed to any energetic demonstrations. Monseigneur LARTIGUE, Bishop of Montreal, published a pastoral letter, in which he said: "Who will dare assert that the whole people of this country desire the destruction of the Government?" Mr. SPEAKER, no one desired it; but the minority at that period, like the minority at present, complained of the injustice they suffered, and the clergy were opposed to them. The minority of that day struggled for the political rights of the people as they are struggling now, and they found arrayed against them every powerful influence and all established authorities. This contrast points to a fact deserving of notice. To-day the Government constantly insult us by crying out: "You represent nothing in this House; public opinion is against you!" Well, Mr. SPEAKER, I ask the Hon. Attorney General for Lower Canada whether he himself and his honorable colleague the Prime Minister, had the majority of the Lower Canada people and clergy with them when, in 1837, they protested energetically against the injustice done to their fellow-countrymen? No, Mr. SPEAKER, at that time they formed part of the little phalanx who went so far as to raise the standard of rebellion on the plains of St. Denis and St. Charles! How times are changed! At the present moment the same men, the revolutionists of former days, strain every nerve to deprive the people of the right of pronouncing for or against the constitutional changes sought to be forced upon them. So complete a forgetfulness of their own past is extremely deplorable. Mr. SPEAKER, for weighty reasons, I do not desire to dwell on the events of 1837. In 1838 there remained to be brought on the trials of those who had been implicated in the troubles. Lord DURHAM found himself placed in an embarrassing position, for it is always difficult for a government to carry on political prosecutions; by such a course it frequently loses its strength and its popularity.

To escape from the difficulties of the moment, the Governor resolved to adopt a great measure. On the day of the coronation of Queen VICTORIA he proclaimed a general amnesty, and granted pardon to all the Canadians, except twenty-four of the most earnest of the revolutionary party. It is important, Mr. SPEAKER, to know who were the twenty-four daring revolutionists against whom the British Government displayed so much severity, and against whom the clergy had pronounced so strongly. These men were Messrs. WOLFRED NELSON, R. S. M. BOUCHETTE, BONAVENTURE VIGER, SIMÉON MARCHESSAULT, H. A. GAUVIN, T. H. GODIN, ROD. DESRIVIÈRES, L. H. MASSON, LOUIS J. PAPINEAU, C. H. COTÉ, JULIEN GAGNON, ROBERT NELSON, E. B. O'CALLAGHAN, ED. ET. RODIER, T. S. BROWN, LUDGER DUVERNAY, ED. CHARTIER, Ptre., G. ET. CARTIER, J. RYAN, Jr., Ls. PERRAULT, P. L. DEMARAY, J. F. DAVIGNON, and Ls. GAUTHIER. Thus, Mr. SPEAKER, among those sanguinary men I find the Honorable Attorney General for Lower Canada (Hon. Mr. CARTIER). (Hear, hear.) Far be from me the thought of reproaching him with his conduct at that period. I have always looked upon it as that of a patriot and of a true friend of his country. Besides, that honorable member has declared to us on many occasions that he did not regret the struggles which he had formerly maintained in order to claim the political liberties of his country, and I can perfectly understand that he does not waver in those sentiments, for it is now an historical fact that all those who took part in those struggles nobly staked their lives for their convictions, and the minority then, like the present minority, could expect nothing but misinterpretation of their opposition to power. It is not for me to decide how far this insurrectionary movement was excited by the deplorable circumstances of the time, but I am perfectly satisfied that those who were at the head of it were impelled by sentiments of patriotism, by the generous desire of obtaining for their fellow-countrymen the political liberties which were refused them. They have therefore laid their country under a great debt of gratitude for the sacrifices which they made. Now see, Mr. SPEAKER; the men who, twenty years ago, constituted a revolutionary minority, braved the clergy and raised the standard of revolt against Great Britain, are to-day in a majority and supported by the powerful influence of England and of the clergy, whose entire confidence they possess. They have their

little entries to Windsor, they fill the highest and most lucrative offices in our country, and are even decorated with the titles with which Her Majesty is used to reward Her most loyal subjects. To-day, as in 1837, the minority do not wish to have recourse to the means furnished by revolutions, after having exhausted those which the Constitution affords, but they have an inward conviction that in twenty years, when the people have succeeded in appreciating what that minority is doing for them to-day, they will feel for the opposition to which it is devoting itself, a sentiment of gratitude, the result of which will be, that on it they will confer their entire confidence, after having refused it in the day of trial. Yes, Mr. SPEAKER, as the minority of 1837 constitutes the majority of to-day, so will the present minority constitute the majority at some day which is more or less near. I will not, Mr. SPEAKER, follow the victims of that melancholy period of our history to the scaffold. With their lives they paid the price of their devotion to the cause of their country, and if, to make a people deserving of the rights of existence, life's blood and devotion are necessary, we have theirs to show that French Canada freely and nobly sacrificed her noblest descendants to the genius of Liberty. (Hear, hear.) But before concluding this sketch of our struggles, from the conquest to the melancholy occurrences of 1837-38, it is important to show that it is to our heroic resistance in the Parliament and to force of arms that we owe the political liberties which are secured to us by the present Constitution. I am unwilling to leave this review of the colonial system of England in Canada without destroying the false impression which exists, that that colonial system was sensibly improved by the liberality of the views of the statesmen of Great Britain, that the struggles through which we passed were owing to the ideas of other days, and that now all the liberties which we enjoy extend to all the English colonies, to which the colonial system of our day secures the advantages and the benefits of responsible government. I believe, Mr. SPEAKER, that I shall be able easily to controvert these erroneous arguments, and to do so I have only to consider the colonial system of England at the Mauritius. That French colony, which is not of such old standing as ours, and which became a conquest of England, fell under the yoke of Great Britain in 1810. It was then the Isle of France; since the conquest its name has been changed to the Island of Mauritius. It contains a pop-

ulation which is almost entirely French, but unfortunately for their political rights it has not, as we have, the advantage of living in the immediate vicinity of a great republic, like the United States, serving, so to say, as a guarantee for the protection of its liberties. The Isle of France, in consequence of its isolated position, is precisely in circumstances which allow of our forming an opinion of what the pretended liberties of the colonial system are worth when there is nothing to fear from the weakness of the colonists or the intervention of a neighboring power in favor of the oppressed. Thus, Mr. SPEAKER, we have a splendid opportunity of judging whether the colonial system, applied under such circumstances, possesses that liberal character which is attributed to it. Well, I say it with regret, we see there, as we saw in Canada, the same aggressive and tyrannical policy against which we had to strive for a whole century. The colonial system gave rise here to deep dissatisfaction. I shall enumerate the grievances which are complained of, grievances for which there is but too great foundation. When the Isle of France was ceded to England, it was stipulated, as in the case of Canada, that the French population should retain the use of their language and their religious institutions, together with the laws under which they had up to that time been governed—three liberties of great value to the descendants of old France. Well, Mr. SPEAKER, we shall now see whether England respected these three articles of the treaty. I hold in my hand a correspondence of no older date than the 6th May, 1862. It is written by a French colonist in the Mauritius, and contains an account of the colonial system under which his countrymen are governed. Before reading this correspondence, I must premise that the population of the island consists of two hundred thousand souls; that population is governed by an Executive Council and a Legislative Council appointed for life, consisting of eighteen members, eight of whom are public officers appointed and paid by the Government of the colony. The other ten are nearly all of English origin. Thus the French element in the Legislative Council of the Mauritius is in the proportion of about one to five, although the population is nearly entirely French:—

To the Editor of the *Economiste Français*.

You promise to the ancient colonies of France aid and protection in your columns; it is therefore natural, that relying on that promise, I should apply to hold up to the view of your readers, and to lay before an intelligent public,

before impartial judges, the acts of a government which, since 1810, has exercised the most absolute despotism over us, concealed under the great name of liberty. We have indeed the liberty of the press, but it is not listened to. Vain are all cries; the Government "stop their ears and let us cry." Then they tell us that we shall never have a more wise, a more paternal, a more liberal government. "What would you have more than the liberty of thinking and writing?" they ask. What we would have is that the liberty of the press should be of some use to us; that the Government should listen to the mouth-pieces of public opinion; that they should not waste our funds in spite of the protestations of the press;* that they should cause the laws, as they were made, to be observed, and by all alike; that among other laws, that of quarantine should be faithfully observed, and that no exception should be made in favor of H. B. M.'s ships of war and transports with troops; that more attention should be paid to the subject of communication with the ships arriving from India; that we should be more effectually protected from the epidemics which decimate our population; that the cholera should be prevented from becoming endemic in the country, so that the French and Creole population of the Mauritius may be preserved; that enquiry should be made as to the causes which may have brought the cholera upon us; that insufficient laws may be revised; that our reserves should be kept at home instead of being lent to the Mother Country or to other colonies; that our treaty of capitulation should be respected; that no attempt should be made to introduce here English laws, when it is agreed that by the French codes only are we to be governed; that the use of the French language, of which we have been deprived in defiance of sworn faith, should be restored to us; that no flagrant injustice should be committed in favor of the English and to the detriment of the Creoles; that the latter may be appointed to the different offices, and that these should not be conferred on incapable favorites; we would have the Legislative Council and self-government, &c., &c. This is what we would have. You see that we wish for a great many things. But are they not all just and reasonable? Let us now proceed to the enumeration of some of them, and, in chronological order, let us begin with the French language. The deed of capitulation, signed in 1810 by the representatives of France and England, contained the following articles, which we, the conquered people, imposed on our conquerors:—

- 1st. Respect for our religion.
- 2nd. The maintenance of our laws.
- 3rd. The guarantee that we should be allowed to speak French.

Well, of these three principal articles (inscribed

in large characters in our deed of capitulation, accepted and promised under the faith of an oath, signed and approved by England), one has been already violated, and the work of undermining another is going on! Setting at naught all scruples, the English Government first robbed us of the use of the French language before the high courts of justice. We have expressed our claims, but a deaf ear has been turned to them. This first step taken, what bounds will be set to this great work of destruction of all that we hold from France? On the application of a few English, the revival of our code is already being considered; and when the whole population apply to the Mother Country for the revocation of an order which renders the transaction of business impossible, without the very costly intervention of legal men and translators, and which, moreover, inflicts a deep wound on the Creole heart, they are told to hold their tongues! When they loudly call for the revision of insufficient laws which facilitate the propagation of mephitic miasmata they are not listened to! When they demand an enquiry into the circumstances which have caused the introduction into their midst of the cruel epidemic, which for more than four months has carried death into their ranks, they are told that they are indulging in idle fancies! At the same time, and as though to turn the public mind from this fixed idea, there is a semblance of bringing up a question already decided upon and voted—that relating to railways! Another grievance. Whilst the epidemic is raging among us, and whilst our municipality stands in need of money for the relief of the poor classes, the Government has none to lend, because the financial reserves of the colony are lent to the Cape, to India, to Ceylon, and to the Mother Country itself.

Thus, Mr. SPEAKER, the Mauritius, which, by the terms of her treaty of capitulation, was to have preserved to her the use of her language, her peculiar institutions and her laws, has soon found herself deprived of the use of her language; her laws have been changed, and her institutions have been subjected to oppression. This, Mr. SPEAKER, is the sort of liberty which a French colony may enjoy under the colonial system of England, when the colony is weak and is not situated, as Canada is, in the vicinity of a powerful republic such as the United States. I think, Mr. SPEAKER, that I have now shewn what has ever been the spirit of antagonism between the two races of English and French origin, on the two continents, and what has been the spirit of aggression of the English element against our population, from the founding of the colony up to our own time; we have seen colonial fanaticism attacking our institutions, our language and our laws, and we have seen that our annihilation as a race has been the evident

* This demand is in fact perfectly just, as of the five papers published in the Mauritius, four are French; but the single English journal on the island was always right, in opposition to the four French journals.

object of those constant efforts. Can we to-day believe that the case is otherwise; and ought not the unanimity of the English element in favor of Confederation to fill us with terror? Is not our loss concealed under this outward semblance of conciliation? Yes, let us consult the history of our country before effecting so radical a change in our Constitution. Let us remember with terror the strife and antagonism which prevailed in days gone by, and let us endeavor to judge with certainty what will be the necessary consequences of a constitutional change of such serious importance as that which is proposed to us. Let us now consider, Mr. SPEAKER, the disastrous consequences of the adoption of the scheme of Confederation. The members of the Government have told us that Confederation would constitute us a military power of the first class, and would enable us to resist the aggressions of the American Union. The defence of our frontier is certainly a question of the highest importance, for no one is unaware that our relations with our neighbors are in a position of extreme tension. They have established a passport system, the sole object of which is to hamper our trade. A resolution has been adopted by Congress, almost unanimously, for the repeal of the treaty of reciprocity which exists between the two countries. In a few months the waters of our lakes will be ploughed by vessels of war, the armaments of which can only be directed against Canada. Such, Mr. SPEAKER, is the position of the United States with respect to us, and to meet this danger the Government proposes to form a Confederation which will, they tell us, constitute a first class power, able to maintain on this continent the supremacy of Great Britain. But will the object proposed be attained? Shall we be stronger under Confederation than we are now? Cannot the Governor General of the Provinces of British North America raise troops throughout the whole extent of the provinces placed under his jurisdiction? Is not the militia of all those provinces under his immediate command? We are told, Mr. SPEAKER, that Confederation will give us a more uniform military organization than that which we now possess. But there is nothing to prevent the formation of that organization under the present Constitution, and I have no hesitation in saying that under that Constitution the several provinces will defend themselves to better advantage than under

Confederation. Is it not precisely by creating here a military power, hostile to the adjoining powerful republic, that we shall bring on war and its attendant calamities? The moment the United States perceive in this Confederation an organization, the object of which is the establishing of the balance of power in America, they will not wait until our fortifications are constructed, or until the Inter-colonial railway is built, but they will attack us at once. On another hand, we offer defiance to the American republic by creating here a political organization which is contrary to the principles of the democratic government which prevails there, and contrary to the famous Monroe doctrine, which, as is well known, is opposed to the establishment of monarchical governments on this continent. The plan of the present Government is, therefore, to establish here a political system which is essentially hostile to the United States, as it will be essentially monarchical, and instead of proving to us a means of defence, it can entail nothing but war and the disastrous consequences attendant upon it. To promote the security and prosperity of our country, the Government, instead of bleeding the people as they propose to do, to erect here and there ruinously expensive, and after all insufficient fortifications, ought to apply the revenues of the treasury to the establishment of new industries, the improvement of our public highways, and the colonization of our wild lands. These inexhaustible sources of wealth, if wisely managed, would double our numbers, our revenue and our power, and would in that way confer upon us means of defence much more effective than those which we should receive from Confederation, which would crush the people under taxes imposed to meet the expense of imperfectly defending our frontier. And is it supposed for a moment that when we have in so urgent a manner decreed the fortification of our frontier, the arming of our militia-men, and the establishment of a fleet on our inland seas, that the United States will do the same and that they will follow the example set them of such ruinous folly? Is it supposed that the American statesmen will not immediately perceive, as we are desirous of raising ourselves up as an enemy on their frontier, and of entailing upon them an enormous outlay in order to hold us in check, that it will be for them a mere question of economy to attack us now and to take possession of the country, before it is in our power to oblige them to keep up that

ruinously expensive war footing? And what could we do against an invading army of two or three hundred thousand men, with our treasury exhausted by the fortifications, and with hardly any assistance from England, whose policy at this moment is anti-colonial? I cannot understand how, in face of the danger which is impending over us, and for which we are so little prepared, the Government can thus cast defiance in the teeth of the powerful nation who are adjacent to us, and whose armies now in the field could set at naught any resistance to immediate invasion. I assert it positively, Mr. SPEAKER, the United States have not the least intention of attacking us, so long as we remain peaceable spectators of their fratricidal struggle, and so long as we continue to confine ourselves to peaceful occupations. But if, on the contrary, we create here a hostile military power, if we establish here the throne of a viceroy or of a foreign monarch, in defiance of the principles which form the groundwork upon which rests the political system of the United States, we may then rest assured that the neighbouring republic will sweep away that monarchical organization, established in rivalry to its own democratic system. (Hear, hear.) Such, Mr. SPEAKER, is the question in its most serious aspect. I shall not enlarge upon the details of the scheme of Confederation, which have been so ably criticised by the hon. members who have preceded me; and besides I shall have an opportunity of discussing them when the amendments to the scheme are submitted to the House. But I may now say that those details cannot be accepted by the people. We have already received numerous petitions praying for the rejection of the measure, and those petitions continue to reach us every day. Now, I ask you, Mr. SPEAKER, what the sentiments of the people will be if that scheme is adopted, and if in the course of two months it is returned to us from England, after having received the sanction of the Imperial Parliament, without its having been possible for us to alter the most trifling of its details? Is it supposed, after a Constitution shall have been forced on the French-Canadians, which they have opposed to the utmost, that they will be very enthusiastic in the defence of that Constitution which shall have deprived them of a part of the political rights which they enjoyed? And, it cannot be denied, by adopting the proposed Confederation, we yield up some of the privileges which we now enjoy;

have not our Ministers themselves told us that under the pressure of the demands of Upper Canada it was necessary to make concessions at the Quebec Conference, in order to ensure the adoption of the present scheme? The hostile majority of Upper Canada have obtained representation based on population, against which Lower Canada has so energetically struggled for fifteen years, because she saw in that concession the annihilation of our influence as a race. Under these circumstances, Mr. SPEAKER, is it supposed that reliance is to be placed on the assistance of the French-Canadians, who were formerly so terrible in the attack, and who fought, without hesitation, one against ten, a proportion in which we shall again find ourselves opposed to the Americans in the probable event of a war? To hope that they will fight with the same impulse now, when they are being deprived of the surest guarantees of their natural existence and of their most sacred political rights, is greatly to deceive ourselves, and to betray ignorance of what has always been the cause of their heroism in the conflict. Under the Constitution as it is, they would again fight with similar courage, regardless of numbers, because they love that Constitution which secures to them all that they hold most dear, and because they wish to preserve it. Under Confederation, on the contrary, we have nothing left to defend; our influence as a race is gone, and sooner than be absorbed in a Confederation, the existence of which will prove a source of constant strife without bringing with it compensating advantages, the people dissatisfied will seek other and more advantageous political and commercial alliances, and for this reason it is that I consider that the scheme of Confederation will lead us directly to annexation to the United States. When the commissioners from the North and the South recently had an interview in order to decide the possible conditions of an honorable peace, one of the three propositions submitted by the North was to the effect that the two armies should not be disbanded after the cessation of hostilities, but should be united for the purpose of carrying on a foreign war. Now, Mr. SPEAKER, what does the expression, "foreign war," when used by the United States, mean, except war upon Canada? And what could the fifty battalions which England could send us do against the combined armies of the North and the South, the strength of which amounts to a million of

men? Situated at a distance of a thousand leagues from us, Great Britain, with all her material of war and our militia, could not defend Canada against so powerful an enemy, except at the cost of the greatest sacrifices. It is not, therefore, at a time when we are placed in such great straits, that we should exclaim loudly that we do not fear the struggle, and that we are ready to measure our strength against that of the States of the American Union. It is equally absurd to give umbrage to their institutions by creating beside them a political organization to which they are fundamentally opposed. Is it believed that our monarchical pretensions and our threats are of a nature to intimidate the American statesmen? In their eyes we are but pigmies hurling threats at giants. Let the war come with the Constitution as it is, and we shall find a hundred thousand volunteers ready to defend our frontier. But if the Government impose on the French-Canadians the scheme of Confederation, from which they have so much fear, and which may prove to be productive of the most disastrous consequences to their institutions, their language and their laws, then, I am bound to say, there will be hesitation in our ranks at the time when every man will be marching towards almost certain death for the defence of a flag which will no longer confer upon our race the guarantees of protection which it to-day secures to us. I say, then, that the time is ill-chosen to make such serious changes, and to lay the foundation of an Empire the existence of which, threatened both from the interior and from the exterior, will be of but a few days' duration. For with dissatisfaction among the French-Canadians, deprived of their rights and privileges, it is impossible for England to maintain her power here against three hundred thousand men invading our territory at ten different points along our frontier. The wisest policy which we can pursue, at this critical moment, is therefore remain peaceable spectators of the struggle between our neighbors, to open our forests to colonization, to turn to account our mines and water-powers, to clear our wild lands, and to labor without ceasing to to recall our unfortunate countrymen who are now scattered over American soil. Let us construct railways, let us double our manufacturing industry, let us enlarge our canals, let us extend our network of railways to the Maritime Provinces; and when we have attained great proportions as a peo-

ple, when our prosperity shall have increased fivefold, and, above all, when the terrible hurricane which threatens to destroy everything in North America shall have terminated its work of ruin, and finally when we shall be strong enough to protect ourselves from external attacks, and the French-Canadians especially shall have obtained sufficient power to have nearly equality of representation in the General Parliament, it will be time enough to lay the foundation of a great Confederation of the British North American Provinces, based on the protective principle of the sovereignty of the states. Under these circumstances Confederation will produce abundant fruits, and will be welcomed by the people of this country, and especially by the French-Canadians, who, having doubled in number in the interval, will be in a position to demand infinitely more advantageous conditions than those which are forced upon them to-day. We shall not then have our present political rights, which were so dearly obtained by the struggles of a century, replaced by local governments, which will be nothing more than municipal councils, vested with small and absurd powers, unworthy of a free people, which allow us at most the control of our roads, our schools and our lands; but we shall then obtain local governments based on the sovereignty of states, as is the case under the Constitution of the United States. The fact is not to be denied: the American Constitution was created by great men in face of a crowd of considerable and opposite local interests, and it cost them several years of deep study to reconcile those various interests, and finally to build up that admirable Constitution which, as the hon. member for Brome has so well said, defies the most severe criticism in relation to its most important bases. With a Constitution like that of the United States, based upon state sovereignty, Lower Canada would elect her own governor and her representatives in the Federal Parliament and Legislative Council, and also all the Executive Ministers.

MR. DUFRESNE (Montcalm) — We should also appoint the judges.

MR. PEREAULT — If the hon. member for Montcalm had listened attentively to the remarkable speech of the hon. member for Brome, he would have learned that in the majority of the states composing the American Union, the judges are not ap-

pointed by the people, but by the Executive branch of the local government, in precisely the same way as in Canada, and that they are in every respect as upright and as distinguished as our own judges. If our French-Canadian Ministers had not been in so powerless a minority in the Quebec Conference (four to thirty-two), they would certainly not have accepted a scheme of Confederation so fraught with danger to the French race as that which has been submitted to us. They would have obtained more favorable conditions than those which are imposed upon us, among which is the appointment for life of the legislative councillors, by the Executive branch of the General Legislature. For my part, Mr. SPEAKER, I am not in favor of the appointment for life of men taken from the crowd to be converted into the instruments of oppression, and too often to serve to cast impediments in the way of the most important liberties and rights of the people. The appointment for life of the legislative councillors by a majority which is hostile to our race is as dangerous to-day as it was in the most evil days of our history, and to accept it is to place our most precious liberties at the mercy of the enemies of our race. With such provisions in the Constitution which it is proposed to force upon us, it is impossible that the French element should be protected in the Legislative Council. It is equally impossible that the aggressive tendencies, of which I gave an historical sketch in the first part of my remarks, will not produce their effect in the Federal Executive, when the question of the appointment of those members is being settled. We have been told, "The French Canadian section will resign if the Federal Executive attempt to practice injustice to the detriment of their fellow countrymen." Well, Mr. SPEAKER, I would willingly believe that they would resign, and that no successors could be found for them, which is still more improbable, and I should like to know to what such a resignation would lead, and what sort of a remedy it would provide for our humiliating position. We shall have forty-eight members in the Federal Parliament against one hundred and forty of English origin; in other words, we shall be in the proportion of one to four. What could so weak a minority do to obtain justice? Evidently the resignation of the French section would make it still more powerless, and it would have to accept the tyrannical

dictates of its opponents. The French members of the present Government themselves give as the ground of the necessity of the proposed changes, the fact that the existing Constitution does not afford us sufficient guarantees. But then, what sort of guarantees shall we have under the Confederation which it is proposed to force upon us and under which we shall be in a minority twice as great? Let us suppose the very probable contingency of a collision between our Local Legislature and the Federal Government, in consequence of the rejection of a measure passed by the Province of Lower Canada and thrown out by the General Parliament; in what position shall we be? Let us remember that the Federal Executive appoints the Legislative Council, presides over the criminal legislation of the country, and appoints the judges who administer it; in a word, that in the Federal Government are vested all sovereign powers, to the exclusion of the local governments. Well, Mr. SPEAKER, I say without hesitation that in the case of a collision, we shall find ourselves completely at the mercy of the hostile Federal majority, and that it may oppress us, assimilate our laws, suspend our judges, arm the militia against us, and send us to the scaffold or into exile in any way they may think proper, notwithstanding our protestations and those of the French-Canadian minority in the Federal Parliament. Such has already been found to occur; the past is there to prove the fact, and everything leads us to believe that the same attempts at fanatical aggression will be renewed in our day, if the scheme of Confederation is adopted. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member for Brome, whose loyalty will certainly not be called in question, himself declared in this House that this scheme would give rise to difficulties and entail deplorable collisions. Supposing, Mr. SPEAKER, that those collisions and difficulties arise, what shall we do? Will not all power be in the hands of the Federal Government and of a hostile majority? Is it not because the people understand it that they reject this measure with threats on their lips and in their eyes; that every day they send us numerous petitions in which they prophesy the most serious dissatisfaction? How long will the eyes and the ears of the members of this House remain closed, that they may not be cognisant of this protest of their alarmed fellow-countrymen? The Hon. Atty. Gen. East himself refuses to communicate to us a single one of the details of the scheme of

Confederation, and he would have us give up all the rights which the existing Constitution confers upon us, by voting in favor of a Local Legislature of which the powers will be naught, and of a General Parliament in which we shall be in the proportion of one to four. Mr. SPEAKER, it is not surprising that the French-Canadian population of Lower Canada is unanimous in rejecting a Confederation which presents to us so gloomy a future—(hear, hear)—and I do not fear to declare that our Ministers are committing an act of very great imprudence in forcing upon the people constitutional changes of so serious a character, and so loudly denounced as an attack on their rights and their privileges. Never, at any period of our history, have there been seen such changes of constitution under such extraordinary circumstances. And exactly at the moment when we are preparing to resist the invading army of a powerful neighbor, we are deprived of the liberties which we enjoy after having secured them by a century of struggles. But it seems to me that new guarantees of security ought rather to be given us, in order to induce us to fight with warlike antagonists ten times more numerous than ourselves, and whose political organization is perhaps less hostile to our race than the proposed Confederation. Have not the present Ministry taught us to look upon the semblance of local government, which they propose to us, as a sufficient protection for all that we hold most dear, and to accept the position of a powerless minority in the General Government, because commercial interests only will be brought in question there? If this proposition is a just one, the Constitution of the United States, with the recognized sovereignty of Lower Canada, affords much greater security for our institutions, our language and our laws. For the sovereignty of the state implies their preservation in the state, which yields up nothing to the General Government except a very restricted number of powers. Yes, Mr. SPEAKER, in proposing a change of Constitution the Ministry have committed a serious fault, and they have no right to endeavor to prevent the people of this province from examining the question of possible changes in all its bearings. Scarcely six months ago the French-Canadians lived happily, relying upon the security given them by the existing Constitution. Now such can hardly be the case, when the proposed changes threaten their existence as a race. Impose these

changes upon them, and then let danger come, and England will find out, but too late, that her most loyal subjects are lost to her. Our people will have learned that of two evils they must choose the least, and that on a comparison between Confederation and annexation, the least evil will not, unfortunately, be found to be Confederation. Before marching on to certain slaughter, the soldier will ask himself for what he is going to fight, and whether the Constitution which he is going to defend is worth the sacrifice of his life's blood. The day upon which the French-Canadian soldier puts this question to himself, will be the last day of the English power in America. I hope I may be mistaken, Mr. SPEAKER, and I would wish to believe that the views of the Government are sounder than mine, at a time when they propose a measure so full of danger as that which is submitted to us. I would wish to believe, above all, that they have no intention of skilfully leading us into a collision with our neighbors, which would tend to carry us directly into annexation, and would strike a mortal blow at English domination on this continent. I shall conclude, Mr. SPEAKER, by summing up my remarks. The union of the two Canadas has not yet done all its work. There is still room for progress under it, and it must be continued. The Hon. Attorney General for Lower Canada (Hon. Mr. CARTIER) maintains on the contrary that it has no longer any grounds of existence, and that we must have a new political organization. Well, Mr. SPEAKER, I venture to hold an opinion different from that of the hon. member for Montreal East, and I have no hesitation in saying that under the union we can yet double our prosperity and our numbers, if we introduce into the administration of affairs a little less party spirit and a little more patriotism. (Hear, hear.) I say, further, that the demand for representation based on population has no cause of existence, that it was repudiated by Upper Canada, at first by the Conservative party, and afterwards by the Liberal party under the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Administration. When we have seen the most energetic and most sincere partisans of representation based on population abandon that principal basis of their politics, and make of it, in their government, a question against which they engaged to vote, I say that it is very wrong to use it as one of the reasons to compel us to accept the scheme of Confederation. That cry, raised by fan-

aticism in the west, will naturally be stifled by the more rapid increase of the population of Lower Canada and the annual diminution of immigration. With the assistance of these two causes our population will, in ten years, equal that of Upper Canada. I say, Mr. SPEAKER, that the scheme of Confederation is not expedient. But even if the scheme of Confederation was expedient, I maintain that the object of it is hostile. I gave an historical sketch of the encroaching spirit of the English race on the two continents. I pointed out the incessant antagonism existing between it and the French race. Our past recalled to us the constant struggle which we had to keep up in order to resist the aggression and the exclusiveness of the English element in Canada. It was only through heroic resistance and a happy combination of circumstances that we succeeded in obtaining the political rights which are secured to us by the present Constitution. The scheme of Confederation has no other object than to deprive us of the most precious of those rights, by substituting for them a political organization which is eminently hostile to us. The hostility of the scheme of Confederation being admitted, I maintain that its adoption will entail the most disastrous consequences. To impose upon the French-Canadians this new Constitution, which they do not want, is to tempt their anger and to expose ourselves to deplorable collisions. (Hear, hear.) It must necessarily be submitted to them before it is adopted; if they accept it, then will be the time to send it to England to be sanctioned. But the Government, and especially the Hon. Attorney General East, cannot ignore the petitions which are presented to us against the scheme, and especially so imposing a petition as that from the city of Montreal, which contains 6,000 French-Canadian signatures, and which is the most numerously signed petition which has ever been presented to our legislature by a city. I say, further, that those who vote for the scheme of Confederation take the shortest way to lead us into annexation to the United States. I am not the first to express this opinion; several hon. members from Upper Canada have expressed it before me within the precincts of this House, and it is because those members from Upper Canada desire annexation to the United States that they vote in favor of the scheme of Confederation. The hon. members from the west, whose

words are so loyal, will be the first to pass over to the enemy with arms and baggage, should an invading army ever appear on the frontier. Such, Mr. SPEAKER, is the position as it is. If His Excellency the Governor General thinks he ought to follow the advice of those who look to Washington, let him even do so; but I think it is high time to speak plainly here, and to warn him of the danger. (Hear, hear.) Mr. SPEAKER, I am not an old man with one foot already in the grave, and on the verge of eternity, and I adopt my course in view of the future. Our Ministers, who, in the course of a long career, have exhausted the supply of honor and of dignity in our country, are perhaps tempted to risk the future of their country for titles, honors and larger salaries under Confederation, perhaps for the sake of being governor of one of the Federated Provinces. We know that England nobly and royally rewards those who serve her without scruple. Besides, the prospect of founding a vast empire is well worth the sacrifice of some months of a worn out career, at the risk of not succeeding entirely in so gigantic a project. (Hear, hear.) But for my part, Mr. SPEAKER, I who belong to the coming generation, and who have twenty years of future before me, cannot approve, by my vote, of a scheme of Constitution which presents itself to us in such a gloomy perspective as regards our nationality, and all that we hold most dear as Frenchmen. If I am thus severe in my remarks, Mr. SPEAKER, I hope it will be understood that they proceed from profound conviction; and it is well known that those who have honey on their lips are not always the most sincere at heart. I know also that sometimes those who state boldly what they think pay very dearly for their boldness and independence, but no dread of this, Mr. SPEAKER, shall ever cause me to shrink from expressing my convictions, when I consider that my doing so may be of any use to my country. (Hear, hear, and prolonged Opposition cheers.)

Cries of "Adjourn, adjourn!" from the Opposition.

HON. MR. CARTIER — No, no! Call in the members.

HON. A. A. DORION said he had moved the adjournment of the debate last evening, to have an opportunity of replying to the honorable member for Montmagny (Hon. Mr. CAUCHON). But as that honorable gentleman was not in his place in the afternoon, he

had yielded the floor to the honorable member for Richelieu (Mr. PERRAULT). The honorable member for Montmorency, he observed, was still out of the House, and he should like to defer his remarks till the honorable gentleman should be in his seat. (Cries of "Adjourn," and "Go on.")

COL. HAULTAIN then rose to address the House. He said—If the House will permit me, I shall relieve the honorable member for Hochelaga (Hon. Mr. DORION). It is not surprising to me, Mr. SPEAKER, that there should be this hanging back on the part of honorable members with regard to expressing their views on this subject, as so much has been said about it, that it is now, I won't say thoroughly, but very nearly worn out. And for my own part, in common, I suppose, with all who will have to speak at this stage of the debate, I feel reluctant to trespass on the time of the House. At the same time, I cannot properly call it a trespass, but must rather consider it a duty. On a matter of this very great importance, involving the interests of so large a portion of this continent, I think it behoves most of us to express our opinions with the best ability that we can bring to the subject. (Hear, hear.) We have had this question discussed from so many points of view, and, I presume, by the ablest men who occupy public positions in Canada, that a humble individual like myself must feel great diffidence in saying another word on the subject. But it is no small encouragement to know—at any rate I feel it to be an encouragement in speaking in advocacy of the scheme—that I am in such good company, that the leading men in this province, the leading men in the British Provinces generally, and I may even say the leading men in the British Empire, are all agreed as to the desirableness of what is now proposed, and as to the wisdom which has been displayed in the framing of the scheme now submitted for our adoption. I do not expect to say anything new, and the fear of repeating what has already been said makes me reluctant to say anything at all; and were I to consult my own feelings, I have no doubt I should be silent, and would rise only when you call on us, Mr. SPEAKER, to give our votes either for or against the resolutions in your hand. I think every honorable member who has spoken in this debate has expressed his sense of the responsibility resting upon him, when addressing the House and the country on a matter of such vast importance to us all. I feel equally with others how great is this responsibility, and have en-

deavoured to bring the best powers of my mind to the consideration of the question. The more we consider it, the more we look into the future in connection with our present movement, the larger the importance, I believe, it must assume in our minds. It not only affects the interests of Canada, but of all the British Provinces of this continent. Its probable results will materially affect the future, both of the British Empire and of the neighbouring republic, and, therefore, more or less the future of the world at large. I do not think that I am using language at all exaggerated. From the best consideration I have been able to give to this subject, I believe there are under-lying the question now before us principles of the greatest importance to the world. I believe there are principles involved in our present action that must very much determine the character of the institutions that will generally prevail. The impression upon my own mind is, that if successful, we shall give greater stability and a more permanent foothold to the principles that obtain in the British Constitution; but that failing in our present object, we shall see the decadence of these principles on this continent, and the advance of those principles which obtain in the neighbouring republic. (Hear, hear.) The more I consider it, the stronger am I of the opinion, that at the present time the principles of democracy and of monarchism—if I may so express it—are at stake; and, considering it in this view, I look upon the scheme before us as calling for the most cordial and earnest support of every man who has learned to value the stability, the moderation, and the justice which have characterized the British nation as compared with any other nation that exists on the face of the globe. The great question before us is that of union—a practicable and attainable union—a union of provinces owning allegiance to the same Crown, possessing, generally, similar institutions, similar systems of government, the same language, the same laws, the same dangers, the same enemies. Our institutions are generally similar, although, no doubt, from having been isolated for so great a length of time, and having had no intercourse one with the other to speak of, there is an idiosyncrasy attached to each of the provinces as they now exist, and the longer we remain separate the greater the divergence must be, and the more difficult union between us will be of accomplishment. The advocates of this scheme propose the union of all these provinces. It is a trite

proverb that "union is strength, and division is weakness." So universally accepted is this statement, that no man can venture to deny its correctness. And I feel, as an advocate of union, that our position is one which is unassailable, and the arguments must indeed be strong which would convince me that we are not going in the right direction when moving towards union and consolidation. (Hear, hear.) Apart from the intrinsic force and power of union, which would be in itself sufficient to call us in that direction, Canada has special reasons for desiring that the British provinces should draw together more closely than they have yet done. By such a step we may remove one great cause of our own political difficulties. I do not think that this is at all a necessary part of the argument for our uniting together. But it so happens that by our union we hope to remove these difficulties, and that is an additional argument for union, although not at all necessary to induce the adoption of the scheme. I believe that if we had no difficulties whatever in Canada, if we were perfectly satisfied with our political position, union would still be desirable on the broad ground of the advantages we would derive from it. But, in addition to those advantages, and the force and strength which union will give us, it will assist us in surmounting and removing those great difficulties under which we labor; and it is a most happy circumstance that, while we are carrying out a principle so excellent in itself, we are at the same time enabled to remove difficulties which might prove most disastrous to our prospects. And, in addition to these reasons, we have evidently the wishes of the Mother Country for the success of this scheme. (Hear, hear.) No one can with reason question the reception which the scheme has met with from the press and from men of all shades of political opinion in the Mother Country. It has met with universal approbation there. (Hear, hear.) There has been no jealousy of it that I know of. There has not proceeded from any quarter one word of disapprobation or of doubt as to the prudence and the wisdom which have dictated our advances towards union. The good wishes of Great Britain are thoroughly with us. (Hear, hear.) An additional reason, I may say necessity, for union exists in the hostility of the United States so palpably manifested during the past few months. In fact, sir, looking at all our interests—our interests socially and commercially—our interests of defence—our internal harmony—our very

existence as an independent people—all bid us go forward in the direction of union. I shall allude but briefly to the political difficulties of Canada, as this part of the subject has been most ably handled by honorable gentlemen who have preceded me. Our difficulties, I had fancied, were palpable to all, and yet we have heard honorable gentlemen who are opposed to the scheme, almost ignoring their existence, or treating them as though they did not weigh in the scale of the arguments on this question at all. I am sorry my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. DUNKIN) is not here, as I will have to refer to some of his remarks. That honorable gentleman, as well as others, intimated to the House that our difficulties had disappeared; that since 1862 Upper Canada had been satisfied with her position; that agitation had been laid aside; that there was no more mention of any sense of injustice on the part of Upper Canada. This line of remark only shews me how ignorant those honorable gentlemen were of the subject on which they were speaking; how entirely they had remained in the dark as to the feelings which existed in the minds of the people of Upper Canada; manifesting a degree of ignorance on one very important feature of our position, that rendered them to a great degree incompetent to deal with this question. From much that I have heard relative to the cause of the dissatisfaction known to prevail in Upper Canada, I think it well not to be altogether silent about it. We must look deeper than the displeasure felt and manifested at the passing of certain measures obnoxious to the majority of that section, or at the unjust principle of an equal distribution of the public revenues between the two sections. It is true that these tended to draw attention to, and make more prominent the real cause of discontent. It lay deep in the chafing of the minds of men whose national characteristic is impatience of intolerance and injustice. It dwelt in the abiding sense of the unfair position that the terms of the union of 1840 now imposed upon them, and obeying their national instincts, they could never cease to insist upon a representative reform. (Hear, hear.) I suppose there are no people on the earth who feel more strongly or who will resist more determinedly the perpetration and continuance of any injustice. It was that sense of injustice, weighing heavily on the minds of the people of Upper Canada, that rendered our position one of difficulty and of danger so long as relief was denied them. I have been surprised, therefore, to hear the statement

which has been made by some hon. gentlemen in this House, that the feelings of dissatisfaction which existed in Upper Canada have disappeared. The formation of the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Government has been mentioned as a proof that we have become indifferent to the question of representation by population, which had been so repeatedly and so strongly urged, and that the people of Upper Canada were quite willing, for the sake of some small material advantages, to cast aside that for which they had been agitating for so many years. In opposition to this, I must state that there was the strongest disapprobation felt and expressed throughout Upper Canada at the formation of that Government. The only excuse made for it was, that it was simply a provisional government, and that its formation was nothing more than a temporary measure. I would not hesitate or fear to appeal to any constituency in Upper Canada, where the question of representation by population had been agitated, and ask them to say whether they did not cherish the strongest feelings of disapprobation that that question should have been ignored at the time of the formation of that Government.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—North Ontario elected a member of that Government.

HON. MR. HOLT—They were all elected.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—But in North Ontario a member of the Government came who had not been the member for that constituency before, and defeated one who was in favor of representation by population.

COL. HAULTAIN—In alluding to this matter, I would wish to guard myself against rousing anything like party questions or party feelings. (Hear, hear.) I desire, in dealing with the important subject now under debate, to remember that the question before us now is not who was right or who was wrong in 1862 or 1863. The question is, are we right in advancing towards union, or are we making a great mistake; but where it is necessary for me to allude to the course pursued by either party, it is for the purpose of argument alone, and not in any way to raise the question who was right or who to blame. I stated, sir, that there was the strongest disapprobation—I might more correctly say disappointment—felt in Upper Canada that the question of representation by population should have been laid aside by the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Government. I felt as strongly as any man could have done the unfortunate posi-

tion in which we were then placed; but giving it the best consideration I could, and believing that a change of government was desirable under almost any circumstances, I most unwillingly consented. I believed nothing else could have been done at the time. It was the opinion of most, though not of all, with whom I then acted—we might have been wrong, that is not the question. Believing, therefore, that we could not then secure the success of the measure for which we had been agitating and which we had been seeking, we thought it necessary to form and acknowledge and support a provisional government, for I do say that the Government then formed was in my estimation, and in the estimation of Upper Canada generally, a provisional government—nothing more; a Government which was simply tolerated, and which could not possibly exist for any length of time. It was a government formed for a certain purpose, and Upper Canada sanctioned it only because of that purpose, which was regarded at the time as of primary importance. He knows little of the mind of Upper Canada who sees in it any indifference to the question of parliamentary reform. It was a position that neither party has anything to boast of; the apparent inconsistency of the one resulted from the felt misgovernment of the other. It is no small pleasure to be able cordially and consistently to act with honorable gentlemen whom I strongly opposed before, and I so acted because I thought it my duty under the circumstances so to do.—(Hear, hear.) Well, sir, how long did this provisional government last? Within one year it was defeated, and before it could shew itself to Upper Canada, there was an entire reconstruction of the Cabinet—and why? Because the principal measure which Upper Canada had demanded was lost sight of.

HON. MR. BROWN—Hear! hear!

COL. HAULTAIN—There can be no stronger evidence of this fact, than that it was necessary to bring into the Cabinet men who truly represented the views and wishes of Upper Canada, and men also in Lower Canada who were thought to be more friendly to Upper Canada demands. Had that government, without reconstruction, gone to Upper Canada, where would they have been? Had they gone to Upper Canada as they were, and without admitting other elements into the Cabinet, they would have met with a very general hostility. The Premier himself was made fully aware of this, and he wisely bowed

to the wishes of Upper Canada. There cannot, therefore, be a stronger evidence than this of the fact that the question of reform in the representation was not laid aside, neither had it lost one iota of its importance in the minds of the great majority of the western section. The Government that had ventured to lay it aside was virtually swept away, and another formed who made it an open question. This, sir, lies at the very foundation of our difficulties. It has been the source of our difficulties, and no doubt would have continued to be, had no remedy been provided. I have said before on another occasion, and I repeat it, that the minds of men in Upper Canada were filled with foreboding as to the future. They feared that Lower Canada would resist their demands; they feared that Lower Canada would continue to deny to them what appeared to them to be palpably just and right, and what the end of it all would be they did not know. I confess that I shared this feeling in common with others; and it was a matter of common conversation that things could not continue as they were; that it was impossible for Upper Canada, with her superiority in numbers and in wealth, to consent to remain in the united Legislature in the inferior position she then occupied. If the attempt had been persisted in to deny to that section what was so reasonable and just, no man could have foretold the serious difficulties which might have followed. Hon. gentlemen from Lower Canada, who have expressed an opinion that this question had ceased to be considered as of importance in the west, manifest a very great ignorance of the character, the feelings and the intentions of the men they had to deal with. My hon. friend from Brome was one of those who wished to make light of our present difficulties. He said, towards the close of his speech, that it only needed a little patience, that very little was wanted to make everything quite smooth. But, sir, even he was obliged to admit that a slight measure of parliamentary reform was necessary in order to remove the difficulties by which we were surrounded, and he evidently intimated his willingness to concede it. And there have been hints thrown out by certain Liberal members from Lower Canada that it would not be such an impossible thing, if we would give up this scheme of union, for Upper Canada to obtain her right position, and what she has so justly claimed. But if this be their feeling, I ask them why they did not come boldly

out before and avow it? I would ask my hon. friend from Brome—and I regret extremely that he is not in his place—why did he not, in 1862, speak of concessions to Upper Canada, instead of, by vote and by argument, do his best to convince us that we could expect no relief from him and from those acting with him, from the same section. Very different language is now used by Lower Canada members of all shades of opinion, to that we have been accustomed to hear. Those who now admit the justice of the demands of Upper Canada, and yet in time past have resisted them, ought to be the last to oppose this scheme, which settles the difficulty on a basis accepted by all. The honorable member for Brome and the British members from Lower Canada, who resisted the reform asked for, ought to be foremost in supporting the scheme before us; and I am sorry to find that my hon. friend appears to me to occupy a very inconsistent position. Had he always advocated parliamentary reform, he might with consistency have opposed the proposed union. In some such position, and even in a stronger point of view, do the French Liberal members appear to be. They were the professed allies of the Reform party in Upper Canada, and were, of course, aware that no reform government could stand that did not deal with the representation question. Now, it appears to me, sir, that the Liberal French party have been singularly untrue to their Upper Canada allies —

HON. MR. HOLTON (ironically)—Hear! hear!

COL. HAULTAIN—I repeat, sir, that the Liberal French members have pursued a course that if continued in, could only have terminated as it has done. I speak of what has come under my own observation since 1862. A new Parliament had been convened. The question of representative reform had attained great prominence. The Reform party had spoken distinctly on that question. Had their Lower Canada allies contemplated a continuance of the alliance, we might suppose that they would have forbore raising unnecessary difficulties. But, sir, what was the course pursued? It will be remembered that an amendment to the address was moved, asserting that the principle of equal representation was essential to the union. This was a gratuitous though most significant expression of the divergence that was inevitable. This was made more palpa-

ble still, when, at the formation of the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Government, the Reform party were obliged to pay, as a price for their alliance, the surrender of the principle most prominent in their political creed. An alliance based upon such terms could not possibly last. And what must we think when we hear hon. gentlemen intimating that this principle might now be conceded? Had the same principles been then enunciated, had a bold, straightforward course been adopted by the Liberal members of Lower Canada, they might now be occupying the position of settling our very serious difficulties. I have alluded, sir, to the wishes of the Mother Country relative to the movement upon which we have entered, and I assert that the feeling there is one of universal approbation. Still, so much has been said relative to the opinions existing in the Mother Country as to the connection with her colonial dependencies, and especially with those in British America, that I think it right to remark on this branch of the subject rather more fully than I should otherwise have done, for I feel the great importance of it. I know of nothing that would so much tend to discourage the people of this country as that an impression should go abroad that the Mother Country was intending to cast us adrift—to sever the connection. I have no doubt myself, sir, that did such an opinion really exist in the Mother Country, and were it to be carried into effect at the present time, or within any short period of time, the only alternative—I fear, the only alternative—would be our annexation to the United States. (Hear, hear.) Therefore, I feel it to be of great importance that no doubt should exist in the minds of the people of this country relative to the feelings entertained towards us at home. My hon. friend the member for Brome dwelt at considerable length on the subject. He expressed, and I am quite sure he entertains the strongest desire for the perpetuation of this connection; yet it did seem to me that he dwelt with peculiar satisfaction upon every word he could extract from speeches and pamphlets, which appeared to him to point to a desire to sever that connection, and I cannot but remember that he was frequently cheered with “Hear, hears” corresponding with the sentiments he expressed. The remarks made by the hon. member from Brome were, to my mind, most extraordinary. The deductions he drew from the speeches of certain noble-

men and gentlemen in the Imperial Parliament, were so directly opposite to what appeared to me the design and tendency of those speeches, that I cannot account for it in any other way, than by presuming that my hon. friend was not in his usual health, and that his mind did not possess that degree of clearness which he generally brings to bear on every subject he investigates. (Hear, hear.) It seemed to me that he looked at everything relating to this question through a distorted medium. I listened with the greatest pleasure to the dissection the hon. gentleman made of these resolutions, and to the microscopic analysis to which he subjected the smallest part of their provisions: It shewed the great acuteness of his observation, as well as the large and extended information of his mind. But I could not help feeling that he was looking at this subject through the discoloured lens of a powerfully microscopic mind. (Laughter.) I have no doubt whatever that this also was the impression made by his speech on other hon. gentlemen. His talents and his ability I fully recognize, and I have no doubt that every hon. gentleman listened, equally with myself, with pleasure to what I may call the excruciating dissection to which he submitted these important resolutions. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) But I must at the same time say that the result of all his analysis, and the summing up of all his observations, only proved to me that the ground on which the advocates of this scheme stand is well nigh immovable and unassailable, and convinced me of the smallness of the objections which have yet been urged against it. Of course my hon. friend from Brome, considering the temperament of his mind, dwelt at length and with much force upon the article which lately appeared in the *Edinburgh Review*. I must acknowledge that in that article there are passages of extreme offensiveness, such as I regret to see in any British publication, and which were uncalled for and imprudent. If I thought that the article reflected the views of either of the parties now dividing the political world in Great Britain, I should indeed say that our connection with the Mother Country was precarious, and that it behoved us to ask with pertinacity what really was the intention of the statesmen and the people at home with regard to us. But, sir, we have happily the most conclusive evidence that could be afforded, the

that article does not represent the views of either of the great parties in the British Parliament. It may be the mind of a few isolated individuals; it may represent what is called the Manchester School; and I am not surprised at all that they should utter sentiments of that character. I believe that the Manchester School, being in a measure republican in their political tendencies, would not be sorry to see us joining the great republic to the south, and that it would not be a matter for much sorrow to them to see us forsaking our allegiance to the British Crown, and joining our fortunes with those of our neighbors. It behoves us to see if there are not some grounds of complaint—if there is not some reason why the Manchester School should wish to get rid of us. It has been well observed that the remarks made upon us by our enemies are generally more valuable than those emanating from our friends. We cannot very well afford to despise the opinions of our enemies, and we would do well to consider, if we desire to perpetuate the connection with the Mother Country, whether we cannot consistently with our interest and honor conciliate every party in Great Britain. Believing as I do that our independence and prosperity depend upon preserving the connection with the Mother Country, I would be willing to remove every just cause of complaint which may be found to exist. I believe, further, that no man should take part in the government of these provinces who is not alive to the importance of this question. And what is the ground of complaint made by those who hold loosely the connection of the colonies with the Crown? The complaint is that they are taxed with our defence, while we tax the industry of the Mother Country, and go directly in opposition to the policy adopted by that country; and surely there is some force and truth in this complaint. There is no doubt that, as we are growing in wealth and numbers, these men feel it as an oppression that they should continue to be taxed as heavily in order to provide means for our defence, and especially as, in times past, we have done so little ourselves in that direction. As from year to year, or decade to decade, we grow in numbers and wealth, we ought to consider, if we value the connection, in what manner we can relieve the Mother Country of the expenses entailed upon her for our defence.

I also hold that, in so far as our financial position admits of it, we should seek to adapt and assimilate our financial policy to that of Great Britain. If we would continue an integral part of that country, we ought not to have high tariffs intervening as so many barriers to that commercial intercourse which should exist between the two countries, for these must be provocative of soreness and dissatisfaction. I am, however, well aware that there are circumstances which, at the present time, do not admit of such a commercial policy with the Mother Country. I merely say we ought constantly to keep the matter in view, and that those who desire to maintain the connection should consider it their duty to decrease the tariff as much as it can be done with justice to our own position, and thus remove the great cause of complaint on the part of the people at home. (Hear, hear.) I have alluded, sir, to the *Edinburgh Review* and to the extreme offensiveness of some of its passages referring to the colonies. But at the same time, there are sentiments enunciated in the very same article, which seem to me to contradict the drift of the article itself. As we have heard so much of this article, and as it has been made the ground on which to base the supposition that there is a growing desire in England to bring to an end her connection with the colonies, I beg to call the attention of hon. gentlemen to this suggestive paragraph, as I find it in the same article:—

The people of England have no desire to snap asunder abruptly the slender links which still unite them with their transatlantic fellow-subjects, or to shorten by a single hour the duration of their common citizenship. On the contrary, by strengthening the ties which still remain, they would convert into a dignified alliance an undignified, because unreal, subserviency.

This is a remarkable passage to find in such an article, because, as I said before, the whole drift of the article seems to imply a desire on the part of the writer to see the connection severed; and yet, while expressing this sentiment, he says there is no desire to shorten by a single hour the duration of our common citizenship! Why, this article which has been made so much of, which has been dwelt upon so forcibly, and which has been sent forth to the country as indicative of the future policy of England—I say this very article has strong language

manifesting a desire for the maintenance of the connection.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—What does the concluding part of the article say?

COL. HAULTAIN—That a stronger alliance is desired.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—I mean the concluding part of the article altogether.

COL. HAULTAIN—I do not mean to say that there is nothing in the latter part which contradicts the former. But the article points to a position the writer would desire to see us occupy.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—A position of independence.

COL. HAULTAIN—Of alliance, not independence.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—No; the latter part of the article expresses the satisfaction felt by the writer at the prospect of our becoming independent.

COL. HAULTAIN—I have not the *Review* by me, and it may be as my honorable friend says. But the general drift of the article is as I have stated it to be. I do not mean to say that there are not apparently contradictory sentiments therein expressed—sentiments which are absolutely and altogether contradictory. To resume my argument, it seems to me that if we evinced a desire to remove the existing causes of complaint, even the Manchester School, even such men as GOLDWIN SMITH, would not be unwilling to see the connection between these provinces and the Mother Country continue. My honorable friend the member for Brome, not only alluded to this article in the *Edinburgh Review*, but he thought there were speeches uttered by certain noblemen and gentlemen in their places in the British Parliament, from which, looking at them through his discolored lens, he could extract sentiments of a similar character. The hon. gentleman would admit nothing whatever in favor of this scheme, and seemed determined that England, whether she liked it or not, should cut the connection. He said the Mother Country eulogised the scheme, but—that Lord GRANVILLE approved, but—that Lord DERBY spoke in favor of the connection, but—All the virtue to his mind was in the “buts.” Nothing would satisfy him, and nothing would satisfy England whatever was done, and the sooner she got rid of us as a bad bargain, the better she would be pleased. (Laughter.) But what was really the tone of the speeches from which the hon. gentleman quoted? Lord HOUGHTON,

81

in seconding the motion for the Address in the House of Lords, on the 7th of February, said, “He hoped and believed that these colonies would still recognize the value of the British connection, and that their amalgamation would render them more safe, without in any way weakening their fealty. (Cheers.)” What language, I ask, could more clearly express the feelings of the person speaking than this, and, as the seconder of the Address, the desire also of the party connected with him, that “our fealty to the British Crown should in no manner be weakened.” And yet my honorable friend from Brome thought, with that discolored view he took of it, that he detected some uncertainty—some “but.” (Laughter.) Lord DERBY was even more strong and emphatic in his language:—

If I saw in this Confederation a desire to separate from this country, I should consider that a matter of so much more doubtful policy; but I see it with satisfaction—perhaps, however, it is too soon to discuss resolutions which have not yet been finally adopted—but I hope I see, in the terms of this proposed Confederation, an earnest desire to retain the blessings of the connection with this country—an earnest feeling of loyalty, and a determined and deliberate preference for a monarchical form of government over republican institutions, and a desire to maintain, as long as it can be maintained peaceably—and no human being can wish to see it maintained longer—the amicable connection which at present exists between this country and the colonies. (Cheers.)

I notice that on both occasions when Lord DERBY and Lord HOUGHTON expressed these sentiments of attachment to the colonies, cheers were given in the House of Lords; and yet the hon. member for Brome, laboring under some extraordinary mental hallucination—(laughter)—thought he could detect evidences of a desire to abandon us to our fate—a willingness on the part of the two great parties represented in the House of Lords by Earl GRANVILLE and Earl DERBY, that this connection should cease! When we consider the position Lord DERBY occupies; when we consider that he spoke from his seat in Parliament—and we all know the significance attached to the utterances of even the men of least note, when they speak from their places in the Legislature, how their words will be noted down and become a matter of record to be referred to five or ten years hence perhaps, as I dare say has more than once been found to be the case with regard to honorable gentlemen

occupying seats on the floor of this House—when Lord DERBY, I say, the leader of the greatest political party in Great Britain—and I do not hesitate to assert that it stands to-day the most numerous party—gives utterance in the strongest terms to his desire to see perpetuated the connection with the Mother Country, I hope we see in that an evidence, that so long as we discharge the duties properly devolving upon us, England will never fail us in our hour of need. (Cheers.) Lord GRANVILLE said :—

It was gratifying to see the good feeling which existed between this country and the North American colonies, which, while they strove to carry out their own wishes, desired to continue the connection with England.

Why, sir, if my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. DUNKIN) was right, Earl GRANVILLE, so far from saying that he desired to see this connection perpetuated, should have expressed his regret that we were desiring to maintain this connection. Notwithstanding the strength of the language I have quoted, my hon. friend from Brome was determined to see in it some desire in the minds of these noble lords that the connection should cease—some desire on the part of the people of England that they should no longer hold, as appendages of the British Crown, these valuable Provinces of British America. He said even, with reference to the language of Lord DERBY, that his lordship “hoped” and “trusted” that so and so would be the case—and that the very fact of Lord DERBY’s expressing a hope that we were not going to sever the connection, was in his mind tantamount to saying that a separation was inevitable. (Laughter.) What would happen, sir, if my hon. friend were to carry out these extraordinary views in the common intercourse of life? It struck me, while he was speaking, that in his state of mind, there might be danger in the interchange of the casual civilities of social intercourse. He is unfortunately laboring under a severe cold. Suppose I were to meet him to-morrow morning, and in the exercise of that friendly regard that I cordially feel for my hon. friend, I were to express a hope that his malady was decreasing. If he were to interpret my “hope” in the same strange manner in which he has taken the “hope” of Lord DERBY and others, he would very likely tell me that he was not so near his dissolution as I imagined, and that he had no intention yet of ordering his grave to be

dug. For it must be evident, that acting under the mental delusion that has characterized his remarks on this subject, he would interpret my “hope” that he was better, to a persuasion on my part that he had but a precarious tenure of his life. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) And to illustrate farther how incapable his mind had become of dealing impartially and correctly with the important subject before us, I would call the attention of the House to the fact that when Lord DERBY expressed “a hope,” he was not speaking at all of the feeling in England, but he was speaking of the feeling in this country. He said he hoped *we* should continue the connection. But when he spoke of the feeling in the old country, he did not even use the word “hope,” but spoke positively and with assurance, saying: “I am sure” that the aid of Great Britain will never fail them when they require it. (Hear, hear.) We have had his remarks quoted to us before, but I make no apology at all for extending the discussion upon it, for I feel strongly how important it is that this country should understand what the feeling in England is with regard to us. We have also had quoted to us the words used in Her Majesty’s Speech, at the time that Columbia was formed into a British province. I will read it again :—

Her Majesty hopes that this new colony on the Pacific may be but one step in the career of steady progress by which Her Majesty’s dominions in North America may ultimately be peopled in an unbroken chain from the Atlantic to the Pacific, by a loyal and industrious population of subjects of the British Crown.

(Hear, hear.) These utterances from high official quarters, which are generally very reticent, are remarkable for their force, and for the unmistakable language in which they are couched. But, if there was any doubt as to the feeling which existed among the leading men of the political parties of the Empire, ought not that doubt to be removed by the visit of His Royal Highness the PRINCE OF WALES to this country? Was that a mere sham, a make-believe, on the part of England and the English Government, that Her Majesty desired to retain, and Her Government and the people of England desired to retain, the allegiance and the homage of Her people in the west? I do not believe it for a single instant. I have had recalled to my mind the language used by the PRINCE OF WALES, which I remember struck me very forcibly

at the time. It occurred in his address to the Canadian regiment in the year 1858, or the beginning of 1859. After its arrival in England, colors were presented to that regiment by H. R. Highness. It was his first public act, after he had been appointed to a commission in the British army. I will read the words which fell from the lips of His Royal Highness on that occasion, and which made a most gratifying impression on my mind, having spent, as a British officer, previous to that time, many years of my life in these provinces. His Royal Highness, in presenting the colors to the regiment, used these words:—

The ceremonial on which we are now engaged possesses a peculiar significance and solemnity, because in confiding to you for the first time this emblem of military fidelity and valor, I not only recognize emphatically your enrollment into our national force, but celebrate an act which proclaims and strengthens the unity of the various parts of this vast empire under the sway of our common Sovereign.

While on this subject, I may refer to one or two of the answers which His Royal Highness made to the various addresses presented to him in passing through this country. One of the most gratifying to my own mind, and to the mind of every man who desires to see our connection with the Mother Country perpetuated, is his answer to the Address from the Legislative Council, in which he said—"Most heartily do I respond to your desire that the ties which bind together the Sovereign and the Canadian people may be strong and enduring." (Hear, hear.) But it is not necessary for me to quote further from the answers made by His Royal Highness. The whole aspect of his visit to this country—the utterances of the leaders of the two great parties in the British Empire—the well-known wishes of our Sovereign and of the Heir-Apparent to the Throne—all these intimate, so far as acts and language can intimate anything, that there is still an unanimous desire on the part of the British people for the continuance of the connection of these provinces with the British Empire. And I believe it rests with us—altogether rests with us—whether that connection shall be perpetuated. (Hear, hear.) I have no doubt that this prevailing desire for the perpetuation of the connection is one main ground of the satisfaction with which the people of England view our movement towards union. They are well aware—not looking at it from the view of our sectional jealousies and party conflicts, but looking at it from a broader point of view—that

our union must tend to the consolidation of our power and our strength, and to the development of our resources. I see no absolute necessity why, as we grow in strength, we should think, for many long years to come, of severing the connection; but as we increase in wealth and in numbers, we ought gradually, in the time of peace, to relieve the Mother Country of the expense to which we now put her for our defence. (Hear, hear.) Another reason why we should earnestly desire a union of the British provinces, in order to develop our nationality, in order that we should become better acquainted, in order that new channels of commerce should be opened up, is because of the hostility of the United States, evidently manifested to this country during the past few months. What has been the policy of the United States towards Canada during that time? We have seen adopted the passport system—a remnant of despotism which even the despotic governments of the old world have abolished. We have seen that democratic people embarrassing and restricting the intercourse between us; they have given notice of the termination of the convention limiting the lake naval force; they have, I believe, given notice of the abrogation of the Reciprocity treaty; we have seen the committee of ways and means reporting a bill for putting the frontier defences in order, and recommending the expenditure of upwards of a million of dollars on those defences. They have given notice, or propose to give notice, of the abrogation of the Extradition treaty. They have proposed the construction of a ship canal around the Niagara Falls for gunboats and vessels of war. This is the policy of the United States towards Canada. (Hear, hear.) And it makes us consider what steps they will take next. It must make every man consider the position of this country, should she be cut off from a communication with the ocean through the United States by the bonding system being suddenly terminated. It makes us feel the humiliating position we occupy, that our very national existence at the present time is in a great measure dependent—most humiliatingly dependent—upon a foreign and an unfriendly power. (Hear, hear.) The people of the United States have recently manifested no good-will towards us, and the steps that have been taken to exhibit their ill-will are perhaps only a foretaste of what we may expect before long. But whether they take extreme measures or not at the present time, does our

present position offer any guarantee for independence, or for the continuance of our connection with England? Rather, do not the condition of this continent and the earnest advice of British statesmen call aloud upon us to be prepared, unless we intend to form part and parcel of the great republic? I can readily understand how men with annexation tendencies, and who are inclined towards republican institutions, would rejoice at our present position. I can understand how men who wish to see the whole continent converted into one great republic, are pleased at difficulties being created between the Empire and the provinces. But those who entertain different views see plainly that some steps must be taken, that we must go to work earnestly to build up a nationality independent of the United States, though not in hostility to it, to counteract the tendency so evident on every hand to drive us into their arms. We know very well what must be the result of the steps which they are now taking—unless we ourselves take measures in another direction—unless we find another outlet to the ocean—unless we find some other channels for our trade and commerce, they know that we must inevitably fall into their arms. That is another reason why I wish to see no delay in the union and in the amalgamation of the British provinces, in order that we may at once consolidate ourselves into one people, and at once endeavor to abolish those barriers which now exist between us, and develop the feeling that we have common interests, and that we are dependent the one upon the other, which can never be the case so long as division walls exist. It seems really astonishing to my mind that any man who really desires to see built up on this continent a nationality independent of the United States, should offer any opposition to the proposal now before us. (Hear, hear.) So much has been said with regard to our financial and commercial position and prospects, that I think it is quite unnecessary for me to say anything further on the subject. I am quite sure that I could not place the matter before you as well as it has been submitted by those who have preceded me. But it is natural that each speaker should dwell upon that which most impresses his own mind. I am persuaded that in every point of view—in view of our dependence upon, and precarious relations with the United States; in view of a desired union with the British provinces; in view of our connection with the Empire—we should be culpably lacking in our duty, did we any longer delay to seek and to

create new channels for our trade and commerce. It is well known that at the present time our productions are actually passing through the hands of the New York merchants before they reach the Maritime Provinces. These merchants are deriving all the benefits of that trade, which, with all our disadvantages, does exist to a considerable extent, and is evidently capable of an enormous extension. It is only necessary to refer to the position and characteristics of the different provinces, to see at once how exactly they supply the wants and deficiencies of each other. Suffice it to say that we are agricultural and manufacturing, whilst they are, and must remain, principally a maritime population, requiring for consumption that with which we can supply them. I know it is said that these channels of commercial intercourse may be opened up without union. But we need to feel ourselves to be one people, with identical interests, dependent upon each other; and what can do this as well as a political union, bringing us together into one legislature and under one government? Perhaps it is not too much to say that our commercial interests would be furthered more in ten years under a political union, than it would be in thirty years without it. (Hear, hear.) In connection with this subject, I am naturally reminded of the Intercolonial Railway. Now, sir, it appears to me, although the Intercolonial Railway has been dragged into this question—although the expense of that undertaking has been dwelt upon by the opponents of this scheme as if it were part of the scheme and of this scheme alone—I believe that whatever the event, whether there be a Confederation of the provinces or not, the Intercolonial Railway is an indispensable necessity. The expense of that railway is, therefore, a question altogether apart from this scheme, and cannot be allowed to enter into the arguments *pro* or *con*. I do not look upon the Intercolonial Railway, at the present time, in the light of a profitable commercial undertaking, neither, to any great extent, as a valuable military undertaking. (Opposition cries of "Hear, hear.") There is not the least doubt that when we are not actually engaged in hostilities, it would be of the greatest advantage in furnishing us with an outlet at all seasons of the year. Before actual hostilities, as in the *Trent* affair, we need it to secure our independence of the United States in bringing rapidly troops and munitions of war into the provinces. When actually at war, we are aware that railways are easily destroyed, and

rendered of little use, unless we have the means of protecting them. But as a great social and political engine, it seems to me absolutely necessary, if ever we are to have a union; and if a union does not come to-day, but is looked forward to ten years hence, I still hold that we ought at the present time, and without unnecessary delay, to commence its construction. Union, sir, is desirable, because undoubtedly it will add to our means of defence. It is true we shall not have any territory added to us which will increase our strength; neither shall we add to the number of battalions in the provinces generally. But it does not, I apprehend, require a military man, or a man with military experience or military education, to be aware that there is no combination which so much needs one head and one guiding mind as the management of military organizations, and the guidance of military operations. What, I ask, would be our position in the event of war, should there be no union? We have at present five distinct provinces, with as many independent governments. The people are but little known the one to the other, and consequently have but the slightest possible interest in each other. In the event of war, circumstances might frequently occur where concerted action on the part of two or more of the provinces might be required. Immediate coöperation might be essential to the success of the proposed project. Should we not have the most serious difficulties thrown in the way of the undertaking, simply from the fact that so many independent governments must be consulted, each jealous of its own rights, and concerned only about its own safety. (Hear, hear.) Such a state of things demands a change, were there no other argument in favor of it. If we are to remain independent of the United States, we must unite, in the most effective manner possible, our available means of defence. We must become acquainted with one another, and do all we can to call into existence a feeling of oneness, and of interest not only in one section or province, but in British America generally. Canadians should cease to think that they are interested alone in the defence of Canada, and Nova Scotians must learn to look beyond the limits of Nova Scotia. If we are to offer anything like a united resistance, we must have a common interest in the whole country. And how can we so surely effect this, how effect it at all, without union? But let us carry out the scheme that is proposed for our adoption, and in course of time we shall

all learn to feel interested in the integrity of every part of the Confederation. If we are united we shall find the people of the Maritime Provinces admirably suited for the work required to be done on the lakes—the key to the defence of Upper Canada. If, therefore, we can be united as one people, if we are brought under one head and one mind, we shall have Nova Scotians assisting in our defence, and very likely we shall assist in the defence of Nova Scotia. (Hear, hear.) I cannot too strongly impress on the minds of those who hear me the strong convictions of my own mind with reference to the importance of immediate and thorough union. Our own interests demand it, the interests of the Empire require it, that we may be able to hold our own against the strong and energetic power to the south of us. For these important objects we must learn to throw aside all our sectional disputes, and to place ourselves in the hands of men who would have to guide us when the time of difficulty may arrive. No one more earnestly desires the continuance of the blessings of peace; but should the reverse come, we must all learn to obey orders with zeal and promptitude, to stand in readiness for service in any part of British America where our presence may be required. This can never be done so long as Nova Scotia is building up a nationality for herself, and New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island are each remaining in a state of isolation, and Upper and Lower Canada are far removed in sentiment and feeling from either. So long as this is the case, we are diffusing our strength and are weakening ourselves. From no point of view can union be more strongly urged as a necessity than in the case of our defence. The defence of Canada, although we have such an extended frontier, is not so difficult as might at first sight appear. There are a few prominent points which must be defended, and which we must make up our minds to hold. It is true we have an extensive frontier, but the frontier of the United States is not the less so. It is true also that we have many towns on the frontier, but they are not to be compared to the wealth and importance of those of the United States, and therefore we are not placed at so great a disadvantage in that respect. There are certain points which are the key or the gates to Canada, and which, if properly defended, we may reasonably hope to hold the country, without fear of any number that may be brought against us, and it is of the first importance that the people of Canada should

awake to the necessity of having these posts defended. If we are to remain independent, if we really desire a nationality apart from that of the United States, it is necessary that we should think of these things, and look them fully in the face—to consider it well, and to see the absolute necessity of coming to some arrangement with the Imperial Government as to the proportion we are mutually to bear. If we are really in earnest in our professed desire to maintain our independence, I believe we shall be willing to tax ourselves and submit to the necessary sacrifices. The very fact that there is an uncertainty existing in the minds of many whether Canada will consent to be taxed for her defence, is one of the strongest grounds, to my mind, why we should lose no time in completing the union of the British American Provinces. I feel that so long as Canada is separated from the rest of British America, so long will she be without any feeling of nationality. She cannot exist here alone. We need to feel that there is a nationality on this continent to which we are attached; and I know of nothing more likely to extend our ideas and views, so as to embrace the whole of British America, than the present project. We are likely to view a country such as the Confederation would include, as something worth struggling for and defending. All other countries of the world are satisfied to tax themselves for their defence, and we find countries not so numerous in population, and with revenues and commerce inferior to ourselves, maintaining comparatively large standing armies. And yet when we talk of our defences—when we speak of the taxation which will be necessary in order to erect and defend these works and to instruct the militia, we hear doubts expressed, uncertainties floating about, whether Canada will really consent to bear her share of it. It shows to me that there is among some a want of a deep-seated feeling of nationality, and that that necessary sentiment has yet to be called out and developed. Where this does exist the people do not hesitate to make any sacrifice necessary for the maintenance of their independence. Other countries have manifested their attachment to their nationality and their flag by the sacrifice of almost everything they possessed. Sometimes, however, it is urged that when the time arrives Canada will show to the world that she is willing to spend her last drop of blood in defence of the soil. This is a very proper sentiment, and sounds exceedingly well, but I cannot help thinking that if those

who give expression to it wish to shew that it can stand the test of trial, they would now urge the expenditure necessary to give effect to it. They would then be doing some real practical good, and not be so liable to be regarded as mere sentimentalists. The question is an eminently practical one, and the sentiment that has no practical issue may be regarded as spurious and useless. We may be sure of this, that if we are not willing to spend the money that is necessary for our defence, when the time comes there will be a great unwillingness to spend the blood. (Hear, hear.) We ought to consider that it is not sufficient that we should be willing to spend our lives, for these alone cannot defend us. If we make no preparation, what will the destruction of life avail us? It is unreasonable and foolish to say that we will leave everything undone—the training of our men, and the strengthening of our positions—until the very time when our only chance must depend upon our having trained men and fortified positions ready to our hand. It would be as reasonable for a man to say, "I will learn to swim when I am drowning." Every reasonable man exposed to drowning would certainly take every means to learn to swim beforehand, so that when exposed to the danger he would be able to extricate himself. It seems to me quite as reasonable for us to say that when the time comes we will spend our lives in defence of the country, and neglect all precautionary measures beforehand. I have no sympathy with such a sentiment, and very little confidence in it. I should like rather to see a little practical sense manifested in a question of such vital importance. I have read with attention the report of Col. JÉRVOIS, who was sent out by the Imperial Government, and, I presume, most other hon. members of this House have also seen it. That officer points out certain places which must be defended, and he closes his report with this remark: "That unless these works are constructed, it is worse than useless to continue any British force in Canada."

MR. PERRAULT—Hear! hear!

COL. HAULTAIN—The hon. gentleman says "Hear! hear!" Of course, sir, I cannot pronounce absolutely what may be passing in his mind, but I have noticed this—the hon. gentleman will know whether it justly applies to himself or no—that when the expenses of our defence were mentioned by my hon. friend the member from North

Ontario (Mr. M. C. CAMERON), in a manner deprecating the expenditure, there was a very significant "Hear! hear!" intimating a hearty concurrence in such sentiments. But, sir, when my hon. friend in his usual forcible manner, expressed his willingness, when the time arrived, to spend the last drop of his blood in the defence of this land, we heard no more of the responding and concurring "Hear! hear!" I alluded to. (Laughter.) My hon. friend, if I understood him rightly, deprecated the idea that any expense should be entailed upon us for defensive works. But, sir, he spoke like a true Briton, and I am quite sure that he was in earnest, and did not utter a mere barren sentiment, when he said that he would spend his last drop of blood in the defence of his country. And I am sure he would do so. But I would put it to my hon. friend if it is more reasonable that he should spend this blood, or spend a few pounds? Who can tell the thousands, ay, the hundreds of thousands of human lives that may be spared by the judicious and timely expenditure now of a few hundreds of thousands of pounds? I wish to impress upon my hon. friend what is the clear conviction of my own mind, that in every point of view it is economy—economy of treasure, and economy of useful lives, to spend some money now to place our country in a state of defence. I think a great change has taken place within the last few years in reference to this subject. The ventilation of the subject has drawn men's minds towards it, and we are beginning to feel that here we are a people considerable in numbers and considerable in wealth, and it is incumbent upon us to do more than we have been doing in times past. I would call attention to a very important work which can scarcely be overestimated. I allude to the Ottawa canal. I regret that the state of our finances will not permit us to think of its construction at the present time, but I refer to it that we may think of it; that the representatives of the people may think of it; that the statesmen of the country may think of it. In order to secure the future defence of the country, and especially the western section of it, and to maintain its independence, the Ottawa canal must be built. The Ottawa canal would be worth 50,000 men to us. With that canal, and the aid of the Mother Country, which we are assured will never be wanting when we require it, we will be able

to maintain and hold our own on the lakes, and thus make our own territory secure, and threaten our opponents at many important points. At the present time we are in a sad condition as regards our canal communication, looked at from a defensible point of view. Our St. Lawrence canals are almost entirely useless. I am glad to see that the American Government have given notice of their intention to terminate the convention for not keeping armed vessels on the lakes. I am glad to see that this is to be put an end to, for it was decidedly prejudicial to our interests, and I have no doubt we shall have gunboats on our lakes before the end of the present year. Had it continued otherwise, we might have been very much at the mercy of the United States. There is no question that, should they determine upon going to war with us before the opening of navigation, we might not be able to get a British gun-boat on our waters by the St. Lawrence canals, as they are so easily accessible to our opponents, and, without much difficulty, could be rendered useless for navigation. As regards the Rideau canal, how are we to get gun-boats through it? There is a certain class of gun-boats that might pass through it.

MR. H. MACKENZIE was understood to express doubt on this point.

COL. HAULTAIN—Yes; the locks of the Rideau canal are, I believe, 130 feet long, and would admit a certain class of gun-boats. But, as my hon. friend seems to remark, the Rideau canal would, nevertheless, be useless, because the only way by which we can reach it is through the Grenville canal, and the locks of the Grenville canal are only 70 feet long. Therefore, we should be entirely at the mercy of the United States, because, unless we held Lake Ontario, the Upper Province would be inevitably gone. Well, sir, it appears to me that all our interests—commercial, political and defensive—and the peculiar circumstances in which we are placed, urgently call for the union of the British Provinces. The reasons are of that force and the interests of that magnitude, that it is surprising to me that any hon. gentleman, who really desires that these provinces should be independent of the United States, should hesitate for a single moment about adopting the scheme, not that it is perfect, but because it is the only one within our reach. (Hear, hear.)

I have now to make a few remarks on the character of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition. The composition of that Opposition strikes me as somewhat remarkable. It is certainly heterogeneous. The great difference between the Opposition and the Government seems to me to be this, that while the Government are anxious to build up, to consolidate, to strengthen, the only object of the Opposition, the only object which keeps them together, appears to be to pull down, to weaken, to divide. (Hear, hear.) Many of the remarks which have fallen from the various members of the Opposition, they might have made with equal force against each other as against the Government. To use a military phrase, they seem to have been firing at one another, but as it is only a war of words and arguments, they may still fire away, although logically *hors de combat*. One says it is necessary we should have a change. Another says he desires no change, but wishes us to remain as we are. A third is against Confederation, because he thinks the Federal principle is one which in all time past has been proved to be weak and powerless. Another member of the Opposition bases his hopes of the world's future on the principles of Federalism. Another says he will have nothing but a legislative union; while, I believe, there are not a few of those with whom he acts who would threaten fire and sword if a legislative union were attempted to be carried. We have surely here an extraordinary display of anything but unanimity. As I said before, they present the spectacle of a most heterogeneous company, with power only to destroy.

MR. T. C. WALLBRIDGE—What sort of a spectacle do the Government present in that respect?

COL. HAULTAIN—The members of the Government have a common object. They have come together, not to assail one another with their opposite principles and views and opinions, but they have come together to combine—they have come together, like reasonable men, for the accomplishment of a great common object—and they have considered how best they can meet one another's views by mutual concession, which is the law that binds society together, without which society would be at an end. They have united in this way and in this spirit to strengthen the position of these provinces, and the position of the Empire to which they belong. But I

do not hear one word of this, with regard to the hon. members forming the Opposition. I do not hear that they have met together, and are prepared to propose to the country some scheme that will be better than the one that is now offered for our adoption. I do not hear a word of anything of the kind, and this I do most seriously complain of. I maintain that the importance of this matter is such, that it is their duty not to avail themselves of what is ordinarily called the latitude of parliamentary opposition.—The circumstances of this country are too grave for us to trifle with such a question. If we present to the House and to the country something to meet the difficulties of our position, then I say that honorable gentlemen who oppose that scheme are wanting in their duty to their country, and are wanting in the appreciation they ought to have of those difficulties, if they do not on their part present something to us, and ask us to accept from them what they suppose better than is offered to them by us. I cannot but express my regret at the course they have pursued. (Hear.) I will now allude, sir, to an opposition to this scheme, which has been very decidedly expressed by a certain section of the Protestant minority of Lower Canada. I am aware, from personal intercourse with many gentlemen belonging to that section of the community, that they do feel a very strong aversion to this scheme, because, as they say, it will place them at the mercy of the French-Canadians. On this point I desire to assure my honorable friends from Lower Canada, that whilst I consider that our present circumstances require us all to speak openly and honestly one to the other, it is and shall be my earnest desire to speak with all kindliness of feeling towards them. I feel compelled to say that there is no part of this scheme that I feel more doubt about, than the effect it will have upon the education and political interest of the Protestants of Lower Canada. It has been said that there is and always has been a spirit of toleration and generosity on the part of the French-Canadians towards their Protestant fellow-countrymen. I have heard it said that they have on every occasion furthered to the utmost of their ability, and in the fairest and most just manner, the educational interests of the Protestant minority. But on the other hand, gentlemen who have paid a great deal of attention to the subject, have

also said that, in time past, although there has not been an open hostility to the education of the Protestant minority, there has been a very decided under-hand obstructiveness. This is stated by gentlemen who have taken a particular interest in the matter, and who, I am confident, would not make such a statement if they did not think it to be the case. And I must say, for my own part, that I do think the Protestant minority have some grounds for this fear. And this is my reason: the religious faith of the majority in Lower Canada is, as we know, Roman Catholic, and they receive from the head of the Romish Church their inspiration; they are guided by the principles that are laid down, and that are from time to time publicly promulgated by the head of that Church. Now, I do not think that my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen can be surprised—and I would ask their attention to what I am saying, I desire to speak honestly, but, of course, courteously—I do not think they can be surprised at these suspicions and fears of their Protestant brethren. And why? Because they must themselves be aware what are the principles of the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

HON. MR. ALLEYN—What are they?

COL. HAULTAIN—They are not tolerant. (Murmurs of disapprobation from various parts of the House.)

HON. MR. ALLEYN—Are Presbyterians more tolerant? The hon. gentleman has stated that the principles of the Roman Catholic hierarchy are not tolerant. Will he explain whether he means that they are not tolerant with regard to civil liberty, or with regard to religious liberty. We wish to understand precisely what the honorable gentleman means.

COL. HAULTAIN—And that is precisely my object. I believe that civil and religious liberty are so bound up that you cannot separate them.

HON. MR. ALLEYN—You believe they are intolerant on both points?

MR. ROBITAILLE—It is not well to discuss such matters here.

COL. HAULTAIN—I think I have only to refer to the letter recently issued from Rome, to find a complete and absolute answer to the question which the hon. member for Quebec has put to me. I see in that letter, which is invested with all the gravity and authority that necessarily surround a message from the head of the Roman Catholic Church

—I see, amongst other things, that it is there stated as an error to be condemned, "that emigrants to Catholic countries should have freedom of worship." (Hear, hear.) I do not think there can be any one more anxious than myself to avoid anything like religious discussion in this House, or to avoid rousing anything like religious animosity. But when we are discussing a scheme of the greatest importance, involving the interests of various sections of the community, I do think it behoves every man to speak honestly. (Hear, hear.) I have said that the Protestant minority in Lower Canada fear lest they should not have full justice done to them. They know the great power of the Romish hierarchy in Lower Canada. They know how much everything is shaped according to the wishes of that body. They know that that hierarchy receives its inspiration from Rome, and within the last few weeks we find what is the character of that inspiration. (Renewed murmurs of disapprobation.) Now I ask my Roman Catholic friends to consider this candidly. When there comes from the Pope, the head of the Roman Catholic Church, a letter clothed with all the authority that we know the French Canadians attribute to that source, and when we have it declared here that it is an error to say that in some countries called Catholic, emigrants should enjoy the free exercise of their own worship—(Hear! hear!)—I hear some of my honorable friends say "Hear, hear," in rather a jeering tone. But I ask you to think honestly about it. Suppose it were possible for the Protestants of Canada to speak in a manner similar to that in which the head of the Romish Church has spoken, and that we were to declare it to be a principle that should guide us, that we ought not give to those who differed from us the freedom of religious worship, would not the Roman Catholics in Upper Canada have good reason to be alarmed? Now, I ask you to do me the justice, my hon. friends, to think of it in a just light, and not in the light of an attack upon your religion. I ask you to think of it fairly, especially at such a time as this, when the Protestants of Lower Canada are called to put themselves into the power of the Roman Catholic hierarchy; for I believe it is simply tantamount to that. I ask you to think what must be their feelings when they read, as emanating from the head and ruler of the Romish hierarchy, such a

sentiment as that contained in the passage I have quoted.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—Will the hon. gentleman allow me to say a word? The Protestant minority of Lower Canada have always lived in harmony, not only with the Catholics, but with the Catholic clergy of Lower Canada. And I may say also, on behalf of the Protestants of Lower Canada—the majority of them at all events—that they are so convinced that there is true liberality in the hierarchy, in the Catholic clergy of Lower Canada, as well as in the great majority of the Roman Catholics of Lower Canada, that they have no such fears as the hon. gentleman entertains. (Hear, hear.)

COL. HAULTAIN—Of course, it must be perfectly obvious, that in a matter of this kind, what emanates from my hon. friend the Hon. Attorney General East will have very little weight, in comparison with what emanates from the head of the Roman Catholic Church. Now, I do not accuse my French-Canadian fellow-subjects of anything like intolerance. But what I say is this, that there is ground for suspicion on the part of the Protestants of Lower Canada, knowing what is the position in which they will be placed, with regard to the Roman Catholic hierarchy, when they find emanating from the head, the very inspiration and fount of that hierarchy, the intolerant sentiments I have alluded to. Why do I mention this? Is it with the view of raising any difficulty about the scheme now before us? Quite the reverse. I speak in time—I speak to assure my co-religionists in Lower Canada—to elicit the declaration of tolerant and generous sentiments on the part of Roman Catholic members; I speak in earnest warning now, that there may be no necessity for it hereafter. I need scarcely declare what are my own sentiments—those of every British Protestant; we grant cheerfully to our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen that which we also demand, the freest liberty of conscience, the freest exercise of every political right. (Hear, hear.)

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—The Hon. Attorney General East rose and spoke for the Protestants of Lower Canada. My hon. friend from Peterborough (Col. HAULTAIN) also speaks for them. How shall we decide between the two?

HON. MR. MCGEE—The hon. gentleman from Cornwall is like the blank leaf between the Old and New Testaments, belonging

neither to the one nor to the other. (Laughter.)

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—I really think this is a very important matter. The hon. member for Peterborough speaks for the Protestants of Lower Canada, and the Hon. Attorney General East also says he speaks the feelings of the same class. What shall we say between them?

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—I can say this. I have seen, as the hon. member is aware, a considerable amount of political life, and during all that time I have always stood by the cause, when it was attacked, of the Catholic hierarchy of Lower Canada; but at the same time I have always stood up on behalf of the rights of the Protestant minority, and it has been my lot always to have the confidence of that body.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—Not as a body.

HON. MR. ALLEYN—I propose that this part of the discussion be postponed till Sunday. (Laughter.)

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—And sing the doxology before we begin.

COL. HAULTAIN—I think, sir, this is a matter too serious to be made the occasion of unmeaning jokes. I speak what I know when I say there is a feeling of distrust on the part of a great many of the Protestants of Lower Canada. And I speak what I know, when I say that what I have quoted as emanating from the head of the Roman Catholic Church, has tended to increase that distrust. It must be evident, that if we are in the future to progress amicably and well, it is better we should speak honestly before we enter into this compact, and that we should all strive to guard against any system being carried out, or any course pursued, that would tend to create difficulties in the future. What do my hon. friends from Lower Canada say with regard to what I have quoted? One hon. gentleman rises with a jeer about deferring this discussion till Sunday. (Hear, hear.) I should like to know what the hon. gentleman thinks of the passage I have read. Does he agree with it?

HON. MR. ALLEYN—Upon my word, I have not read the whole letter.

COL. HAULTAIN—Does he agree with the portion I have read?

HON. MR. ALLEYN—I am in favor of liberty of conscience to the fullest extent.

COL. HAULTAIN—I think, in justice to themselves, hon. gentlemen of the Roman

Catholic faith should make themselves acquainted with what has emanated from Rome. I feel there is ground for the remarks I have made, and that I would have been failing in my duty to the Protestants of Lower Canada, had I not made them—had I not stated on their behalf the grounds of their fears for the future. I hope hon. gentlemen will make themselves acquainted with what I have alluded to. I do not know whether the long list of errors was read out in the Roman Catholic churches, but I do know that the Encyclical letter which accompanied it was communicated to those who attend church. I do not know whether my hon. friend is in the habit of going to church.

HON. MR. ALLEYN—Oh! yes.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—I would like to know how my hon. friend from Peterborough will satisfy those for whom he speaks, if he votes for this Confederation scheme.

COL. HAULTAIN—I have sufficient confidence that my honorable friend the Attorney General East would oppose anything like an oppression of the Protestant population of Lower Canada. I am quite satisfied he will faithfully carry out the assurances he has given from his seat in Parliament with reference to the amendments to the Education Act of Lower Canada.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—And I may say that my fulfilment of those pledges will be easily performed, because it has never entered the minds of the Catholic clergy in Lower Canada, or of the majority of the Catholics of Lower Canada, to oppress their fellow-subjects the Protestants. (Hear, hear.)

MR. J. DUFRESNE—What happened before the union should be proof of that.

COL. HAULTAIN—Well, after all that has been said to me, I ask honorable gentlemen of the Roman Catholic persuasion to look at what the head of their Church has written and published to the world, and then to say either the one thing or the other—either that they have no confidence in what the head of their Church says, or that they have confidence in it, and will act accordingly.

HON. MR. MCGEE—I hope the honorable gentleman will be found willing to extend to the Roman Catholic minority of Upper Canada the same privileges which we are ready to extend to the Protestant minority of Lower Canada.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—The honorable member for Peterborough admits that the intentions of the Hon. Attorney General

East are sincere, and says he relies on them. But, on the other hand, he reads to this House an edict which supersedes any promises which the Hon. Attorney General can make. That is the difficulty in which the honorable gentleman is placed.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—I recommend the honorable member for Cornwall to read the Encyclical letter.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—I have read every word of it.

MR. BELLEROSE—Then you didn't understand it.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—All I wished to say was, that I think the honorable member for Peterborough has put the case very fairly.

COL. HAULTAIN—Whether I put it fairly or not, or whether honorable gentlemen approve of what I have said or not, matters not in the least to me. I have simply discharged what I conceived a duty to my fellow-religionists in Lower Canada. I bring to the knowledge of honorable gentlemen of the Roman Catholic persuasion what many of them seem to have been ignorant of. And it is all nonsense to endeavor to ignore the fact that I have brought before them. We know that in some Roman Catholic countries absolute intolerance prevails. In Spain, for instance, not a Protestant church is allowed to be erected throughout the whole length and breadth of that country. It is of no use, therefore, for honorable gentlemen to jeer at what I say; and when an edict of intolerance is again promulgated and sent out to the world, emanating from the very head of the Romish Church, is it surprising, when the Protestants of Lower Canada are in a small minority, and know that they will be at the mercy of the hierarchy entertaining those views, that they should feel some reluctance to be left in that position. I know this very well, that the generality of Roman Catholics in this country would avow, as they have done, their opposition to the sentiment I have quoted. I call upon them practically to disavow it, and I have confidence that they will do so. Whether they like the dilemma in which they are placed, or not, is another matter. (Hear, hear.) Composed, as our society is, of those different elements, when we have to discuss matters similar to that before us, when we have to adopt a scheme involving the interests of minorities and sections, it is right that we should do so frankly and honestly one to the other, and face to face. I have spoken with every desire to avoid being

offensive, uncourteous and unkind, and I have done it, I trust, in a manner befitting the occasion and my own character.

MR. DENIS—Will the honorable member allow me to put to him a question? Since the honorable member has referred to this letter from the head of the Church, does he entertain the opinion that any honorable member has a right to come here and criticise in a similar way the mode of procedure of Protestant clergymen? If so, how are we to get along at all? The honorable member may have his own opinions in regard to this letter, but he ought not to state them on the floor of the House, for if he does so any other honorable member has the right to come here and criticise the conduct of respectable clergymen of the Free Church, of the Episcopal Church, or of any other Protestant Church, and make such comments as he thinks fit. This ought not to be. Then, the honorable member said the letter ought to be looked upon with suspicion. Well, all I can say is, that if we go into a chapter on suspicions, every man ought to be suspicious. We might bring suspicions to bear upon everything, however respectable it may be, and in this way it would be impossible with frankness to deal with anything. My hon. friend uses the word "hierarchy." Well, a word even does damage sometimes. My honorable friend may have his opinion upon these things, and that opinion ought to be respected, because I believe it to be an honest opinion; but if he has a right to speak of "Romish" and all that sort of thing in connection with our Church, we will have a right to speak in a disrespectful manner of ministers of the Free Church, of the High Church, of the Low Church, and of all the other kinds of churches, and bad feeling will be created to no purpose.

COL. HAULTAIN—MR. SPEAKER, whenever any one who has the right or authority to speak for Protestants enunciates such a doctrine as that which has emanated from the Pope of Rome, I am quite willing it should be thrown in my teeth on the floor of this House. I will tell my honorable friend who has just addressed me, what he ought to have been aware of, that there is no analogy whatever—no similarity whatever—between the Pope of the Church of Rome and any minister of any other body of Christians. I would dismiss this subject, sir, by simply stating that I have used terms ordinarily employed, and have been anxious to do so in no offensive manner. Some of the reasons given for the opposition which has been offered to the scheme now

before the House are, that it is not perfect, and that it embraces principles which would endanger the working of the projected Constitution. Now, of course, sir, the scheme in one sense is not perfect.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Hear, hear.

COL. HAULTAIN—Any Constitution drawn up to meet the circumstances under which the five, I may say the six, provinces were situated must necessarily present apparent inconsistencies. Concessions and mutual compromise must inevitably be consented to if we are to have union at all. It does not manifest any extraordinary degree of acuteness in order to be able to discover the possible difficulties that may arise from it. Honorable gentlemen who have spoken against it have magnified the dangers of collision, and especially has the honorable member for Brome done so. I am of opinion, sir, that if the same rigid and hostile analysis were made of any form of government, or of any constitution, monarchical or republican, originated for uniting separate and distinct peoples together, it would not be difficult to foresee dangers of collision as likely to flow therefrom. Were the British Constitution itself subjected to the same kind of dissection, flaws and compromises might be detected, and possible dangers be foretold. In the Constitution proposed for our adoption, as with all others, the successful working of it must mainly depend upon the characters and principles of the men who have to work it. The honorable member for Brome certainly attempted to make the worst of these resolutions, and endeavored to point out, in almost every feature, defects which he thought might endanger the interests of the people. He dwelt particularly upon the apparent facilities for the development of what is called in this country "log-rolling." He said we might find the Maritime Provinces working with each other, and with Lower Canada against Upper Canada, and *vice versa*. Well, it must be obvious, sir, that the honorable gentleman's objections in this respect applied with as much force to a Legislative union as to a Federal union, and yet my honorable friend is himself in favor of a legislative union.

HON. MR. HOLTON—I must set my hon. friend right. My honorable friend from Brome—who is now absent—said he was opposed to any other union than that at present existing between the provinces; and his whole argument went to show that he was opposed to any other tie than that now existing.

HON. MR. MCGEE—If the honorable

gentleman will permit me, I may say that I followed the honorable member for Brome very closely, and that according to my understanding he expressed himself in favor of Federation, but without a union such as that now proposed. His argument was that we should federate with the Imperial Government, and that there should be a Council in London.

HON. MR. HOLT—That was another point.

HON. MR. MCGEE—No, it was this point: His proposal was—and he is the only member on the other side who has ventured to put forth a counter-proposition to that now before the House—that we should have a Council similar to that for the East Indies. I intend to reply to this proposition when the proper time comes. But my honorable friend from Peterborough is quite right in what he has stated.

COL. HAULTAIN—I am of opinion that the honorable member for Brome, if he did not desire it at the present time, at any rate expressed himself in favor of union at some future time.

HON. MR. HOLT—A legislative union, if a union at all. But he really did not want any other than that now existing.

COL. HAULTAIN—That is precisely what I said, and I maintain that the very same arguments which I have alluded to as used against a Federal union, might likewise be urged against a Legislative union—that there would be the same amount of “log-rolling” in the latter as in the former.

HON. MR. BROWN—And a great deal more.

COL. HAULTAIN—Certainly as much. I think my honorable friend from North Ontario (Mr. M. C. CAMERON) used the same argument, and yet I believe he is in favor of a legislative union.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—I am.

COL. HAULTAIN—But my honorable friend must see that this argument against the Federal union might be urged with equal cogency against any union at all.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—I may, perhaps, be allowed to say that my position is just this, that a legislative union would be preferable, because the people would enter into it with the design of working for the harmony and advantage of the people; whereas, if a Federal union were entered into, the local interests of each province would predominate over the interests of the whole.

COL. HAULTAIN—I think in this point of view the argument is rather in favor of

the Federal principle, which does remove some of the causes of the difficulty, in so far as local matters are removed from the jurisdiction of the General Government, and are left to that of the local governments. But looking at it in every point of view; considering the greater expense, the danger of collision between the governments, and the comparative division of sovereignty under the Federal system, I am decidedly in favor of the closer and more simple form of government secured by a legislative union. (Hear, hear.) But I would remark to those who oppose the former because of their professed desire to see the adoption of the latter, that in attacking the Federal scheme in the manner alluded to, they are only putting arguments into the mouths of those who are opposed to any union at all. They should also take into consideration, that it is admitted on all sides that a legislative union is unattainable, and therefore, practically, we need not now discuss their comparative merits. It appears to me but a useless waste of time to advocate a certain system of union with others, and to make such advocacy the ground for opposing a practicable union, when those with whom we are to unite, and who are free to make their own choice, pronounce against it. (Hear.) We have to consult the wishes of six independent provinces; and if five of them oppose a legislative union, what sense or justice is there in making our preference for it an argument against the only union that all will consent to, unless indeed it is urged that no union is better than a Federal one. In again referring to the remarks of the honorable member for Brome, I feel bound to say that I listened with great pleasure to the microscopic analysis to which he subjected the proposed scheme. He was, however, only satisfied with picturing all the possible dangers to which we might be exposed in the working of it. He dwelt with a certain kind of satisfaction on the succession of knaves and fools to whom might be committed our future destiny under it; the possibility that its very adoption would call into existence a race of public men devoid of all moral worth and ordinary intelligence. But, sir, I wish to take a practical, common sense view of this question, and I think the country will be inclined to do the same. Were a similar dissection made of the provisions or institutions regulating human society in any of its diversified combinations, dangers and difficulties might be magnified, and all patriotism, virtue and justice consigned to the grave of the past; this would apply

equally to all associations, whether of a commercial, political or national character. Apply it to our own position at this moment. We meet here to conduct the affairs of the country; the forms and rules laid down for our guidance are the result of the wisdom and experience of centuries, and yet half a dozen unprincipled men, if so determined, might obstruct all business and prevent the working of our system of government. The only practical conclusion I can draw from such an analysis would be to abolish all government and abandon all association. My honorable friend went too far; he strengthened the position of those it was his avowed object to assail. It was obvious to my own mind that every day experience, under approximately similar circumstances, swept away the array of dangers and disasters he conjured up, and happily gave us hope that men might arise equal to the occasion that in the future might arise. Our own political difficulties may be pointed to as the opposite to this experience. The essential difference lies in this. Felt injustice creates our present difficulties, whereas, with all the supposed defects of the scheme before us, palpable injustice to any section cannot be charged against it; and in our dilemma have we not had the men equal to the occasion? If we have men at the head of our affairs, desirous of acting justly and uprightly, there is nothing that I have heard from the honorable member for Brome, the chief opponent of the measure, to create apprehension for the future. It certainly is incumbent upon the Opposition, if they are dissatisfied with this scheme, considering all the circumstances of our position, to lay before the House and country some proposition in lieu of it.

HON. MR. HOLTON — What do you say to the maintenance of the *status quo*?

COL. HAULTAIN — I need hardly remind my honorable friend, who is now one of the leaders of the Opposition, of his own admissions that it is neither just nor possible to remain in *status quo*. He has before said that the union, as at present constituted between Upper and Lower Canada, could not continue. And he is quite right. We cannot remain as we are. So said also my honorable friend the member for Hochelaga (HON. A. A. DORION), the present leader of the Opposition. He has expressly stated that some change was necessary. So far we are agreed. A new political combination has been accordingly devised, and the advocates of it say to the

Opposition that if they do not like the scheme, then they are bound on their own admission, as patriotic men, to submit something else. Then only will they have a sufficient excuse for rejecting what is proposed as a solution of our difficulties. (Hear, hear.) The only honorable gentleman who has offered anything in substitution for Federal union is the honorable member for Brome. I confess, sir, that it was with surprise and something akin to disappointment, that I heard the conclusion, the summing up, of my honorable friend's very able speech. No one can deny to him scuteness of intellect and great analytic powers of mind, and it was without doubt an intellectual repast to which he for some hours treated us. But, sir, what a waste of mental energy, how fruitless his intellectual toil! What has his country profited by his exertions? Has he proposed something worthy the elaborate dissection we had listened to? Did he address himself to the difficulties in which his country is placed, and propound a Constitution harmonious and faultless? What did he, sir, propose for drawing together these isolated fragments of the British Empire, consolidating them into one, and thereby adding to their future strength and prosperity? To meet all those urgent wants and diversified interests, he proposes to appoint "a Colonial Council in London, something like the Indian Council, to which our Ministers from the various colonies might be sent to consult with Her Majesty on affairs concerning those provinces." (Hear, hear.) And what is this Indian Council that my honorable friend would prefer to the broad union we propose in order to bring those provinces together, which have been too long separated? What is the position of India, and what the object and composition of the Council of India? That vast country is a conquered appanage of the British Crown. It is governed by a Governor in Council, who acts under the orders of the Secretary of State, the president of the Indian Council in London. The revenue and expenditure of the Indian Empire are subjected to the control of the Secretary in Council, and no grant of such revenue can be made without the concurrence of a majority of the Council. Such, sir, is the Council that my honorable friend proposed for our consideration, and in the adoption of which "we would be taking the best means of developing our relations in a proper connection with the Mother Country." He further says that "in the present

scheme there was no step of the kind contemplated." And who, sir, in his sober senses would venture to propose such a step? It is difficult to conceive that my honorable friend was serious when recommending it for our adoption. A more crude and ill-digested scheme (using his own words) could scarcely have emanated from his mind. What had become of all the acuteness and microscopic power he brought to bear upon the resolutions of the Quebec Conference? "A Colonial Council in London, something like the Indian Council!" Does he mean that we ought to have a Council in London which is to direct us as to our proceedings; which is to send out governors general to this province from time to time to dictate the course of our legislation, and instruct us in regard to the expenditure of our money?—because the Indian Council, under the presidency of a Secretary of State, has control of the whole expenditure of the means of the East India Company, and the Governor General of India acts under their direct supervision and command. I mention this to shew what position the opponents of the resolutions now before us are in, what they are reduced to in order to provide something as a substitute for what is proposed for their acceptance.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Surely my honorable friend does not wish to misrepresent the honorable member for Brome—to say that he purposed to substitute for our present governmental machinery a council similar to the Indian Council. My honorable friend surely does not want to impute to the honorable member for Brome, in his absence, such an idea as that.

COL. HAULTAIN.—I find it difficult to impute anything at all. (Laughter.) I have given his own words and their legitimate meaning. I could not understand what was passing in my honorable friend's mind, which certainly appears to have been in a most extraordinary state. (Renewed laughter.) From beginning to end my honorable friend seemed to be labouring under some hallucination. (Laughter.) And I cannot help thinking that my honorable friend from Chateauguay (Hon. MR. HOLTON) is also labouring under the same hallucination. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—I confess I cannot see the point of the joke.

COL. HAULTAIN—In making these remarks I do not seriously wish to impute to the honorable member for Brome a desire that we should put ourselves into the hands of a Secretary of State and a council at home. I

do not suppose that his mind had quite deserted him. But applying something of the same kind of analysis to the remarks of that honorable member, which he applied to the scheme now before the House, it would be quite legitimate and fair to conclude that such was his meaning. I do not think my honorable friend from Brome or the Opposition have any reason to pride themselves on the scheme he has suggested for our guidance. And it is most extraordinary that a man of his acuteness of mind, and of his extended information, should so far forget himself as seriously to propose for our acceptance, in his place in Parliament, after a labored, lengthened and able analysis of these resolutions, this animalcule which he announced as the result of his protracted incubation of eight hours' duration. (Laughter.) I am sorry my honorable friend is not here to listen to what I have thought proper to reply. I need not say that I have made these remarks in the most friendly spirit, befitting the friendliness and respect that I cordially entertain towards him. When, MR. SPEAKER, I think of the smallness of the objections and of the greatness of the subjects involved, I cannot help seeing that it is much to the interest of the British Empire, as certainly it is altogether to our interest, that the scheme now before us should go forward to fruition. I should have liked, had time permitted, to have said a few words as to the remarkable concurrence of circumstances which has taken place in connection with the present movement, and to the no less remarkable unanimity which on the whole prevailed at the Conference. At the time of the assembling of that body, we heard from all quarters of the extreme difficulty—the almost impossibility of getting so many men of widely different opinions, and representing so many diverse interests, to come to a mutual understanding. It could only have been accomplished by the unanimous desire that seemed to prevail to accomplish the object that brought them together. And now that we have secured a scheme, to which the leading men of all the provinces have assented, are we to throw it on one side, and adopt some such miserable thing in its stead as that proposed by my honorable friend the member for Brome? We have yet to learn what other members of the Opposition may be able to produce; but I hope, for their own credit's sake, they will submit something more suited to the gravity of our position. As between the two schemes yet suggested, I can have no difficulty in making my selection,

Much has been said, and I believe felt also, about the uncertainty of our future. We are forcibly reminded that the future is not in our own hands; neither by any prudence or wisdom of our own, can we determine it. We are from day to day debating upon our present position, devising new arrangements for the future, and discussing the probabilities of their success or failure. It proclaims our own impotence and our absolute dependence upon a higher Power. I feel deeply, sir—and I make no apology for expressing it—that we ought to look above for Divine guidance; and I regret that our religious differences should so operate as to prevent our performing together a public act of invoking God's blessing on our proceedings, without which all our deliberations will fail of success. (Cheers.)

HON. MR. ALLEYN moved that the debate be adjourned.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER moved in amendment, that the debate be adjourned, and be resumed immediately after routine business on Monday.

After discussion, the amendment was carried on a division.

The House then adjourned.

—o—

MONDAY, *March 6, 1865.*

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—Before the debate on the resolutions in your hands, Mr. SPEAKER, is continued, I wish to say a few words. The Government is well aware that the House must naturally feel anxious and desirous of information—and that no doubt questions will be asked—as to the course which the Government will pursue in consequence of the news that has been received from the Province of New Brunswick, with reference to the result of the elections in that province. (Hear, hear.) The Government are quite prepared to state their policy on the question before the House, in view of that information. Although we have no official information as to the result of those elections, and would not be justified, constitutionally, in making up our minds as to that result, until the Legislature of New Brunswick has declared itself either for or against the Confederation scheme; yet we know, as a matter of fact—and we cannot shut our eyes to the fact—that the Premier and several of his colleagues in the Government of New Brunswick

have been defeated, and that so far there has been a declaration against the policy of Federation. Of course, in a general election, it is not to be supposed that the question of Confederation is the only one discussed at the polls. Being a general election, there was the usual fight between the ins and the outs, the Ministerialists and the Opposition; and, of course, a lot of other influences were at work, such as questions between the Intercolonial Railway on the one hand, and lines of railway to connect with the United States on the other. Still, we should not be treating the House with candor if we did not state that we must consider the result of those elections as a check upon the Confederation project. The Canadian Government however, I may say at once, do not consider that the result of these elections should in any way alter their policy or their course upon this question. (Hear, hear.) They wish it to be most decidedly understood, that instead of thinking it a reason for altering their course, they regard it as an additional reason for prompt and vigorous action. (Hear, hear.) We do not consider that in these events to which I have alluded, there is any cause whatever for the abandonment of the project, or for its postponement. In fact, the only reason why we should consider them to be a matter of grave import is, that they form the first check that the project has received since the question was submitted to the people of these provinces, at the time of the formation of the present Government of Canada. If we only look back to June last, and then regard the present condition of the question, we cannot but feel surprise at the advance which has been made. In June last we would have been satisfied if we could have contemplated that so soon as this the question would even have been favorably entertained by the governments of the different provinces. But, within the short period which has since elapsed, a conference has been held, and the measure framed by that conference has received the sanction of the governments of all the provinces, and each of the governments of the five colonies is pledged to submit, not only the question of Confederation, but the scheme as prepared by the Conference, to the legislature of each of those provinces. And we have gained more than this. Not only has every government of every colony been pledged to the scheme, and pledged also to us all its legitimate influence as a Government to

obtain the endorsement of the project by their respective legislatures, but we have also obtained the sanction and approval of the Government of the Mother Country. (Hear, hear.) That approval has been conveyed to us by a formal dispatch from the Colonial Office, and in addition, we have had, subsequently, the approval of the British Government as expressed in Her Majesty's own words in the Speech from the Throne in opening the Parliament of Great Britain. And not only this, but we know that it has met, or will meet, with the unmistakable approbation and sanction of the Parliament, the press and the people of England. (Hear, hear.) Therefore, instead of being at all surprised that the whole scheme should not have been begun, carried on, and ended without one check, we should be well satisfied that we have only received one such check from the commencement. The obligations under which the Canadian Government entered at the time that the Conference was concluded, and those resolutions finally agreed to, still remain in full force, and we feel that force. We feel it our duty to call upon the Legislature of Canada, and to use all the legitimate influence of the Government to obtain from the Legislature of Canada a favorable opinion upon the resolutions that have been submitted for its consideration. (Hear, hear.) And, sir, in view of the intelligence that has reached us from New Brunswick, we think it of more importance than ever that the scheme should be carried out as a whole—that it should be dealt with as a treaty, to be endorsed without one single amendment or alteration. (Hear, hear.) As every hon. member of the House who is desirous of carrying Confederation must see, it is now more especially necessary that that course should be taken, so that no other province shall have the opportunity of saying, "Why, even the Province of Canada itself, through its Legislature, does not approve of the scheme as settled by the Conference." We must give no excuse to any one of the colonies to say, "It is open to us to deal with the question as we like; for even the Province of Canada, which pressed the subject upon us of the Lower Provinces, did not express its approval of the scheme, but propounded a new one of its own, which it is open to us either to accept or reject." (Hear, hear.) Sir, not only do we feel that the obligation and expediency of pressing this measure upon the attention of the

Legislature remain as before, but we feel it all the more necessary now to call for prompt and immediate action. The Government will, therefore, at once state, that it is our design to press, by all proper and parliamentary modes of procedure within our power, for an early decision of the House—yes or no—whether they approve of this scheme or do not. (Hear, hear.) One great reason, among others, calling for promptness, is to provide as much as possible against the reaction which will take place in England from the disappointment that will pervade the minds of the people of England, if they get the impression that the project of the union of the provinces is abandoned. (Hear, hear.) I believe that if one thing more than another has raised British America, or the Province of Canada, its chief component part, in the estimation of the people and Government of England, it is that by this scheme there was offered to the Mother Country a means by which these colonies should cease to be a source of embarrassment, and become, in fact, a source of strength. This feeling pervades the public mind of England. Every writer and speaker of note in the United Kingdom, who has treated of the subject, says a new era of colonial existence has been inaugurated, and that if these colonies, feeble while disunited, were a source of weakness, they will, by forming this friendly alliance, become a strong support to England. The disappointment of the corresponding reaction would be great in the Mother Country, if they got the idea that the project was to be given up; and we appeal to honorable gentlemen not to fall away from the position we have obtained by the mere submission of the scheme to the Government and the people of England, and not to allow Canada and the whole of British America to lose all its vantage ground by showing any signs of weakness, any signs of receding on this question. (Hear, hear.) Another reason why this question must be dealt with promptly and an early decision obtained, is, that it is more or less intimately connected with the question of defence, and that is a question of the most imminent necessity. (Hear, hear.) No one can exaggerate the necessity which exists for the Legislature of this country considering at once the defences that are called for in the present position of affairs on this continent. I need not say

that this subject has engaged our anxious attention as a Government. The Provincial Government has been in continued correspondence with the Home Government as to the best means of organizing an efficient defence against every hostile pressure, from whatever source it may come. And, as this House knows, the resolutions themselves speak of the defence question as one that must immediately engage the attention of the Confederation. We had hoped that the Confederation scheme would have assumed such an aspect that the question could have been adjudged of as a whole, and that one organized system of defence could have been arranged between the Federal Government and the Imperial Government at an early day. But we cannot disguise, nor can we close our eyes to the fact that the course of events in New Brunswick will prevent an early united action among the provinces on the subject of defence; and, therefore, that question comes up as between Canada and England, and we feel that it cannot be postponed. (Hear, hear.) In fact the subject has already been postponed quite too long. (Hear, hear.) It is time, high time, that it was taken up and dealt with in a vigorous manner. (Hear, hear.) These are two of the reasons which, the Government feel, press for a prompt decision of the House upon the resolutions before it. (Hear, hear.) Then there is a third reason, which is found in the state of the commercial relations existing between Canada and the United States. The threatened repeal of the Reciprocity treaty, the hazard of the United States doing away with the system of bonding goods *in transitu*, and the unsatisfactory position generally of our commercial relations with the neighboring country—all this calls for immediate action. And the fact of the union of these provinces being postponed, and of the construction, therefore, of the Intercolonial Railway being put off indefinitely, renders this all the more imperative. It is, therefore, the intention of the Government—and they seek the support of this House and of the country to the policy which I now announce—first, to bring this debate to an end with all convenient speed, with a view to having a declaration of the House upon the question of Confederation. The Government, to this end, will press for a vote by every means which they can properly use. Then, secondly, as soon as that is obtained, it is the intention of the Government to ask

the Legislature for a vote of credit, and prorogue Parliament at the earliest possible date. (Hear, hear.) It is their intention to provide that all the unfinished business of the present session shall be so arranged, that it can be proceeded with next session, from the point where it is dropped at the close of this session. Upon the prorogation of Parliament, the Government will send a mission to England at once, for the purpose of discussing and arranging these important points to which I have alluded—the question of Confederation, under its present aspect—the question of defence—and all matters bearing upon our commercial relations with the neighboring country; with instructions to press their work forward with the least possible delay, with the view of enabling the Government to submit the result of the mission—which we hope will be satisfactory—to this House at an early summer session. (Loud cheers.)

HON. J. S. MACDONALD said—The manner and spirit in which the Government have made the announcement of their decision is so far satisfactory. They have, however, adopted a new policy and announced a change of tactics, and one which this House is to be called upon to enforce. They have departed widely from the policy that they decided upon not long since. I beg leave to call the attention of the House to the words used by the Hon. Premier of the Government himself, at the opening of the session. He says:—

They had assumed the charge of affairs with an understanding that they would have a right to appeal to the country; and while they were consulting about it, they received an intimation from the real chief of the Opposition, through one of their own friends, to the effect that he was desirous of making overtures to them, with the view of seeking to accommodate the difficulties. The hon. gentleman and some of his friends then came into contact with the leaders of the Government, and it was agreed between them to try to devise a scheme which would put an end to the misunderstandings, and at the same time secure for Canada and the other provinces a position which would ensure their future safety, and procure for them the respect and confidence of other nations. They arranged a large scheme and a smaller one.

And now, MR. SPEAKER, I wish to call the attention of the House to this point. "If the larger failed, then they were to fall back upon the minor, which provided for a Federation of the two sections of the province."

The larger scheme, Mr. SPEAKER, is evidently a failure. (Hear, hear.) And I will tell you why I think it a failure. This scheme was to be agreed to by all the provinces, and the different Governments were to bring it down for the consideration of their several Houses of Parliament. The leaders of the Opposition in New Brunswick, as well as the Government of that province agreed to a treaty, as it is called, and went back to submit that treaty to their Legislature for approval. But being defeated in New Brunswick, it is not possible for the arrangement to be carried out. What reason has the Government for believing that those who have been just elected in New Brunswick as opponents of the scheme will allow it to be brought down for the consideration of their Legislature? How can it be expected that a free people will agree to a scheme, from the terms of which they entirely dissent? It seems to be the idea of honorable gentlemen opposite, that if this Legislature adheres to the scheme, it will be forced upon the unwilling people of New Brunswick—that some process will be found by which the Government of that province will be induced to submit it to their Legislature. They seem to imagine that the rejection of the TILLEY Government, and, consequently, of their Confederation scheme, by the people, is a matter that can be traced only to the annexation proclivities of a large section of the people of New Brunswick. If that is so, we ought immediately to appoint a day of general thanksgiving, in this appropriate time of Lent, for the blessing of being relieved from any danger of union with such a people. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) It would be one of the greatest misfortunes that could happen our province to be connected with those annexationists.

HON. MR. HOLTON—But it is not true that the annexation feeling was the cause of the defeat.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—I do not say it is so, but I am referring to what members of the Government have said about this defeat being caused by the disloyal and annexation proclivities of the people of New Brunswick.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—Who did?

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—Well, I find their organ of this morning attributing it to that cause. And what did the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. McGENE) say on Friday night, on the reception of the news? He

said there were many in that portion of the province who were influenced by a desire for connection with the United States, and that there were capitalists from Boston and from Maine whose interests lay in having New Brunswick more closely coupled with the destiny of the United States. If these are the feelings that induced the gentlemen who have been elected to repudiate the proceedings of the Convention, then, I say again, they are a people with whose views we of Canada should have no sympathy. If the gentlemen on the Treasury benches suppose that by passing these resolutions they will compel the gentlemen, who have been returned to that Parliament on the express condition that they shall oppose the treaty or Convention scheme, to turn round and support it, then what shall we say of such men? What shall we say of men who, after having obtained the suffrages of the people as opponents of the scheme, shall turn round immediately after they have got into office, and in effect perjure themselves? (Hear, hear.) We have, unfortunately, enough of that class of legislators in Canada, without linking our destinies with like persons from New Brunswick. If that is the character of the people to whom we are to be united, then all I can say is, that they are not a desirable class to have added to Canada. If it is contemplated that they are going to compel those gentlemen to vote approval of the scheme, who have been elected specially to oppose it, it would be very interesting to know by what process it is to be done. Are they to be bribed into acquiescence, or forced into submission? If the latter, then we must presume that they are not of the race of British freemen who, elsewhere, would resent with indignation—ay, rebel—before yielding up their independence; and in that view, they are again unworthy of association with us. There is no doubt that the gentlemen who have been elected in New Brunswick have deliberately considered their position, and whether it is attempted to bribe them or coerce them, they will manfully resent it. I do not believe it is desirable to have a Confederation adopted by either course. What are we to gain by compelling such a community to come in with us? Will they not, for all time to come, cast upon us the reflection that they became part and parcel of the Confederacy without their consent? Is it desirable to have to do with neighboring

colonists, who have been either forced or bribed to accept what is repugnant to them? Will they not always be a source of discord by endeavoring to make the scheme work badly? (Hear, hear.) But, Mr. SPEAKER, we have before us an instance of the danger of men undertaking to make treaties without authority. This is the kind of penalty which they pay, and I think we have an instalment of the punishment that is justly due to them, and which they will receive. Sir, we find that in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, a union took place between the Government and the Opposition for the purpose of arranging a plan by which those provinces should be joined together. They had the authority of their respective governments and legislatures before entering into that Conference. They met together by deliberate pre-arrangement, with full consent, unlike the manner in which the gentlemen opposite precipitated themselves into a union fever, growing out of a political contingency. When the delegates went to Charlottetown, from their respective provinces, to treat of matters of great importance to the people of those provinces, and considered it to be a desirable object to obtain the union of the Maritime Provinces, they were interrupted in their deliberations by the members of the Canadian Government—Greater inducements were then offered them, and they were filled with higher hopes and expectations of the good things to be derived from the Confederation of all the provinces. Lieutenant-governorships, chief-justiceships, and life-memberships of the Legislative Council were all held out in the prospective by the Canadian Ministers. By these means they inveigled these men from the object for which they met, and undermined the purpose they were assembled to promote. The Canadian Ministers said:—"Never mind your union of these provinces. Come away from Charlottetown with us, and we will show you plans by which your ambition may be better gratified, although you may thereby betray the trust of the people who sent you here. They may not be satisfied, but never mind them—they can be managed in some way afterwards. We will show you the way." This, in effect, was the language used towards the delegates. They took the bait offered them, and the next thing we heard of was the adjournment of the Convention to Halifax, where the delegates enjoyed the "feast of reason and the flow of soul" for a

week. They then sped off to St. John, where convivialities were renewed, and finally they all agreed to come to Quebec, and we all recollect the subsequent feasting in Montreal, Ottawa, Kingston, Toronto and Hamilton. I will not allude to the meeting that took place here, because it is well known what the result of the Conference was; but I will speak of the sequel to these proceedings—the events that subsequently happened in the Lower Provinces. Hon. Mr. TILLEY knew he could have submitted the scheme of the Quebec Conference to the people of New Brunswick—that he could have summoned the Parliament of that province and ascertained what its wishes were—as early as the Canadian Government could. But he did nothing of the kind. He knew he had violated the trust reposed in him, and that he had given reason for a withdrawal of the people's confidence; but he thought that by bringing on an election in the country, he could gain his own ends by the unsparing use of all the influence a government can employ on such occasions, and by employing all the arts of cajolery for the purpose of deceiving the people and winning them over to his own selfish purposes. Well, what is the result? Hon. Mr. TILLEY and his followers are routed horse and foot by the honest people of the province, scouted by those whose interests he had betrayed and whose behests he had neglected; and I think his fate ought to be a warning to those who adopted this scheme without authority, and who ask the House to ratify it *en bloc*, without having sought or seeking to obtain the sanction of the people. (Hear, hear.) I come now, sir, to a matter personal perhaps more to myself than to any one else. I would ask the House who was it that assailed the Government of Canada more by his speeches and letters than this same Hon. Mr. TILLEY? Who was it that charged the Government of this country with a breach of faith towards the Lower Provinces in reference to the construction of the Intercolonial Railway; and whose statement was it that was reëchoed on the floor of this House over and over again, that Canada had lowered its character and dignity by failing to go on with that undertaking? Was it not the Hon. Mr. TILLEY who made these false accusations, and were they not, on his authority, repeated here by an honorable gentleman now in the Government, at the head of the Bureau of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. MCGEE)? Recollecting these things, sir, I have a pleasure—a mischievous pleasure—(hear, hear, and laugh-

ter)—I have a mischievous pleasure, I say, in knowing that the Hon. Mr. TILLEY has been defeated. (Ironical cheers.) I repeat that I have experienced to-day a considerable degree of happiness in announcing that the man who, at the head of the Government of New Brunswick, betrayed the trust of the people, who failed to carry out their wishes in respect to the union of the Maritime Provinces, who exceeded the authority with which he was entrusted, who betrayed the interests of his province and abandoned everything that he was sent to Charlottetown to obtain—the man who went throughout the length and breadth of his province crying out against the good faith of the then Canadian Government—I say I have happiness in announcing that he has been disposed of by the people. (Hear, hear.) Hon. Mr. TILLEY came to Quebec in 1863, with Hon. Mr. TUPPER, and although he made the charge of bad faith against the Canadian Government, he knew as well as Hon. Mr. TUPPER that the agreement of 1862 respecting the Intercolonial Railway was to be abandoned, except so far as the survey of the line was concerned.

HON. MR. MCGEE—Hear, hear.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—The honorable gentleman cries "Hear, hear," but can he say that, while a member of the Government, he did not write a letter to a gentleman in this province, in which he said that the scheme of 1862 was abandoned by the Canadian Government.

HON. MR. MCGEE—The honorable gentleman has made that charge once before publicly, and I denied it publicly. If he can get any such letter of mine, he is fully authorized by me to make it public. Hon. Mr. TILLEY, so far from believing the scheme abandoned, went back to New Brunswick with a very different impression; and I ask the honorable gentleman whether he did not say to him while here:—"I declare to God, TILLEY, if I thought by resigning my office we could get the Intercolonial Railway, I would do it." The honorable gentleman is out of office now, and perhaps he will say whether he made this declaration or not. (Hear, hear.)

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—I do not deny that. I was then, and always have been, in favor of the Intercolonial Railway, and am desirous that it should be built. I think that an outlet to the ocean on British soil, at all seasons of the year, is a very desirable thing to be obtained, and upon that point I have never changed my opinion. But I do say that Hon. Mr. TUPPER and Hon.

Mr. TILLEY understood that it was not to be proceeded with at that time, and a memorandum was drawn up by Dr. TUPPER at the time (I am now speaking in the presence of my late colleagues, who are aware of all the facts), embodying the decision at which the Government arrived, but which was not signed, because Hon. Mr. TILLEY asked that Mr. FLEMING might be considered as engaged to proceed with the survey, and wished to reserve it for the formal ratification of his colleagues when he went back to New Brunswick. When he did go back, his colleagues dissented from the views he had formed, and, in order to get himself out of the awkward position in which he was placed, he took the ground that the abandonment of the project was owing to the bad faith of the Canadian Government. Now I say it is a matter of great satisfaction to me that the honorable gentleman who circulated this charge, and gave ground for honorable gentlemen now on the Treasury benches to attack the Government of which I was a member, and accuse it of bad faith to the sister provinces, has for these bold and audacious statements met his just deserts. He has been scouted and rejected by his own people. He has lost their confidence, and with that loss of confidence this great scheme of Confederation has come to woeful grief. I say punishment has overtaken him. It was a long time coming, but it has come at last with terrible effect. (Hear, hear.) The Hon. Attorney General West says that the Government will ask for a vote of credit, but he has not told us how long this vote will extend. He does not tell what they will do if the Confederation scheme fails, as it is pretty sure to fail. He does not say that it is going to carry, nor does he say that it will be succeeded by any other. Where, I would like to know, is the smaller scheme—the pet scheme of the member for South Oxford—of a Federation of Canada first, to be followed, it need be, by a Federation of all the provinces? What is the honorable gentleman to do with this scheme? Is it to be brought down to the House, or, the larger one having failed, is it to be kept in hand for use at some future time? Have we not a right to know what this scheme is and what the Government proposes to do in regard to it? (Hear, hear.) Are the people of the country to be left in a feverish state of excitement, because the Government has no definite policy, until the mission spoken of goes to England, in the hope that the people of the Lower Provinces will in the meantime repent of the

action they have taken? Why, sir, not only have the minds of the people of Canada been unhinged by the proceedings of the past year, not only have they been made dissatisfied with the institutions under which they have lived and prospered for a number of years, but political parties have also been demoralized. (Hear, hear.) Yes, the Reform party has become so disorganized by this Confederation scheme, that there is scarcely a vestige of its greatness left—hardly a vestige of that great party that demanded reform for a number of years, but which unfortunately, in 1864 as in 1854, went over to the other side when its leaders could no longer endure to remain in the cold shades of opposition. (Hear, hear.) Is it too much to ask honorable gentlemen on the Treasury benches to tell us something of the scheme for federating these two provinces—to give us an inkling of what is to be done, now that the other scheme has failed, and of the liabilities to be assumed by the respective sections of Canada? Are we to be kept in ignorance on these subjects? Are the affairs of the country to continue in the unsettled state in which they now are? Is all legislation to remain at a stand-still until the more and more doubtful prospect of Confederation is realized? (Hear, hear.) What amount of money is required by the Government to meet the danger that is said to have suddenly threatened us? Are the people not to know what preparations are to be made and what sums are to be expended in our defence? I am not opposed to any proper measures being taken to defend the country, but at the same time prudence dictates that we should know what they are to cost before we blindly vote for them. If Confederation is not to take place, what is the use of going on with measures of defence that depended upon Confederation being carried? Why not come down now with a scheme that will apply to Canada alone, and let us know precisely what burdens the people will have to bear for their defence, what additional taxation will be required, and all other information connected with the subject? (Hear, hear.) I do say that it is anything but satisfactory to be told that we are to postpone the promised scheme for our defence at this time, to adjourn over till summer, and in the meantime to send commissioners home to treat with the Imperial Government. If the danger is so imminent as it is said to be, why this long delay? (Hear, hear.) Sir, I never was myself an advocate of any change in our Constitution; I believed it was capable of being well worked to the satisfaction of the

people, if we were free from demagogues and designing persons who sought to create strife between the sections. (Hear, hear.) I am not disposed to extend my remarks further at present. All I can say is, that the Honorable Attorney General West has done the House justice if he has given us all the information in his possession with regard to the present aspect of the Confederation question; and yet it appears to me somewhat absurd to proceed with the debate, when even the Government itself admits the measure to be a failure. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. DORION—I think the announcement made by the Hon. Attorney General West must have taken the House a little by surprise. (Hear, hear.) The policy agreed on by the Government in June, 1864, was certainly not the one carried out at the opening of this session, and still less that which has just been announced. The policy, as we find it in a memorandum then communicated to the House, was that a measure for the Confederation of the two Canadas, with provisions for the admission of the other provinces, should be brought before the House this session. I will give the terms of the memorandum, in order that there may be no doubt about it. When explanations were given in June last, by the present Government, two memoranda were communicated to the House. One was a memorandum that had been communicated to the Hon. the President of the Council, and marked "Confidential." It was in these words:—

The Government are prepared to state, that immediately after the prorogation, they will address themselves, in the most earnest manner, to the negotiation for a Confederation of all the British North American Provinces.

That, failing a successful issue to such negotiations, they are prepared to pledge themselves to legislation during the next session of Parliament for the purpose of remedying the existing difficulties, by introducing the Federal principle for Canada alone, coupled with such provisions as will permit the Maritime Provinces and the North-Western Territory to be hereafter incorporated into the Canadian system.

That, for the purpose of carrying on the negotiations and settling the details of the promised legislation, a Royal Commission shall be issued, composed of three members of the Government and three members of the Opposition, of whom Mr. Brown shall be one, and the Government pledge themselves to give all the influence of the Administration to secure to the said Commission the means of advancing the great object in view.

This was the first memorandum that was

communicated to the Honorable President of the Council. It was a proposition on behalf of the members of the then Government to the Honorable President of the Council, to the effect that the Government would be prepared, immediately after that session, to take measures for obtaining a Confederation of all the provinces, and, failing in that scheme, to bring into the House at the next session—that is the present session—a scheme for the Confederation of the two Canadas, with a provision that the Maritime Provinces might come into the union when they saw fit. But this proposition was not accepted, and another memorandum was submitted to the Honorable President of the Council in the following terms:—

The Government are prepared to pledge themselves to bring in a measure next session for the purpose of removing existing difficulties, by introducing the Federal principle into Canada, coupled with such provisions as will permit the Maritime Provinces and the North-West Territory to be incorporated into the same system of government.

This, then, is what the Government pledged itself to do. The first memorandum to open negotiations for a Confederation with the Lower Provinces was rejected by the Honorable President of the Council, and he agreed to go into the Government on this pledge, that it would be prepared to bring in a measure, this session, for the purpose of removing existing difficulties, by introducing the Federal principle into the Government of Canada, coupled with such provisions as would enable the Lower Provinces to come in at any subsequent time. This is the measure that was promised by the Government; this is the measure that honorable gentlemen on the other side, at the end of last session, said they would be prepared to introduce to the Legislature this session. But instead of that the whole scheme has been altered. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. GALT—Read the balance of the statement.

HON. MR. DORION—There is nothing in the remainder of it to qualify the pledge then made by the Government. (Hear, hear.) It is a distinct and positive pledge given by honorable gentlemen in their places on the Treasury benches, that at this session of Parliament they would bring in a measure for the Confederation of the two Canadas, leaving it to the other provinces to come in if they pleased. (Hear, hear.) Certainly there is this addition at the end of the memorandum:—

And the Government will seek, by sending representatives to the Lower Provinces and to England, to secure the assent of those interests which are beyond the control of our own legislation, to such a measure as will enable all British North America to be united under a General Legislature based upon the Federal system.

We find, from these explanations, that a measure for the Confederation of the whole of the provinces did not suit the Hon. President of the Council and the Liberal party in Upper Canada, that it was rejected by him and his party as not the proper remedy for our difficulties, and that another measure was accepted by him, applying the principle of Federation to the two Canadas; and in order to secure to that measure the acquiescence of those interests which were beyond the control of the Government of this country, delegates were to be sent to confer with the Lower Provinces with the view of bringing them into this union. Well, sir, I must say that if the honorable gentlemen opposite had not been untrue to their pledge—if they had brought to this House the measure they then promised—we in this country would, at all events, have been saved the humiliation of seeing the Government going on its knees and begging the little island of Prince Edward to come into this union, and then going to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and supplicating them to relieve us of our difficulties; and saved the humiliation of seeing these supplications and the bribes in every direction with which they were accompanied, in the shape of subsidies to New Brunswick and Newfoundland, and of the Intercolonial Railway, rejected by those to whom they were offered. Canada would, at all events, have held a dignified position, and not suffered the humiliation of seeing all the offers of our Government indignantly rejected by the people of the Lower Provinces. The Hon. Attorney General West says that the scheme of Confederation has obtained the consent of the governments of all the provinces; but where are those governments now? Where is the Government of New Brunswick? Where is the Government of Prince Edward Island? (Hear, hear.) As for the Government of Nova Scotia, it pledged itself to bring the scheme before the Legislature; but it is well known that it dare not press it, and still less appeal to the people upon it. The members of that Government were wiser than the Government of New Brunswick, and would not appeal to the people. And here I must say that I

action they have taken? Why, sir, not only have the minds of the people of Canada been unhinged by the proceedings of the past year, not only have they been made dissatisfied with the institutions under which they have lived and prospered for a number of years, but political parties have also been demoralized. (Hear, hear.) Yes, the Reform party has become so disorganized by this Confederation scheme, that there is scarcely a vestige of its greatness left—hardly a vestige of that great party that demanded reform for a number of years, but which unfortunately, in 1864 as in 1854, went over to the other side when its leaders could no longer endure to remain in the cold shades of opposition. (Hear, hear.) Is it too much to ask honorable gentlemen on the Treasury benches to tell us something of the scheme for federating these two provinces—to give us an inkling of what is to be done, now that the other scheme has failed, and of the liabilities to be assumed by the respective sections of Canada? Are we to be kept in ignorance on these subjects? Are the affairs of the country to continue in the unsettled state in which they now are? Is all legislation to remain at a stand-still until the more and more doubtful prospect of Confederation is realized? (Hear, hear.) What amount of money is required by the Government to meet the danger that is said to have suddenly threatened us? Are the people not to know what preparations are to be made and what sums are to be expended in our defence? I am not opposed to any proper measures being taken to defend the country, but at the same time prudence dictates that we should know what they are to cost before we blindly vote for them. If Confederation is not to take place, what is the use of going on with measures of defence that depended upon Confederation being carried? Why not come down now with a scheme that will apply to Canada alone, and let us know precisely what burdens the people will have to bear for their defence, what additional taxation will be required, and all other information connected with the subject? (Hear, hear.) I do say that it is anything but satisfactory to be told that we are to postpone the promised scheme for our defence at this time, to adjourn over till summer, and in the meantime to send commissioners home to treat with the Imperial Government. If the danger is so imminent as it is said to be, why this long delay? (Hear, hear.) Sir, I never was myself an advocate of any change in our Constitution; I believed it was capable of being well worked to the satisfaction of the

people, if we were free from demagogues and designing persons who sought to create strife between the sections. (Hear, hear.) I am not disposed to extend my remarks further at present. All I can say is, that the Honorable Attorney General West has done the House justice if he has given us all the information in his possession with regard to the present aspect of the Confederation question; and yet it appears to me somewhat absurd to proceed with the debate, when even the Government itself admits the measure to be a failure. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. DORION—I think the announcement made by the Hon. Attorney General West must have taken the House a little by surprise. (Hear, hear.) The policy agreed on by the Government in June, 1864, was certainly not the one carried out at the opening of this session, and still less that which has just been announced. The policy, as we find it in a memorandum then communicated to the House, was that a measure for the Confederation of the two Canadas, with provisions for the admission of the other provinces, should be brought before the House this session. I will give the terms of the memorandum, in order that there may be no doubt about it. When explanations were given in June last, by the present Government, two memoranda were communicated to the House. One was a memorandum that had been communicated to the Hon. the President of the Council, and marked "Confidential." It was in these words:—

The Government are prepared to state, that immediately after the prorogation, they will address themselves, in the most earnest manner, to the negotiation for a Confederation of all the British North American Provinces.

That, failing a successful issue to such negotiations, they are prepared to pledge themselves to legislation during the next session of Parliament for the purpose of remedying the existing difficulties, by introducing the Federal principle for Canada alone, coupled with such provisions as will permit the Maritime Provinces and the North-Western Territory to be hereafter incorporated into the Canadian system.

That, for the purpose of carrying on the negotiations and settling the details of the promised legislation, a Royal Commission shall be issued, composed of three members of the Government and three members of the Opposition, of whom Mr. BROWN shall be one, and the Government pledge themselves to give all the influence of the Administration to secure to the said Commission the means of advancing the great object in view.

This was the first memorandum that was

communicated to the Honorable President of the Council. It was a proposition on behalf of the members of the then Government to the Honorable President of the Council, to the effect that the Government would be prepared, immediately after that session, to take measures for obtaining a Confederation of all the provinces, and, failing in that scheme, to bring into the House at the next session—that is the present session—a scheme for the Confederation of the two Canadas, with a provision that the Maritime Provinces might come into the union when they saw fit. But this proposition was not accepted, and another memorandum was submitted to the Honorable President of the Council in the following terms:—

The Government are prepared to pledge themselves to bring in a measure next session for the purpose of removing existing difficulties, by introducing the Federal principle into Canada, coupled with such provisions as will permit the Maritime Provinces and the North-West Territory to be incorporated into the same system of government.

This, then, is what the Government pledged itself to do. The first memorandum to open negotiations for a Confederation with the Lower Provinces was rejected by the Honorable President of the Council, and he agreed to go into the Government on this pledge, that it would be prepared to bring in a measure, this session, for the purpose of removing existing difficulties, by introducing the Federal principle into the Government of Canada, coupled with such provisions as would enable the Lower Provinces to come in at any subsequent time. This is the measure that was promised by the Government; this is the measure that honorable gentlemen on the other side, at the end of last session, said they would be prepared to introduce to the Legislature this session. But instead of that the whole scheme has been altered. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. GALT—Read the balance of the statement.

HON. MR. DORION—There is nothing in the remainder of it to qualify the pledge then made by the Government. (Hear, hear.) It is a distinct and positive pledge given by hon. gentlemen in their places on the Treasury benches, that at this session of Parliament they would bring in a measure for the Confederation of the two Canadas, leaving it to the other provinces to come in if they pleased. (Hear, hear.) Certainly there is this addition at the end of the memorandum:—

And the Government will seek, by sending representatives to the Lower Provinces and to England, to secure the assent of those interests which are beyond the control of our own legislation, to such a measure as will enable all British North America to be united under a General Legislature based upon the Federal system.

We find, from these explanations, that a measure for the Confederation of the whole of the provinces did not suit the Hon. President of the Council and the Liberal party in Upper Canada, that it was rejected by him and his party as not the proper remedy for our difficulties, and that another measure was accepted by him, applying the principle of Federation to the two Canadas; and in order to secure to that measure the acquiescence of those interests which were beyond the control of the Government of this country, delegates were to be sent to confer with the Lower Provinces with the view of bringing them into this union. Well, sir, I must say that if the honorable gentlemen opposite had not been untrue to their pledge—if they had brought to this House the measure they then promised—we in this country would, at all events, have been saved the humiliation of seeing the Government going on its knees and begging the little island of Prince Edward to come into this union, and then going to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and supplicating them to relieve us of our difficulties; and saved the humiliation of seeing these supplications and the bribes in every direction with which they were accompanied, in the shape of subsidies to New Brunswick and Newfoundland, and of the Intercolonial Railway, rejected by those to whom they were offered. Canada would, at all events, have held a dignified position, and not suffered the humiliation of seeing all the offers of our Government indignantly rejected by the people of the Lower Provinces. The Hon. Attorney General West says that the scheme of Confederation has obtained the consent of the governments of all the provinces; but where are those governments now? Where is the Government of New Brunswick? Where is the Government of Prince Edward Island? (Hear, hear.) As for the Government of Nova Scotia, it pledged itself to bring the scheme before the Legislature; but it is well known that it dare not press it, and still less appeal to the people upon it. The members of that Government were wiser than the Government of New Brunswick, and would not appeal to the people. And here I must say that I

compliment the Government upon the wisdom it shows in not appealing to the people of Canada. Honorable gentlemen have shown far more foresight in this matter than the Government of New Brunswick, in refusing to let the people have an opportunity of pronouncing upon this scheme, for the petitions coming down daily against it show conclusively that the people, of Lower Canada at all events, are almost unanimously against it, and that an appeal to them would meet, as regards the members of the Lower Canada Administration, with the same fate which befel the members of the New Brunswick Government. (Hear.) I do not wish, sir, to prolong this debate more than necessary, but I must say that I am surprised to hear the Hon. Attorney General West say that the defences of the country require such immediate attention that the matter cannot be delayed for a moment. If I mistake not, the Government have had in their hands a report from Col. JERVOIS upon the defences, since the 12th of October last, and yet since that time not a single thing has been done towards defence. We are now told with startling emphasis that the country is about to be invaded, or is in most imminent danger; and all at once, now that the great scheme of Confederation is defeated, we learn that not an hour's delay can be allowed, and that we cannot even wait to vote the supplies, so urgent is the necessity of sending a mission to England about this matter. Between Friday last and this morning the Government has discovered that this imminent danger threatens us, and so anxious is it about it that we cannot even stop to vote the ordinary supplies, but must pass at once a vote of credit. (Hear, hear.) And, sir, while I am on the subject of the defences, I must say it is most astonishing that although we have repeatedly asked for information on the subject, in connection with this great scheme, we can not get it. (Hear, hear.) At the earliest moment after the commencement of the session, the honorable member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. J. B. E. DORION) made a motion for any despatches, reports, or communications, or for extracts thereof, which might be in the possession of the Government on the question of the defences of the country, and the Hon. Attorney General West rose and replied that to give this information would endanger the safety of the province. The Ministry of Canada therefore refused us that which we now find in the report which comes from England.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—Not the report.

HON. MR. DORION—If not the report, at all events the substance of it. There they do not find that it will endanger the safety of the country by giving the House of Commons such information as will enable Parliament to take the necessary steps to provide for the defences of any part of the British Empire. I moved another Address at a later period, asking for such information on the subject of our defences as the Government might deem it proper to give; and although that Address was voted a full fortnight ago, I have been unable to obtain an answer to it up to the present time. Nor can we get information in regard to the finances—in fact every kind of information which is necessary to enable us to form proper and correct judgments is refused. But, sir, I must say that at the present moment I am unaware of any reason which could be urged for our being called upon to act with such precipitate haste as to grant a vote of credit to hon. gentlemen. (Hear, hear.) The session has been called at the usual time—rather earlier than the usual time for holding our meetings of Parliament—and I say it is a most extraordinary thing that we should be asked by the honorable gentlemen on the other side to give them a vote of credit. (Hear, hear.) Why, sir, is the whole business of the country to be thrown into a condition of derangement in order to allow the honorable gentlemen to get themselves out of a difficulty—not to get the country, but themselves, out of the difficulty which they have acknowledged to have overtaken them? (Hear, hear.) Are all the affairs of the province to be thrown over, for such a reason, until next session, which may not be held for six months or nine months, or until the honorable gentlemen choose to call us again together? Because “an early summer session” may be the month of August or the month of September, or it may mean even a later period than that. Do they expect a vote of credit of six millions of dollars to enable them to construct these defences which are spoken of by Col. JERVOIS?

HON. MR. GALT—No, no.

HON. MR. DORION—Then, if we do not pass a vote for that purpose, what is to become of the country in the meantime? (Hear, hear.) We are told that there is urgent necessity for expending money on our defences, and that the danger is imminent. Well, sir, I apprehend if there is imminent danger, we ought to be kept sitting here until provision

is made to meet that danger, or at all events, affairs ought to be placed in such a position that, at any moment, we can be called together to provide for the danger. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. GALT—We want to avert it.

HON. MR. HOLTON—What is the danger?

HON. MR. DORION—It puzzles the honorable gentlemen to reply. I think that they themselves never discovered there was any cause for alarm until Friday last, when there was imminent danger of the defeat of their scheme, and imminent danger also of the loss of their position. (Laughter.) This, sir, is the real danger the hon. gentlemen want to avert, and they proceed to do so by asking us, in lieu of granting the ordinary supplies, to pass a vote of credit. We will then be sent away, with the prospect before their friends and supporters of another session this summer, when the additional sessional allowance will of course be welcome to all. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) I simply rose, sir, to protest against the continuance of this scheme by the honorable gentlemen opposite. I think they are bound to proceed in some other way, seeing that this scheme cannot be carried as it certainly cannot. It has been rejected not only by New Brunswick, but by Prince Edward Island, one of whose delegates to Quebec, Mr. WHELAN, has been holding meetings, and all that he has been able to accomplish is the passing of resolutions of confidence in himself, and the assertion that no such scheme should be given effect to without being first submitted to the people. That is the most favorable expression of opinion that can be obtained in Prince Edward Island. It is well known, too, that the Legislature of Nova Scotia is against the scheme by a large majority. And now we find that New Brunswick has pronounced against it also. Will hon. gentlemen go to England and press on the scheme under such circumstances? Will they argue that because we are 2,500,000 and they only 900,000, we ought to swallow them up by pressing them into Confederation against their wishes? (Hear, hear.) I do not suppose honorable gentlemen on the other side purpose attempting to coerce, by means of their influence with the Imperial Government, the Lower Provinces to come into this Confederation. Therefore it is that I say that this scheme is killed. (Hear, hear, and derisive Opposition cheers.) I repeat that it is killed. I claim that it is the duty of hon. gentlemen opposite, and particularly is it the duty of the Hon. President of the Council, to insist upon their

colleagues keeping to the pledges they have made. It is the duty of the Liberal members generally to insist on these pledges being redeemed, without which they would have refused to sanction the taking of office by the three Liberal members of the Government, and in accordance with which alone they could justify that step before their constituents. It was only the knowledge that, failing the success of this measure, they would carry out a scheme which was within the power of the Government to carry, that the Liberal party of Upper Canada approved of their three friends making part of the Government. The Administration could not give a pledge that they would carry the Confederation of all the provinces, but they could pledge, and did pledge themselves to bring in, in the event of the failure of that scheme, a measure for the federation of Upper and Lower Canada. And, sir, not only was this promise made at that time, but we have since seen, this session, the head of the Government, Hon. Sir E. P. TACHÉ, renewing the pledge then given in these words:—"They arranged a large scheme and a smaller one. If the larger failed, then they would fall back upon the minor, which provided for a federation of the two sections of the province." And it was expressly stated that during this session, if the present scheme failed, they should bring in a measure to federate the two provinces. (Hear, hear.) That was the promise given to the Honorable President of the Council, and, if it is not redeemed, I fear his position will be a most unenviable one in the country. (Hear, hear.)

MR. T. C. WALLBRIDGE—There is another point, Mr. SPEAKER, upon which I desire to see an understanding come to before we proceed further with this discussion. Honorable gentlemen opposite have attempted by their professions to manufacture a little cheap pocket loyalty, and to that end I find the most atrocious sentiments expressed in this morning's editorial of their organ, the *Quebec Chronicle*. I will read the paragraph.

HON. MR. GALT—You need not; we have all read it.

MR. WALLBRIDGE—It will bear reading again for the information of the House. It is as follows:—

A telegram from New Brunswick on Saturday night says TILLEY and WATERS are defeated—majority 250. These gentlemen were the Confederate candidates for the city of St. John. Knowing the influences at work, we are not greatly surprised at the result; but our conviction in the

alternative of confederation or annexation is more than ever confirmed when we see how completely American influence can control elections of the provinces.

These sentiments are calculated to introduce into political discussion in this country a dangerous element, a mischievous cry. I would like to ask the Hon. Attorney General West, who has to some extent endorsed this sentiment, whether I was right in understanding him to say that it was the influence exerted by American railway men on the elections which led to the defeat of the Confederation candidates?

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—What is that?

MR. WALLBRIDGE—I understood the Hon. Attorney General West to state that the American railway influence had had some effect upon the St. John's elections.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—I will repeat to the honorable gentleman what I did say. It was this: that I had no doubt the question of Confederation was one of the subjects which influenced the people of St. John. But I did not pretend that that was the only one. There were other local questions which, I have no doubt, had their due weight of influence. There was, for instance, the usual struggle between the ins and the outs, and I presume there was the influence to be contended against of those who were in favor of the railways to the American frontier—the Coast Line or Western Extension Railway—as opposed to the Intercolonial Railway interest.

MR. WALLBRIDGE—I wish to nail this forgery to the counter before it goes further, and to that end I desire to be permitted to read a few extracts from one of the leading papers in the Lower Provinces (the *Nova Scotian*), and which are as follow:—

But not quite so fast, good friends. This is not the first we have heard of this "military" railway. Last summer, a committee of Congress, composed mostly of shrewd New Englanders, came from Washington to examine and report as to the expediency of constructing a "military" road to the frontier of New Brunswick. They were not allowed, however, to stop at the frontier, for when they arrived there they found an invitation inviting them to go on to St. John. They went, and St. John was in a perfect *furor* of interesting excitement. A public meeting was called; we are not sure whether Mr. TILLEY was present or not—we think he was accidentally absent from some inevitable cause, but sent a message with his compliments and sympathies. The mayor occupied the chair; the viands were excellent; the champagne flowed "*à la Ottawa*;"

the speeches were eloquent; and although St. John had but recently been all in a blaze with sympathy with the poor suffering Southerners, somehow it happened—under what genial influences we cannot say—that they managed to create a most agreeable impression, not only upon the stomachs, but upon the loyal hearts, of the committee of Congress.

But this was not all. The provincial railway was placed at their disposal free of expense, and they were *chaperoned* over it by leading men, to Shediac and back to St. John. Mr. TILLEY, we think, was on this trip; and after all was over, they went back with a wondering appreciation of the "good lord, good devil" versatility of our New Brunswick friends.

Again the same paper remarks:—

The New Brunswickers understand this, and with Mr. TILLEY at their head, co-operating with the shrewdest men of New England, are bidding in a spirit of commercial enterprise for the great stream of passenger traffic across the Atlantic, which they (the Americans) desire to turn into our good city (Halifax). Apart from all its other advantages, they propose, it appears, to purchase our railroads, and thus release, for our disposal in other railways, the capital employed in its construction.

In another article, the same authority places this story about the American interference in the St. John elections in a stronger light. I will read it for the benefit of the credulous:—

Strange to say, we find Mr. TILLEY, not only investing the public funds of New Brunswick in the construction of a military road from Portland to St. John (of course only the Yankee end of the line is military), but the delegates themselves have actually made special arrangements with that gentleman to enable him, in event of the present scheme of Confederation being consummated, to construct the New Brunswick portion of this proposed railway. Now, we would like the delegates to explain this little matter to the satisfaction of the old ladies whom they have been frightening with horrible stories of Yankee devastations, smouldering homesteads, and blazing churches.

In the face of these extracts is it not idle to say that Hon. Mr. TILLEY was defeated by American railway influences? The presumption would be the contrary. Looking to their interest, those shrewd New Englanders spoken of would have supported the candidate who is willing to invest the funds of New Brunswick in a railway connecting with their line. Hon. Mr. TILLEY, the leader of the New Brunswick Government, was defeated, not through American influence, but because of the unpopularity of the Federation scheme,

as presented to the people of his province ; and it is wrong to introduce this new cry into our politics. Canada has been cursed with party cries, and it is time for us to clear the political arena of such false issues and dangerous contests. To introduce this new element of discord can only gain for its promoters a temporary relief, whilst the damage it will inflict upon the best interests of the country are positive. Our critical relations, at this moment, with the American people are mainly traceable to cries of this kind. By rendering the people suspicious of such influence, the promoters of the cry are hastening the accomplishment of what they pretend to oppose. Once render the people of this country dissatisfied with the working of their system of government, and there will be danger of their continuing what will then seem inevitable. If there be any who desire annexation, they could not better forward their views than by raising the false cry of American interference in our political contests. Once destroy public confidence in our institutions, and it is impossible to predict what extremes may not be resorted to. If the Ministry have information of the kind alleged, of an interference by foreigners in the political contest now going on in New Brunswick, they are bound to lay it before the House. Such an interference could not be tolerated, and the country should know the truth of the allegation at the earliest possible moment. If the vote of credit asked for is for military purposes, for fortifications, the Government will find their hands strengthened by the support of every hon. member of this House. It is not necessary to cry loyalty to obtain the vote, no more than it is necessary to cry annexation to secure the passage of an act to unite the provinces. I have been surprised at the alternative that has so often been put by hon. members,—Federation, or Annexation. Yes, and by hon. members who, in 1858, helped to laugh out of the House the resolutions of the present Hon. Finance Minister, on the ground that if they were carried and confederation follow, there would be a movement in the direction of annexation. (Hear, hear.) I ask where is the consistency of the two positions—in 1858 federation was a move towards annexation, in 1865 it is the only measure that will prevent annexation ? The language of Her Majesty and of some “noble lords” has been referred to as a reason why this scheme should be accepted without enquiry. But it should be remem-

bered that this is not the first time that language has been put in an Address from the Throne, to palliate the sacrifice of the true interests of Canada. We are as capable of judging here, on the floor of this House, what is for the true interests of the country, as any of the noble lords of the realm. If their speeches contain the sum of wisdom in regard to our affairs, pray how is it that our frontier has been in times past so extensively sacrificed ? Every one who has given any attention to the subject will see that under the Ashburton treaty our frontier was shamefully surrendered to the Americans, and that it received the sanction of noble lords at home ; and now we have to build our railway over the rocks of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, to the seaboard. (Hear, hear.) This question of Federation is a question which concerns our country, which concerns our allegiance, which concerns our connection with the Home Government and the future of this country ; and when our interests are at stake, we are the proper parties to judge of what is best. (Hear, hear.) Therefore, to raise a false cry to enable hon. gentlemen on the opposite side to carry out their measure without amendment and without consulting the people of this province, is unjust in practice and wrong in principle. It is a dangerous experiment. Had hon. members been aware of the whole circumstances of the New Brunswick elections, they would perhaps have reflected before placing Hon. Mr. TILLEY in a false position.

HON. MR. MCGEE—It is all a mistake.

MR. WALLBRIGE—The extracts read are confirmatory of this view. I know something of the railways of New Brunswick, and I am aware that a scheme was favored by the people of St. John to extend their railways to the American frontier, as Canada has done in several instances. It was their interest to connect with the Portland road, just as it was the interest of Canada to connect the Grand Trunk with the road from Montreal to Portland. And with Hon. Mr. TILLEY as the advocate of such extension, is it reasonable to infer that the American railway men opposed his election ? The scheme before us is fraught with a job of greater proportions than the New Brunswick people ever thought of. The lurking influences of the Grand Trunk Railway, or of the well-known contractors, who are uppermost whenever this union is spoken of, are at work. (Ministerial laughter.) Ministers may laugh, but it is patent to all that the rail-

way, by the longest route it will be possible to find, is the pivot on which the scheme revolves. If it be the desire to get to the seaboard, and not to give certain contracting firms a job, why is not the shortest, cheapest and best route, from every point of view, selected? Why climb over the mountains of the centre of New Brunswick, or along the seacoast, when a road can be constructed by a better but shorter route, for much less money, by the valley of the St. John? I contend that the route this road is to run should be made known to this House. It is a question involving the expenditure of millions, and if the cheaper route be built, the saving to Canada will also be many millions of dollars. I know that certain honorable gentlemen are prepared to vote on this question phlegmatically. (Laughter.)

MR. H. MACKENZIE—What is it to vote phlegmatically?

MR. WALLBRIDGE—An hon. gentleman asks me what a phlegmatic vote is? I would inform him it is to vote on this question, which so deeply concerns our future interests, without inquiry. It will cause some honorable gentlemen to give the lie to their whole political lives. It is to vote away, without enquiry, our rights to the North-West territory. It is to seal up that country hermetically for all time to come. That is what I call giving a phlegmatic vote. (Hear, hear.) We find that the representatives at the Conference from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick made it a point of the proposed Constitution to construct the Intercolonial Railway, also took good care to make the opening of the North-West contingent upon the state of the finances, and the Confederation will commence life with a debt of \$150,000,000. It is evident, therefore, that the North-West is hermetically sealed, as far as Canada is concerned. What shall we gain by this particular scheme of Confederation? We have been running with railway speed into bankruptcy, and this scheme is one which will add immensely to our debt, and especially to our debt on account of unproductive and useless railways, and of which we do not even know the route, although, now that the elections in New Brunswick are over, it cannot affect the position in that province to give the information we are seeking. (Hear, hear.) I am in favor of a union of the British North American Provinces. But the union that is desirable is a union in fact, not an

organized system of discord, with a number of petty legislatures that will only serve to create strife and prevent our moving forward in the career of civilization and improvement. The scheme of the hon. gentlemen, to some extent, will give us the advantages of a legislative union, but it is incumbered with objectionable details—details which, in their importance, amount to principles, and to secure their rejection or amendment I shall employ what energy I can bring to bear. The scheme has been submitted to the people in New Brunswick, and it has there been admitted, as well as in Nova Scotia, that it was subject to amendment. Why should Canada not have the same right accorded? Why should we take the scheme in its entirety, when its authors cannot justify certain provisions which specially relate to this country? It is treating Canada with contempt, and hon. gentlemen will be held responsible. I have very great confidence in several of the hon. gentlemen opposite. I have very great confidence in the Hon. President of the Council and the two other hon. gentlemen whom he took into the Ministry with him. But, when the Hon. the President of the Council consented to go into the Administration without getting a fair representation in it of the party with which he was acting, both in Upper and in Lower Canada, he miscarried. (Laughter.) That may account for some of the objectionable features of this measure. It may account for Canada consenting, and for the Hon. President of the Council giving his consent, that the voting at the Conference should be by provinces, instead of by numbers. They took very good care to arrange that we should pay according to population. (Hear, hear.) But they voted by provinces, and in that way hampered the scheme with many objectionable details. And I think, therefore, it is now competent for this House to criticise those details, and to take such steps as will ensure their exclusion from the Imperial Act. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—Before these explanations are over—and I have no desire to prolong them further than is necessary—I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Finance as to the course to be pursued with reference to the Lower Canada School Law, which was promised to be introduced this session. We are now told a prorogation is to take place, and I would like to know whether the pledge given by the honorable gentleman at Sherbrooke, on behalf of himself and his col-

leagues, and renewed several times in the House since the session commenced, is intended to be carried out, or whether it is to be modified—because it must be obvious that that matter has an important bearing on the question of Confederation, with which it has been connected by honorable gentlemen opposite.

HON. MR. GALT—I think the statement made this afternoon by the Hon. Attorney General West is perfectly explicit. The Government intend to ask for a vote on the resolutions now in the hands of the Speaker. With regard to the School question, the Government are under the same pledge as they have always been: it will be legislated upon by this House.

HON. MR. HOLTON—This session?

HON. MR. GALT—It will not be legislated upon this session, because, as the Hon. Attorney General West has stated, it is the intention of the Government to prorogue the House at the earliest date. But all the conditions connected with the resolutions will be legislated upon as a matter of course.

HON. MR. HOLTON—I understand, then, that the pledge to bring down that question this session is withdrawn—the policy of the Government on that point having been modified by the result of the elections in New Brunswick.

HON. MR. GALT—There is no change in the policy of the Government on the subject of Confederation, or any of the other measures connected with it.

HON. MR. HOLTON—But the honorable gentleman must permit me to recall the nature of the pledge given by himself and his colleagues at Sherbrooke and in this House—that there would be a bill brought down by the Government during this session of Parliament, for the amendment of the Lower Canada School laws. This was repeated by the Honorable Solicitor General East, on behalf of the Government, in the course of certain interpellations made on this subject in the absence of my hon. friend the Finance Minister. And the conclusion of the whole matter now is, that the hon. gentleman states emphatically that this is not to be done. The people of New Brunswick, therefore, among the other mischiefs they have wrought by the free exercise of their franchise in the rejection of the Government which undertook, without legislative or other authority, to enter into arrangements for revolutionizing the country—among other mischiefs they have wrought

has been this, that the Minister of Finance and his colleagues conceive themselves to be relieved thereby of the obligations they undertook to the country and to the House—

HON. MR. GALT—No! no!

HON. MR. HOLTON—The obligations they undertook to the country and to the House to bring in an amendment to the Lower Canada School laws during this session of Parliament. The hon. gentleman knows full well—none better than he—the point of these remarks. It may not be appreciated by the House generally, especially by the members from Upper Canada, but the hon. gentleman knows well the importance of it, and that the English Protestants of Lower Canada desire to know what is to be done in this matter of education, before the final voice of the people of this country is pronounced on the question of Confederation. The assurances given by the hon. gentleman led them to believe—and in point of fact they do generally believe—that that measure is to be brought down before the final vote of this House is taken on the question of Confederation. That is the point of the whole matter. And the honorable gentleman now tells us, through his leader, that the Confederation resolutions are to be put through this session immediately, and that commissioners are going to England to press legislation founded on those resolutions, while on the other hand he himself, the great Protestant champion of Lower Canada, who claims the confidence of Lower Canada Protestants in an especial manner, now tells them that this promised legislation is not to be had until next session of Parliament, when it will be too late perhaps to petition this House, or even to send popular petitions to the Imperial Parliament against this measure. Therefore it is, I repeat, that among the many curious results of the free exercise of their franchise by the people of New Brunswick, we have this, that the Protestant champion of Lower Canada is not going to do that which he undertook to do on behalf of his fellow-countrymen and co-religionists—that which he promised this session, but now postpones till another session, when all the circumstances may be changed. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. GALT—I think the interest evinced by the hon. member for Chateaugay in this matter is somewhat remarkable. I feel grateful indeed to him for the kind solicitude he expresses on my behalf, that I should cause no disappointment to the class which to a certain extent looks to me. Still

I think he is guilty of rather a paltry quibble in the statement he has just made. The position of the Government was most distinctly stated by the Attorney General West, and no misunderstanding can exist with regard to it. It is admitted frankly that the events in New Brunswick call for some special action by this Government, and the action which they propose to take was stated in the most distinct terms by the Government. As regards the education question, statements have been made already as to the nature of the amendments which are to be proposed to the existing School law. The Government will unquestionably take care that that law shall be amended in the sense of those statements before the Confederation scheme finally becomes law in Canada. I think no further statement is necessary. I can add nothing to the assurances which have already been given on that subject. (Hear, hear.)

HON. J. H. CAMERON—There is one point on which I should like an explanation from the Hon. Attorney General West. He says there will be a vote of credit asked from the House, until the next meeting of the Legislature. That, I suppose, will not be until July or August, but the appropriation for the services of the volunteer force on the frontier expires in May. Will that vote of credit include the amount necessary to continue the volunteers on their present service, if the Government find that they require it to be continued up to a subsequent period, say the first of August? I should like an answer to this question, if the Government have made up their minds on this part of the subject. I may remark, also, that one cannot help feeling it to be a matter of regret that the public business of the country could not go on. Of course, if the Government determine that the question of Confederation shall be pressed to a speedy decision by the House, and the Hon. Atty. Gen. West and other members of the Government proceed immediately thereafter to the other side of the Atlantic, it will be necessary that the House should rise, without getting through the ordinary business of the country. At the same time, a few weeks more would enable the House to get through all that business, and when we met again in July or August, we would be able to devote our whole time to the measures which the Government may submit to us, as the result of the mission to England. If this debate is

to be pressed as rapidly as the Hon. Attorney General indicates, I have no doubt we would be able to dispose of it, and also to get rid of the whole of the public and private business on the Orders, so as to allow the prorogation to take place before the first of April. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. GALT—I will answer the question put by my honorable friend to the Hon. Attorney General West. The intention of the Government is to ask such a vote of credit from this House, as in their opinion the necessities of the country will demand, until the period when Parliament may again be called together. With reference to that, I would remind the House that the ordinary supplies have been voted up to the 30th June, and this will have to be borne in mind in considering the sum the House will be asked to vote. The Government will unquestionably have in view the continuance of the protection of the frontier. (Hear, hear.) As the Hon. Attorney General has stated the intention of the Government is to meet Parliament again, so soon as they are in a position to state to them frankly the views of the Imperial Government; and that of course, to a certain extent, depends on the time during which they may be delayed in London in getting a final answer. But the intention of the Government is to lose no time in meeting Parliament again. (Hear, hear.)

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—I have a word or two to say. The Government have changed their policy so quickly, that we can now place no reliance on the statements of Ministers of the Crown. I have not the slightest doubt that hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches at this moment contemplate—and I ask the attention of the House to what I am saying, because it is a bold statement I am to make—I say it is my deliberate opinion, that if we pass these resolutions, the gentlemen on the Treasury benches will go home and find a justification in England for manufacturing a bill of perhaps an entirely different character, that will cover all points, and that they will come back and force that on the people of this country at all hazards, having embodied in it whatever regulations they please as to schools, and whether there shall be one House or two Houses in the Local Parliament, and all other such matters. I am satisfied that that is their plan. They know well they cannot go to an unwilling people

with this scheme—they dare not submit it to the country—and they propose, therefore, to steal a march on the people, and will come back with a bill manufactured in London, as was done in 1840, and press it on the people of Canada. We know how it was in 1852 or 1853, when an act came over to us, making an alteration in our Constitution, with respect to the increase of representation in Parliament, of which no one to this day has been able to trace the origin. What was done on that occasion may be done again. They will be met in England by gentlemen from New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and they will manufacture there a Constitution for the people of Canada—which the people of Canada will be compelled to take, or else expose themselves to be called traitors and rebels. They will come out with the authority of the Government, and invoke the name of the Queen, and will attempt to impose the Constitution thus manufactured on all the colonies, stigmatising as traitors all who oppose them. This is not the first time that that game has been played. Honorable gentlemen, failing to obtain the assent of an unwilling people here, will take that course—especially when, as is well known, the people and Government of England are only too anxious to throw upon us a large burden for the defence of this country. Influenced by the attentions and blandishments they will receive in England, Ministers will sacrifice our interests, and, as the price of it, will perhaps come back with high-sounding titles. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—That has been done already.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—And what has been done before may be done again. They will go to England as if armed, as they suppose, with a *carte blanche* from the people of this country, because of the adoption of the scheme by this House to obtain a Constitution, such as is shadowed forth in these resolutions—imperfectly as they themselves admit—for Upper and Lower Canada and the provinces generally. The English Parliament will say, “We have here the best intellects of the provinces, the leaders of both parties, the men who have played their part before the country for the last eight or ten years, with the confidence of their respective parties.” But, if they were to read at the same time what these leading men have in that period said of one another, they might

well question whether the men who had branded each other with infamy and disgrace, were the men best fitted to unite in framing a bill to secure the peace and quietness of this country—a measure, in the language of the hon. member for South Oxford (Hon. Mr. BROWN), forever to settle the difficulties between Upper and Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) I protest vehemently against these attacks on our rights. I protest against our being asked thus blindly to vote away our rights and liberties. However clever these gentlemen may be, we know to our cost what our cleverest financiers have done and will do again when they get out of the reach of public opinion, for the moment. When the country got tired of them, they entered into this Coalition to strengthen themselves. These are the men who will give us a new Constitution made in England. I do not pretend to be a prophet; but I ask you, Mr. SPEAKER, to remember, that I have declared now what is my deliberate conviction as to the game that will be played by hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. BROWN—It does astonish me that an hon. gentleman in the position which the hon. member for Cornwall has occupied for so many years, should deliberately rise and make such statements as we have heard from him, after the grave announcement made from the Treasury benches with the assent of the Governor General of this province. The hon. gentleman has been told that the Government intend, if the House sanction this measure, to carry it home with the honest intention of giving effect to it, and of having arrangements made with reference to the other grave matters which have to be considered there.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—What are they?

HON. MR. BROWN—The question of defence, and the question of the commercial relations between these provinces and the United States. He has been told that it is the intention that members of the Government should go to England; that on their return, at the earliest possible moment, Parliament shall be called together and have submitted to it the result of the negotiations. And after all this, the honorable gentleman has the rashness—I shall not use a harsher word—to get up here and impute to the whole members of the Government, and to the head of the Government, who has

sanctioned the making of this announcement to the House—

HON. MR. DORION—I rise to a point of order. I ask if it is in order to bring before the House the authority and name of the Governor General.

MR. SPEAKER—The name of the Sovereign cannot be introduced in this way, but I do not know that the rule extends further.

HON. MR. BROWN—I am quite in order. I apprehend it is quite impossible that we could have made to the House the statement with regard to the prorogation, and the intention of sending members of the Government to England, in the way we propose, unless we had the direct sanction of His Excellency.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—You advised him of course.

HON. MR. BROWN—Of course. With the duty we owed to His Excellency, it was impossible we could make such a statement, without first obtaining His Excellency's sanction. The hon. gentleman knows it well, and when he ventured to get up and make the rash charge that the whole thing is a trick, to get some scheme entirely different from this carried through the Imperial Parliament, he assumes a liberty that is entirely unworthy of a member of this House. (Hear, hear.) And I can tell the honorable gentleman and my honorable friend from Hochelaga, who are so anxious about the position which has been taken on this side by myself and by my hon. friends the Postmaster General and the Provincial Secretary—I can tell them that we are quite alive to the position in which we are placed, and that we have no fear with regard to the course we have taken, are now taking, and shall continue to take, till this measure is brought to a satisfactory conclusion, but we will be able to justify ourselves in the eyes of those who placed us here. (Cheers.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—The statement just made by the Hon. President of the Council is one, I conceive, of very great importance, as it puts a meaning on the declaration made by the Hon. Attorney General West, which some of us, at all events—myself among the rest—did not catch when the hon. gentleman made his statement. We are to understand now, by the declaration of the Hon. President of the Council, that the Government do not intend to have anything concluded in this matter

of Confederation till the next meeting of the House.

HON. MR. BROWN—I did not say anything of the sort.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Then what was the point of attack on the hon. member for Cornwall? That hon. member indicated his fear and his belief that a Constitution would be framed in England, at the instance and, perhaps, under the supervision of certain of the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, which would prove to be utterly distasteful and unpalatable to the people of this country. And the Hon. President of the Council gets up and repels that with the greatest possible indignation. It appears to me that, if there is any point in his indignation, it must be here—that some further action is to be sought from this House before any effect is given to the question of Confederation. I take it, that is the fair inference from the statement now made by the Hon. President of the Council. I ask whether that is the inference to be deduced—whether that is what the hon. gentleman meant? (A pause.) The honorable gentleman declines to answer.

HON. MR. BROWN—Go on, and finish your speech.

HON. MR. HOLTON—I would like an answer now.

HON. MR. GALT—No, no. Finish your speech.

HON. MR. HOLTON—The honorable gentleman knows well that this is not part of the regular debate. I did not rise to make a speech. The Hon. Attorney General West did not rise to make a speech. No one has done so. The Hon. Attorney General, on behalf of the Government, made a statement. That statement has led to some observations, and some enquiries, that the House might understand its full purport. The regular debate is to be resumed by my honorable friend from Quebec (Hon. Mr. ALLEYN), who, having moved its adjournment, is entitled to the floor, and I should be sorry to keep it from him, by making a speech. But I want those points to be clearly understood, for it is in the interest of all parties that they should be. Though I do not go quite so far as my honorable friend from Cornwall in his observations—

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Though I do not go so far as he has done, yet I thought there might be some danger, but I look upon the statement made by the Hon. President of the

Council, and the indignation with which he repelled the charge of my honorable friend from Cornwall, as calculated to reassure the House. And I merely rose for the purpose of asking honorable gentlemen whether we are really to understand from the supplementary statement made on behalf of the Government by the Hon. President of the Council, that the further consideration of this House is to be invited to all these measures—to the new Constitution for the country, as well as the arrangements that may be come to with respect to our defences, and with respect to our commercial relations.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—If I supposed for a moment that the honorable member for Chateaugay really required an answer, he should get it. I have no doubt the Hon. President of the Council would gladly give an answer, if he really thought he had any information to give to the honorable gentleman. But no one understands better than the honorable member for Chateaugay the way in which the case was put. The honorable member for Cornwall (Hon. J. S. MACDONALD) rose, and in rather an unparliamentary way—after a statement had been formally made to inform the House and the country what was the policy of the Government—upon his honor declared his belief that the Government were not sincere in the explanations they had made, and that their design was to get a bill passed by the Imperial Parliament, contrary to the feelings of this country and of the Lower Provinces, and to force that upon the people. That was the declaration of the honorable gentleman. I do not know if he was sincere in making it. He seemed to be sincere, and pledged his honor and his conscience to it. (Laughter.) But his doing so only convinces me, that, if he had been in office himself, that is the course he would have adopted; no such suggestion would have risen to any man's mind, unless he had thought it a feasible one. (Hear, hear.) For our part we do not consider such a course to be in accordance with our position in this House, or in accordance with our principles as men of honor; and the Hon. President of the Council rose to repel the dishonoring insinuation with that just indignation which was felt by every man who heard it, and to declare that the belief of the honorable gentleman was utterly untrue, unfounded, and unwarranted. But I shall repeat the announcement in a way that it may be understood by the hon. member for Cornwall—in language that will be plain to the meanest

capacity—(laughter)—so that no man can mistake it. Our intention is to get the sanction of this House to the Address I have moved, and this having been done, the two branches of the Legislature will have given their votes in favor of the Confederation scheme, and there is the end to that, so far as Canada is concerned. We will then go over to England with that in our hands, and will say to the Imperial Government:—"Canada has agreed to this, New Brunswick has not agreed to it, and we wish to take counsel with the Imperial Government as to our position. This is the unmistakable voice of the people of Canada through their representatives, and we, as representing the Government of Canada, which has three-fourths of the whole population of the provinces, come to consult with the authorities of the Mother Country what is best for the interests of these provinces." (Hear, hear.) We shall also discuss the question of defence, and, I have no doubt, we shall be met in a most large-hearted and liberal spirit by the English Government, and that England will now, in justice to Canada, pledge herself to her utmost resources in men and money for our defence. (Hear, hear.) Then there is a third question—that of the Reciprocity treaty; and we will also take counsel with the British Government as to the best means of treating that subject. And the honorable gentleman knows—at least he ought to know, for I cannot answer for the limits of his understanding—that we can only discuss that through Imperial avenues, that we can have no direct communication in such matters with the American Government. Having taken counsel with the Imperial Government on those three points, we shall call the House together at the earliest period, I hope long before the current half-year terminates, that is, before the 30th June. We will submit the result of our mission, and it will then be before the House for discussion. Though another session, it will be in effect a continuation of this session, and when we have debated and disposed of the most pressing subjects, we will then take up what remains of the Confederation scheme—such as the constitution of the local governments and the school question, with regard to which, as the Hon. Minister of Finance has stated, we shall propose to carry out to the letter the pledges we gave at the Conference, and which we ask the House to endorse, and hope it will. (Hear, hear.) We will also submit the result of our negotiations on the question of defence, and on all those matters

connected with the relations between Great Britain and the United States, so far as British America is concerned, and on which we are authorized to take action by the Imperial authorities. We cannot know at what stage the negotiations between the Imperial Government and the United States Government may have arrived when the House meets again; but the result of the mission of those members of the Canadian Government who go home, will be submitted to the House. We shall lay before the House all that the British Government resolve upon, after hearing what we have to say as to the question of Confederation in its general aspect, and in its relation to the position it may have assumed in the other provinces. We shall then lay before the House the scheme of the local governments for the two Canadas. We shall lay before them the action necessary to be taken with reference to the School question, the matter of defence and the Reciprocity treaty. The honorable member for Cornwall gets up, and, because he finds the Government are resolved to take a firm and proper course in this matter, he chooses to throw improper and insulting remarks across the floor. But the House has learned what value is to be attached to the honorable gentleman's statements, when a little while ago it heard him—an honorable gentleman who professes to be such a patriot—stating, with reference to this scheme, in favor of which a large majority of the people of Canada had declared, that he had a "mischievous satisfaction" in seeing it checked. It was in the same spirit of causeless, senseless mischief that he got up to prophecy all sorts of improper conduct on the part of the Government. (Hear, hear.)

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—Whatever views may be entertained by the Honorable Attorney General West of my capacity, I suppose I have got along in my own way as he has got along in his way. But I think the House may thank me for having obtained at last—notwithstanding the castigation the honorable gentleman has dealt out to me, and which I hope I shall be able to survive, as I have borne up heretofore under similar avalanches of hard words about my want of judgment, want of capacity, and so forth—I think the House may thank me for having obtained at last from the Honorable Attorney General the explicit statement he has made, that the scheme is to come back again for the consideration of this House.

HON. MR. DORION—The Honorable

Attorney General West did not say that.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—He said—if not the scheme itself—that all the arrangements connected with it, as to the local governments, the proportions we are to assume of the defence of the country, and the School question—which the Honorable Finance Minister told us, but for this untoward affair in New Brunswick, would have been submitted before this session closed—that all these things will be brought back and be submitted next session, before the Confederation scheme is finally concluded. This was not so explicitly stated in the honorable gentleman's first speech. I have been accused of being so unpatriotic as to take a mischievous pleasure in any check upon the scheme. What I said was, that I had mischievous pleasure in seeing that the honorable gentleman who had charged the Canadian Government with bad faith had been defeated and ousted from his place. And I say that, if this scheme were likely to prove for the advantage of the people of this province, no one would rejoice more than I in seeing it carried. But I have always felt, and do now feel, that the Constitution of this country can be well worked out. I have never given a vote for Federation. I have never given a vote for a legislative union.

AN HON. MEMBER—Or for annexation.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—No; I did not sign the annexation manifesto. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) I have not assented or given countenance to any scheme for changing our present Constitution, and it is not right for the honorable gentleman, because I do not choose to assent to this scheme without knowing all the details, to taunt me with being unpatriotic. (Hear, hear.) The honorable gentleman would have the House to understand that I was ignorant of the fact that this Government could not deal directly with the American Government with regard to the Reciprocity treaty. And yet in the face of this charge, he must have known that the only record which an Address of this House brought down the other day was a Minute of Council addressed to the Secretary of State by myself and colleagues, on the subject of reciprocity.

HON. MR. HOLTON—And what have honorable gentlemen opposite done since?

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—They have done nothing since, of course. We were attacked by the Hon. President of the Council because we did nothing with regard to the Reciprocity treaty.

HON. MR. BROWN—The honorable gen-

tleman is entirely mistaken. He is thinking of the time when I privately urged upon him, as Prime Minister, the necessity of taking steps, and prompt steps, for ascertaining what was the mind of the Washington Government, and whether or not a new treaty could be negotiated. He explained to me the obstacle that stood in his way; and, though I considered the difficulties in his way ought to have been overcome, yet the circumstances were such that I never blamed him.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—We did all we could in the way of making representations to the Imperial Government. And what have honorable gentlemen opposite done since?

HON. MR. BROWN—We have been acting in the same direction ever since, and I think it would have been well for the interests of this country if we had not been fettered as we have been.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—Well, I say that this explanation of the Honorable Attorney General is more explicit and much more elaborate than the explanation we had from him in the first instance. In commenting upon that first explanation, I hope I did not make use of unparliamentary language. But I am entitled surely to draw deductions from the announcements made to us from the Treasury benches, and I am not bound to mince matters if I feel alarmed at the consequences which may result from the giving of this dreadful blow to the Constitution we have so long lived under. It is surely not unseemly that I should feel keenly on this subject, and that, before the Constitution to which I am sincerely attached is swept away, I should express that indignation which I may have expressed somewhat warmly this afternoon. (Hear, hear.) Much stronger language has been expressed on the floor of this House, when the motives of the honorable gentlemen on the Treasury benches have been questioned by honorable gentlemen whose intellect perhaps as far transcends mine as day outshines night. (Laughter.) But I think the country and the House will yet thank me for stating, even in the earnest manner I did, my alarm in connection with this matter. At all events, I have a sincere belief in the truth of what I stated. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. DORION—The explanations given to-day by the Honorable Attorney General West are fuller than those at first given; yet I am afraid that there is still some misunderstanding. The Honorable Attorney General West stated that the scheme for the

constitution of the local governments would be submitted to the House next session. Is it the intention of the Government, or the delegation when in England, to press the scheme upon the Imperial Government without the concurrence of the Lower Provinces? If the Lower Provinces do not come in, will the Government press the adoption of the scheme so as to apply it to the two provinces of Canada? For, if I understood the Honorable Attorney General West, he said that next session they will bring in the constitutions of the local legislatures. Now, if they are not to press the scheme at all, there would be no necessity for local legislatures. (Hear, hear.)

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—I desire simply to state, as I have said before, that after these resolutions are carried, those who go to confer with the Imperial Government will doubtless adopt such steps as they think are best suited to us. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

MR. RANKIN—I feel obliged to the honorable member for Cornwall if he elicited the explanations just given, though I cannot approve of what he said otherwise. To me the intelligence is most acceptable. (Hear, hear.) I learn that it is the intention of the Government to go on without regard to the action of the Lower Provinces, and to press this measure through without being influenced by the action of New Brunswick. I hold that it is common sense for us to remember that we are considering the interests of the people at large, and this scheme, if acceptable to the people of Canada, is acceptable to four-fifths of the people of British North America.—(Hear, hear.) It must be evident to the meanest capacity—to make use of the words of the Honorable Attorney General West a few minutes ago—that one of two destinies awaits us: either we must extend and strengthen British influence and British power on this continent, or these provinces must, one by one, be absorbed by the neighboring republic. (Hear, hear.) That has been my opinion for years, and it is my opinion still. However, Mr. SPEAKER, I simply rose for the purpose of soliciting more distinct information upon one point on which I have heard nothing said, although the explanations may have been given before I came into the House. I wish to know what is the intention of the Government with reference to the volunteers now on the frontier,—whether they have provided the means to maintain this force, if required, beyond the 1st of May next?

AN HON. MEMBER—That question has already been answered.

MR. RANKIN—I only hope the Government will ask the House for means to keep up whatever force may be thought necessary, not only till June, but till October if requisite. (Hear, hear.)

MR. GIBBS—I think that the policy of the Government, as announced to-day by the Hon. Attorney General West, is bold, manly, and straightforward, and such as will entitle them to the confidence of this House and of the country. (Hear, hear.) It shows that they, at least, are in earnest on this great question of Confederation which they have introduced, and whatever may have been the opinion of the Opposition as to the motive which induced them to lay this measure before the House at the opening of the session, I think it must be utterly dispelled by the announcement just made to the House. (Hear, hear.) If the scheme was worth anything when the Government, in the opening Speech this session, declared its intention of asking the consideration of the House for it, the same scheme must be worth as much now, and I trust that none of the difficulties which may for a moment interpose, will prevent the Administration from carrying it through. (Hear, hear.) It has been said that the measure which they should have brought down was the smaller one, whilst they have introduced the larger. Now, sir, I hold that the greater always includes the less; and that the Government, instead of being blamed for the course they have taken, are entitled to the thanks of this House for bringing down the more important one at the outset. (Hear, hear.) It is not often that questions of the importance of that now before the House are carried without considerable opposition. I need only refer, as an example, to that of the Clergy Reserves, during the discussion of which there were fights, fierce and numerous, lasting for many years, until the measure was carried at last. And now, as we are about to obtain what Upper Canada has sought for years—representation by population—we find, unfortunately, difficulties interposing; but I hope that notwithstanding these, the Government will not falter, but will carry out the wish of the majority of the members of this House and of the people of the country, and consummate the scheme of uniting the British North American Provinces. (Hear, hear.) I am very happy to find that the Government have taken into consideration the negotiations on reciprocal

trade with the United States. That is a most important question, and I should have been glad, for that alone, if the Confederation scheme had been carried out successfully, because it would have been much easier to discuss the matter through the British Government by means of representatives from the General Confederacy, than by representatives from the various disunited provinces. Now I say, Mr. SPEAKER, that the course the Government have pursued must inspire confidence in them on the part of their supporters, and I believe that the country will approve of it too. (Hear, hear.) I hope they will relax no effort to see the scheme carried to completion. (Hear, hear.)

DR. PARKER—If I understand correctly the statement just made by the Government, they propose to send a delegation to England for the purpose of discussing the three questions of the Reciprocity treaty, the defences, and the scheme of Confederation now before the House. The Hon. Attorney General says that the question of the defences is very pressing, and that immediate action should also be taken with regard to the Reciprocity treaty. If these subjects are so pressing, they should be dealt with at once, irrespective of whether this scheme is carried or not. (Hear, hear.) A period of constitutional changes is most unfavorable for the proper consideration of these questions; and if the necessity is as urgent as represented, they should be taken up and considered at once, even in advance of Confederation. EARL RUSSELL, then LORD JOHN RUSSELL, was severely ridiculed by the British press because he introduced a Reform bill during the Crimean war. I deprecate most strongly the attempt made to coerce constitutional changes upon this House and the country under the pressure of danger and coming war. (Hear, hear.) He is no friend of Canada who is constantly creating alarm and raising the cuckoo cry of loyalty. (Hear, hear.) This Government was formed for the express purpose of discovering a remedy for our constitutional difficulties, and I hold them to that engagement. This scheme is to unite the whole of the British North American Colonies; and if the treaty is adopted by the Imperial Government, if an Imperial Act is passed on the basis of these resolutions, and the Maritime Provinces persist in their present refusal to come in, in what position are we then placed? Is this plan of Federation to be applied to the two Canadas? Sir, this is

not the constitutional remedy we desired and sought? And I ask the House if it is prepared to accept this union for ourselves? (Hear, hear.) I think that the Government should have confined themselves simply to the constitutional question, and should not have tacked on to it our commercial and defensive relations, for the purpose of obtaining a little prestige. They have not put the question before Parliament fairly, or as it has been placed before the legislatures of any of the other provinces. I think the House should look at the question in this way—is an Imperial Act to be passed, establishing a Confederation of the two Canadas on the basis of these resolutions? I am not prepared to accept that as the constitutional remedy. I do not want it in that form. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. MCGEE—The hon. gentleman who has just sat down says that we have put this question before the House as it has not been put in any of the other provinces. Now, my information, which perhaps is as correct as his, leads me to believe that the same course has been pursued here as has been or will be adopted in three of the other provinces—Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, and Nova Scotia. The last information received shows that there is, as I am informed, a fair chance of the resolutions being adopted in Newfoundland. In Nova Scotia the resolutions were brought down by the Provincial Secretary, and it was then stated that the adoption of the resolutions would be moved, on a future day. So Dr. TUPPER, the Provincial Secretary, stated.

DR. PARKER—Read His Excellency's Speech.

HON. MR. MCGEE—Well, it was a very proper one. But the hon. gentleman will see that out of the four provinces he is wrong in regard to three of them. Then, my hon. friend the member for North Hastings (Mr. T. C. WALLBRIDGE) repudiated the idea that American influence had anything to do with the result of the elections in New Brunswick. Now, I may say to my hon. friend that one of the successful candidates is the agent of the American line of steamers—the International line—which does all the carrying trade to New Brunswick; and there is not, I am told, a pound of the stock of that company held in New Brunswick. (Hear, hear.) Does any one suppose that the influence of that company was not used for his election? Both steamboat and rail-

way, and mining and fishery influences were brought to bear; and I think it will not be saying too much—and I have no hesitation in saying, for my part—that in that portion of the country, as well as in others, that the fight was between parties pro-Yankee and pro-British. It was a fair stand-up fight of Yankee interests on the one side and British interests on the other; and those who are here ungenerously and unwisely rejoicing over the defeat of Hon. Mr. TILLEY, are in reality rejoicing in the triumph of Yankee interests. I state this from the knowledge I have obtained from ten different visits to that country, and I am quite sure, if my hon. friend had been there all the times that I have been, and had the same opportunities for observation, that he would understand that there are influences there quite apart from the real merits of Confederation. (Hear, hear.) Among other cries, Hon. Mr. TILLEY was assailed because it was said that Hon. Mr. MACDONALD had stated the Intercolonial Railway could not be made—as of course a railway could not be made—a part of the Constitution. That is a sample of the cries against Hon. Mr. TILLEY. In fact, it was a contest between prejudice and patriotism; between ignorance and intelligence; between Yankee influence and the broad principles of British North American policy. (Hear, hear.) Those who rejoice over that state of things may congratulate themselves if they choose, but it is for us to stand by the true public opinion of the country; it is for us to show an example of firmness and good faith in carrying out this scheme; it is for us to show the rest of the Empire that we are determined to adhere to our original resolution, and that we are not a people who do not know our own minds for three weeks, and make proposals one day or one week to breathe them down the next. (Hear, hear.) I am sure if my honorable friend from North Hastings only knew that country as well as I do, that he would come to the same conclusions.

After the recess,

HON. MR. ALLEYN said—MR. SPEAKER, those whose fortune it has been to sit since 1854 in the reformed Legislature of Canada, have had to deal with and settle matters of the highest importance to the province. Questions which in other and older lands have loosed the bonds of society, have caused bloodshed and almost led to anarchy, such as our Seigneurial Tenure and Clergy

Reserve Acts, have been finally and peaceably disposed of, not possibly without injustice to a few, but certainly to the satisfaction of the community at large. Yet all those things, though of the greatest importance to us in Canada, sink into insignificance in comparison with that now before this House. While they related to our own affairs only, and were designed to promote the peaceful working of our own province, the question which we have now to pronounce upon concerns and relates to a Constitution for all the provinces of British North America, and for a country which may eventually comprise half a continent, and extend in one unbroken chain from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean. (Cheers.) But although the consideration of this great question has consumed a good deal of the time of this House, and though it is one of such great importance, and so wide in its extent that it does not excite those strong personal and party feelings in the minds of honorable members which much less important questions, of a more local nature, generally excite, still, sir, I think there is no one who looks at the future of this country for which we are called upon to act, who can avoid coming to the conclusion that the question is one deserving of so much deliberate consideration at our hands, that no amount of time can be considered wasted in debating and deciding upon it. Yet Mr. SPEAKER, this is no new question. It has been brought up several times in Parliament, and before the people, and has occupied the attention of our ablest men, more or less, for the past forty or fifty years. It has been presented, theoretically, to the minds of the public of every province in British North America, in articles and pamphlets that have been written upon it; but now for the first time, by an extraordinary combination of events such as may never occur again, it presents itself to those empowered to deal with it practically and to give it life and vitality. (Hear, hear.) We have a great responsibility resting upon us with reference to the decision we shall come to on this important question. When I say that there has been an extraordinary combination of events, I think not the least extraordinary was the coming together of the leading men from all parts of the provinces, entertaining widely different and hostile views, yet determining to keep those views in abeyance while they

devised a scheme for the benefit of our common country. When before has the spectacle been witnessed of the leaders of adverse political camps surrendering that advantage which a resistance to any great change must always give in party politics, and meeting together to settle upon a common ground of action? This we saw last summer in the meeting of the delegates from all the provinces. Many of these gentlemen must have known that they risked their political positions, and we now know it in a practical way. But far better for a public man to be defeated in a great cause than to succeed in a bad one. (Hear, hear.) We cannot look upon the action of those men without conceding to them, first of all, a great amount of credit for the honorable and patriotic spirit which they evinced. Whatever views we may hold of their judgment, it must be conceded on all hands that their conduct deserves a high meed of praise. (Hear, hear.) But when we see this question taken up in all the provinces, and receiving so much attention in England, and even in other portions of Europe, in so short a period of time, I think we must feel that there must be some great overruling cause at work to induce so vast an amount of attention to be given to the subject. I have examined the question carefully in this aspect, and I venture to express an opinion respecting the cause, by reference to the history of nations. I recollect in a speech from Lord MACAULAY, in addressing the University of Aberdeen I think it was, speaking of the events of 1848, the remark occurs that since the invasion of the Huns civilization never ran such risks as in that year. (Hear, hear.) Its dangers passed away, but the results remain. The wave which threatened to submerge, obeying a natural law, retired beyond low-water mark, and has left exposed more than one coast. Small nations seem not to be considered, the faith of treaties is laughed at, and in this boasted age of civilization the doctrine that might is right prevails as strongly as in the seventeenth century. (Hear, hear.) The Danes, a brave and virtuous people, have been exposed to a hopeless war with Austria and Prussia, chiefs of the Teutonic race, while England and France remonstrated, by words and protocols, but acted not. The iron heel of Russia has crushed out the last sparks of freedom in Poland—long-suffering Poland, for whom so much sentiment has been expended, and free En-

gland and generous France stood silent lookers on. (Hear, hear.) From the Caucasus we have had the exodus of a nation from the land they defended for centuries, in bitter pilgrimage, losing thousands and tens of thousands on the way, to seek in the wilds of Asia for subsistence and freedom. On this continent the great nation which adjoins us has resorted to the bitter arbitrament of the sword, and an internecine and deplorable combat is being waged on a scale unknown since the Russian campaign and the great Napoleonic wars. These things, according to the stern rules of statecraft, may be right, and nations possibly cannot break the hard law of non-intervention; but when we see such events passing around us, must we not come to the conclusion that power must of necessity increase and encroach, or that it is as unreasonable now as it ever has been, and that pure justice and abstract right, without armed battalions to support them, will neither preserve integrity of territory nor secure protection of person. Again, in the discoveries in the arts and sciences, we can perceive how much the power of great states have become increased as compared with the smaller ones. The telegraph has annihilated time, railroads and steamers have devoured space. War can only be waged by nations possessing vast resources in money, warlike engines and materials. One iron-clad man-of-war, with her complement of Armstrong guns, would cost the year's revenue of a province. (Hear, hear.) And if we look around us we see this principle of territorial aggrandizement, this gathering together of the *disiecta membra* of nations; this girding up of the loins of empires for coming events is steadily carried out. The principle of centralization is rapidly going on, is pressing together the great nations, and rendering it necessary for smaller nations and provinces to unite, and centralize for their common defence. (Hear, hear.) The subject is not one of theory, but of fact. Look at Italy, such a short time ago a weak and scattered congeries of states, now united into one powerful government. VICTOR EMMANUEL is King of some twenty-five millions of people; France has Nice and Savoy and possibly a portion of Central America; Prussia and Austria have robbed Denmark; Russia has absorbed the Caucasus and is advancing into Central Asia; Mexico is springing into a powerful empire; the United States are, in men and the materials of war, showing a power which the world has seldom seen excelled. Such things passing

round us, it would ill become us not seriously to consider our position, and, if possible, profit by the occasion. (Cheers) What I have already said applies to all the provinces and to all small powers; but we in Canada have had peculiar difficulties of our own. Usually great questions strengthen governments. Aaron's rod swallows up the rods of the magicians; but, though we have settled great questions, our governments have fallen like houses of cards. Coalition and party governments alike have met the same fate, and it had become seriously to be considered as to whether responsible government was not a failure in Canada. Before the cry for an increased representation for Upper Canada, several of our best public men were driven from political life; and it must have become clear to those who watched events that there must soon have been a readjustment of the representation based partly, at least, on numbers, or a dissolution of the union. I think, sir, that those who have read and profited by the events of the past, and have considered what is likely to occur in the future, must be satisfied that a repeal of the union between Upper and Lower Canada would be a very great misfortune. And as to representation according to population, the appeals to prejudices and passions, and possibly well grounded fears which must result from granting that to Upper Canada, would be most disastrous. (Hear, hear.) We should have had, in Lower Canada, a very large amount of discontent and even disaffection; and, therefore, I consider it a great advantage to Canada that the adoption of Confederation will meet these difficulties without causing the discontent and disaffection which either of the above measures would inevitably arouse. (Hear.) But, sir, I may be asked, will these provinces, if united, become a great power? Sir, I shall frankly answer that I think not at present, nor will I venture to predict what the future has in store for us; but I think thereby we obtain a greater chance of obviating the evils to which I have referred, and we in Canada shall also overcome our peculiar difficulties — and this I say, that united, we shall possess advantages which separate, though portions of the same empire, we cannot realize. (Cheers.) We shall be one to deliberate, to decide and to act. We shall have but one tariff; trade will be unshackled, our intercommunication will be unbroken, the Lower Provinces will give us a seaboard, while the manufacturing capa-

cities of Lower Canada and the agricultural wealth of Upper Canada will be theirs. A worthy field will be opened for the ambition of our young men, and our politicians will have a future before them, and may fairly aspire to the standing and rewards of statesmen. (Cheers.) I therefore think it cannot but be a very great advantage to all the provinces to be united together, and I think that we in Canada especially have peculiar reasons for desiring Confederation. If united, with the assistance of Great Britain, and true to ourselves, not calling on Jupiter without putting our shoulders to the wheel, we need fear no foe, and if the day should come when it shall be necessary for us to stand among the nations of the earth, we shall do so under far more favorable circumstances than should we remain till then separate provinces. (Hear, hear.) I forbear to criticize the details of the scheme; in the nature of things one portion or another must be displeasing to each of us; but I am ready to accept the lesser evil for the greater good. I know, too, when worked out the united Parliament will alter and amend as the evils become serious. Holding these opinions, it is needless for me to say that I shall vote for the Address and the resolutions unchanged. On Friday night I heard an hon. member (Col. HAULTAIN) declare that the Protestant minority of Lower Canada entertained apprehensions with regard to their religious liberty, and that hon. member expressed grave doubts as to the toleration of Catholics in matters of religion. While I give the hon. gentleman full credit for his sincerity and the temperate manner in which he expressed himself, I think it would have been far better had that portion of his speech been omitted. It would certainly have had much greater weight with the country without that portion than with it. I do not believe the Protestants of Lower Canada fear persecution, and there are those in this House, their natural representatives, yielding to none here in talent and knowledge, well able to speak for them. But, sir, had the hon. gentleman read history as carefully as he seems to have studied polemics and theology, he would not have fallen into the error into which he has. He would have found that all sects of Christians have had reason to blush for the persecutions of their fellow-men, and that the best course we can pursue is to allow the veil to fall over the errors of the past.

(Hear, hear.) But, sir, he would have learned this, also, that those who laid the foundations of the British Constitution were Roman Catholics; that the barons who wrung the *magna charta* from King JOHN were Catholics. (Hear, hear.) It was a Catholic Parliament, the Diet of Hungary, that alone granted full, free, unrestricted and unqualified emancipation to Protestants, and Catholic Bavaria has followed the example. In America, the Catholic State of Maryland first adopted, without limit, religious toleration. Had the hon. member visited Rome he might have seen a Protestant Church, and have attended service every Sunday in the year under the eyes of the Pope.

MR. T. C. WALLBRIDGE—There is no Protestant Church in Rome. I have been there, and speak from personal knowledge.

HON. MR. ALLEYN—It is not in a central place, but it is in Rome as properly understood.

MR. T. C. WALLBRIDGE—It is not in the city proper. It is outside the gates, in a garret.

HON. MR. ALLEYN—Not in a garret, though the church is not attractive, but there is full tolerance in respect to the service. But this is only a little incident growing out of the remarks of the hon. member for Peterborough. In making the observations I have, I trust he will not think I have intended to say anything that might prove personally disagreeable to him or to any hon. member, because the manner in which he stated his propositions to the House was all that could be expected or desired from an hon. gentleman of his position, and I should be very sorry to say anything that would be considered offensive. My hon. friend asked me if I ever went to church. In reply I would say that I only go when I can be sure the preacher is a properly admitted clergyman. Had the hon. gentleman travelled in France, he might have found the Protestant clergyman received from the state an allowance of one-fifth more than his Catholic brother, on the ground that he may have a family to support. In Lower Canada a Catholic Legislature gave equal rights to Jews a generation before enlightened England emancipated Catholics. (Hear, hear.) And, sir, the history of the Jews gave a terrible warning to all who persecute for belief's sake. They, God's own people, set

that bad example. For belief they crucified, and during a thousand years for belief they were oppressed and wronged as no nation ever suffered. Sir, it has not been by persecution that while all other denominations of Christians scarcely number 120,000,000, the members of the Roman Catholic Church are at least 150,000,000. Had there been a rule of intolerance and persecution, by an inevitable law they would long ere this have caused the destruction of that which used them, and MACAULAY would not have been obliged to write with regret, as he admits, that the Church of Rome,—

As she saw the commencement of all the governments and of all the ecclesiastical establishments that now exist in the world, there is no assurance that she is not destined to see the end of them all. She was great and respected before the Saxon had set foot in Britain, before the Frank had passed the Rhine, when Grecian eloquence still flourished in Antioch, when idols were still worshipped in the temples of Mecca. And she may still exist in undiminished vigour when some traveller from New Zealand shall in the midst of a vast solitude take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge and sketch the ruins of St. Paul.

In reading this extract and bringing it to bear in this connection, I hope my hon. friend will not think I intended to shock his feelings by alluding to an early fall of London Bridge, or a speedy decay of the cathedral of St. Paul. (Laughter.) I quote this passage alike for its novelty as knowing it will be particularly agreeable to my hon. friend the member for Peterborough. I can assure my hon. friend the feeling pervading the Catholics of Lower Canada is a disposition to give the utmost tolerance to all religious sects. For my part, Mr. SPEAKER, persecution for religious belief I know to be a crime against humanity, and I therefore believe it to be a sin against the Creator. I have to say, however, once more, in conclusion, that I shall vote for the resolution now before the House. (Cheers.)

MR. HOPE MACKENZIE said—As there seems to be a lull in the debate, Mr. SPEAKER, I will embrace the opportunity of briefly stating what I have to say in reference to this scheme. And to begin, I congratulate the Government upon the stand they have taken on this matter. There was a degree of anxiety, a feeling of uncertainty amongst the friends and supporters of the Administration, as to the mode of dealing with this question after the reception of

unfavorable news from the Lower Provinces. For my own part I have not shared in that feeling, but continued to have confidence that the Government would pursue the only proper course, and ask the House to pronounce upon the scheme on its merits. If the result of the first elections held in New Brunswick is a true indication of the state of feeling in that province, then it is plain that defeat awaits the present proposition for union in that quarter; but as yet no province has pronounced upon it, either for it or against it; and the intelligence received that the union party have met with unlooked for reverses at the New Brunswick elections, however dampening to the prospects of early success, is no sufficient reason why we, the originators of the scheme, should set the bad example of summarily giving it up. We have a plain duty to discharge in regard to the proposition laid before Parliament by the Government, and that is, either to accept or reject it as a whole. (Hear, hear.) Sir, I will not occupy the time of the House so long as I probably would have done, had I spoken at an earlier stage of the debate, and that for two reasons, because the ground has been all gone over by those who have spoken already, and because I think the Government have good ground for urging upon the House the propriety of bringing the debate to a close as soon as possible. I can easily understand that it is a matter of paramount importance to have the views of the Canadian Parliament laid before the Imperial Government at the earliest possible moment. I cannot, however, feel it to be consistent with a proper discharge of my duty to give a silent vote. Having spent some time amongst my constituents prior to the opening of this session, and had conversations with the people in reference to this scheme, at my meetings with them I gave expression to certain objections which I felt in my own mind to certain details of the scheme, if I did not express those objections on the floor of the House. (Hear, hear.) But, Mr. SPEAKER, while I discussed freely and candidly what appeared to me the objectionable features of the scheme, I stated most distinctly to my constituents that in the event of no alteration being agreed to by the governments of the several provinces, the scheme as a whole, just as it stood, ought to be accepted; and that in the event of the alternative being offered to Parliament of accepting or rejecting the scheme as it stood, I should feel it my

duty to vote for it. (Hear, hear.) And I may say here in regard to the question of an appeal to the people upon this subject, that I at any rate can vote freely against any proposition of that kind. I stated to the people of North Oxford that in my opinion an appeal to the people upon this scheme was entirely uncalled for, and they agreed with me. I may, perhaps, take the liberty of saying to those honorable members who clamour for a dissolution, merely for the sake of ascertaining the mind of the people upon the measure, and who do not take to the untenable ground of denying the right of this Parliament to legislate on the subject, that if they did not consult their constituents with a view to obtaining an expression of public opinion, they ought to have done so. They had the scheme before them in all its details for months, and I think they ought to be in a position, when they came here, to know whether their constituents were in favor of the scheme or against it. In the meetings which were held in my county, I met with only two individuals who were prepared to go the length of denouncing the scheme *in toto*, although many would prefer to see it, in some respects, different from what it is. So well disposed did the people show themselves to be towards the union scheme, that in the town of Woodstock, where a very large and influential meeting was held, the editor of a newspaper that had been, up to that night, urging the necessity for a dissolution of Parliament before the adoption of the scheme, was the first to rise to move a resolution approving of the scheme in all its features, and neither in his speech nor in his resolution did he even hint at an appeal to the people; and that meeting voted for the scheme without a single dissentient voice. (Hear, hear.)

MR. RYMAL—The circular had been sent to that editor, perhaps. (Laughter.)

MR. H. MACKENZIE—Well, if so, I am not aware that it has done him any good or produced any change in his political course. I am quite satisfied, Mr. SPEAKER, that the people are perfectly willing that this Parliament should deal with this Confederation scheme. I will now, sir, state briefly what I think of the general features or underlying principles of the scheme. The honorable member for Brome the other night entertained the House by a very elaborate examination of the scheme, and, among other things, he proposed to show that the proposed Constitution was an entire departure

from the British model, and had in it so large an infusion of the republican system of the United States as to render it obnoxious to Britons; but, in opposition to his own premises, he succeeded in proving to a demonstration, if he proved anything, that in scarcely a single particular is it modelled after the pattern of the republic. He even denounced this scheme because it is so very different from and, in his opinion, inferior to the United States Constitution. Well, sir, I accept of it because of its British and monarchical features,—I accept of it because of its monarchical character. (Hear, hear.) I look upon it as a scheme more national than federal in its character—as looking more to a national union of the people than a union of sections, and it is chiefly because of this feature of it that it commends itself to my judgment. (Hear, hear.) The honorable member for Lotbinière dissented from this view the other night, and argued that unless the supreme power was placed in the hands of the separate provinces, it could not be acceptable to Lower Canada, as otherwise their institutions would be endangered; and yet oddly enough, he elaborated an argument to prove the fleeting and unstable character of federations established upon the only principle that he seems disposed to accept for this country. In the course of his remarks on this head, he said:—

The Hon. Minister of Agriculture said of Federalism, that it was on account of the weakness of the central power confederations had failed; and it was argued in our case, that there would not be so much weakness in the central power. This was precisely why the French-Canadians—his fellow-countrymen—looked with suspicion on the proposition to establish a Confederation with a central power—a power so strong that the local parliaments would possess, so to speak, no power at all. (Hear, hear.) All the confederations he had referred to had at least this excuse, they were sovereign states, and, when menaced by other powers, leagued themselves together for the common interest.

Now, sir, while the honorable member will have nothing to do with it, because of the supreme central power that is provided in the scheme, I take it just because of that controlling central power. I stand as an advocate of national unity, and I would not accede to the principle of state sovereignty in this Confederation, the provinces delegating certain powers to the General Government and reserving the residuum of power to themselves. (Hear, hear.) We

need not go to the history of the South American republics, as the member for Lotbinière did, to find an illustration of the working of the principle of Confederation as applicable to our case. Being not only republican in their character, but based upon the principle of divided sovereignty, and inhabited by a people who had no aptitude for working democratic institutions, they can bear no comparison with this proposed Constitution. But if the hon. gentleman desired to travel to South America to find something approaching a parallel to this scheme of union, he could find it in the constitutional monarchy of Brazil, where the wide-spreading provinces of the empire have their local parliaments for their local affairs, and a central parliament and executive over all—elected and chosen pretty much as our Central Parliament and Executive will be, and exercising similar powers; and he would find that while the republics founded upon the doctrine of state sovereignty were in a state of perpetual turmoil, and whose daily bread was, according to the hon. member, anarchy and revolution, the Empire of Brazil was flourishing and shewed signs of stability that predicated its future greatness. (Hear, hear.) But to come nearer home, sir, we have abundant evidence of the dangerous character of the doctrine of state supremacy in a confederation. I would remind the House of the early ruin that threatened the United States under their first Constitution, which was an embodiment of this vicious principle, and how clearly the great men of the first year of the republic foresaw the ruin it threatened to bring upon them. WASHINGTON, perceiving the rapid decline of the Confederation, was incessant in his correspondence with the leading patriots of the day to obtain their opinions upon a new Constitution, and MADISON replies as follows:

Conceiving that an individual independence of the states is totally irreconcilable with their aggregate sovereignty, and that a consolidation of the whole into one simple republic would be as inexpedient as it is unattainable, I have sought for some middle ground which may at once support a due supremacy of the national authority, and not exclude the local authorities wherein they can be subordinately useful.

Mr. JAY's convictions in favor of central supreme authority are equally strong. He says:—

What powers should be granted to the Govern-

ment so constituted, is a question which deserves much thought. *I think the more the better*, the states retaining only so much as may be necessary for domestic purposes.

HAMILTON, likewise, speaking of Federation such as men had hitherto been familiar with, and such as then existed in America, and equally anxious with his co-patriots to save his country from the anarchy and ruin that he saw approaching as the inevitable result of a partitioned sovereignty, thus addressed the head of the republic:—

All Federal governments are weak and distracted. In order to avoid the evils incident to that form, the Government of the American Union must be a national representative system. But no such system can be successful in the actual situation of this country, unless it is endorsed with all the principles and means of influence and power which are the proper supports of government. It must, therefore, be made completely sovereign, and state power, as a separate legislative power, must be annihilated.

I read these extracts to show how rapidly the Central Government of the United States was falling into contempt because of its subordination to the separate states, and to show that the leading minds of America, while the republic was yet in its infancy, felt that the doctrine of state supremacy was one calculated to foster anarchy, and that was sure to bring the early destruction of the fabric they had reared, and also to show how earnestly they labored to remove the evil and transfer the sovereignty to the Central Government, as their only hope of maintaining permanent peace and order, and of imparting stability to their system. I think, sir, it becomes us in framing a Constitution for these provinces to profit, not only by the early but by the later experience of our neighbors—to enquire how far they succeeded in eradicating the evil from their new Constitution, and to what extent their present troubles are chargeable to what is left in their system of the dangerous principle referred to. Let us profit by the wisdom of the framers of the American Constitution, and by the experiences of that country under it—not to copy their work, but to help us when framing a Constitution for ourselves to steer clear of evils that they have felt. Believing that the Quebec Conference has done so and have presented to us the framework of a Constitution, the leading features of which are in unison with the constitutional principles of the British monarchy, and consistent with that allegiance

which we all owe and cheerfully yield to the Throne of Britain, I cheerfully endorse the scheme. (Hear, hear.) I will now, Mr. SPEAKER, look at the scheme in its sectional aspect; and, in my judgment, it is in this respect a fair one. The apportionment of the debt and other financial arrangements is a theme upon which many remarks and explanations have been made in this, as well as in the other branch of the Legislature; and charges are made of having bribed the Lower Provinces into the scheme, and that the Canadian Delegates in the Conference sacrificed the interests of Canada in their eagerness to consummate a scheme that had its origin in their political necessities. One hon. gentleman complains that population is not the proper basis upon which to distribute the burden of the public debt, and that by adopting it Canada has been saddled with many millions more than her share. "Revenue," it is contended, "is the true test of ability to pay, therefore revenue is the basis upon which the apportionment should be made." Were the taxation alike in all the provinces, there would, at least, be the appearance of justice in the argument; but with revenue raised under the operation of different tariffs, in the several provinces, I think population is a juster basis than revenue. Taking, however, the revenues as we find them under existing tariffs, and adjusting the debt by that standard, we find that it will differ but little from the apportionment that has been agreed upon; and were the tariffs of the Maritime Provinces somewhat higher than they are now, I apprehend, sir, that the consuming ability of these provinces would demonstrate not only their ability to pay according to this test, but also that Canada is in no way imposed upon in regard to the amount of debt with which these provinces are to be permitted to enter the union. I believe that every one of the five provinces has had its interests well consulted in this scheme, and that it is so well balanced throughout in reference to those interests, that there is very little to complain of. (Hear, hear.) But speaking from an Upper Canadian point of view—which I deem it my duty to do, as one of the representatives of that section—I will glance at one or two of the objections urged by the honorable member for North Ontario, very briefly. That honorable gentleman accuses Upper Canadians of disregarding and forgetting their former professions on the representation question, and broadly asserts that the

Honorable President of the Council, as the leader in the agitation for representation by population, has agreed to a measure that is a mere delusion, that in point of fact puts Upper Canada in a worse position than she now occupies. He says that instead of occupying a position of equality in the legislature, as now, she will be found in the new union with a majority of thirty arrayed against her. The honorable gentleman builds his argument upon false and erroneous premises, when he says that Upper Canada does not get by this scheme what its people have long sought, representation according to its population; and when he points out that all the other provinces, unitedly, will outvote her in the General Legislature by thirty votes, I submit, sir, that his argument is exceedingly unfair, and is founded on the assumption that Upper Canada asked for an increase of representation for the purpose of obtaining supremacy in the Government. Now, I deny that most emphatically on behalf, not only of myself, but of every man from Upper Canada who demanded a change in the representation. We did not advocate that change for the purpose of gaining the supremacy, but simply and solely as a measure of justice to the people of Upper Canada, and to place them on an equal footing, man for man, with the people of Lower Canada. We had certain grievances and wrongs which we complained of, and which the granting of representation would not of itself redress; we complained that a larger proportion of the public revenues, to which we contributed seventy per cent., was spent in Lower Canada than in Upper Canada; we complained also of legislative acts passed by majorities from Lower Canada and which concerned Upper Canada chiefly; we did not ask representation by population because we believed it, of itself, would sweep away all this injustice, but because it would give us this advantage, that we would in this House have our due proportion of the representation, every man in Upper Canada having an equal, and no more than equal, voice in the Legislature with every man in Lower Canada. This was all we asked; we never demanded more than what was just; we asked but fair play—British fair play—an equal representation, man for man, and we would be willing to take our chance in the political struggle for the redress of the evils we complained of. We never sought or wished for supremacy, but only our just and fair influence according to our numbers and the public burdens we bore, and having obtained

this we were willing to take our chance whether that influence, employed in a legitimate and constitutional way, succeeded in removing our grievances or not. (Hear, hear.) To say now that we do not obtain what we have contended for—to say that we do not get representation by population because the Lower Provinces, including Lower Canada, will have thirty more votes in the General Legislature, is simply doing Upper Canada an injustice and a wrong; and the history of the British parliamentary system and our own experience in Canada, warrant the conclusion that in the General Legislature we shall not have, as alleged by honorable gentlemen opposed to the scheme, parties divided against one another because of the provinces which they represent. Under our present Constitution we are not divided sectionally, but as political parties, for we find gentlemen from both sections taking sides according to their political predilections, irrespective of sectional considerations; and so it will be under the proposed Confederation. We have conservatives and radicals, and always will have them. Do we not find men of both races in the province voting on both sides politically? It is true the demand for constitutional changes has to some extent, but only to some extent, divided us as the representatives of sections in this House; but on all other questions—such as commerce, banking, customs tariffs, excise, and other questions—we find gentlemen voting according to their political views, and not as representing sections. So it will be under the Confederation. People will be divided into parties by their political opinions and leanings, and not by sectional considerations. (Hear, hear.) In claiming, then, that under it there will, on all questions, be a majority against Upper Canada, is to assume that Upper Canada will be at war with all the other provinces, and that they will be continually at war with it. Well, what right has any man to assume that this will be the case—that Upper Canada will be the Ishmael of the Confederation? I think he has none whatever. (Hear, hear.) The addition of seventeen members to Upper Canada in the outset, with the proposed arrangement for re-adjustment every ten years according to the increase or decrease of population in each of the provinces, is substantial justice to all, and is all that Upper Canada ever asked for or expected. But, Mr. SPEAKER, the honorable member for North Ontario not only accuses the Upper Canadians who support this scheme of an

abandonment of their principles on this point, and of offering to the people of Upper Canada the very opposite of what they asked for, but charges that we have sacrificed our cash as well as our principles. An honorable member of the other House has taken similar ground, and charges in effect that the Lower Provinces have been bribed into this scheme at the expense of Upper Canada, and that as regards Lower Canada, we undertake to pay her in perpetuity a subsidy of \$167,000 a year; and the honorable gentleman asks if ever Lower Canada asked for anything like that under our present system? He tells us, too, that for each of the seventeen additional members we get in the Federal Government, we pay at the rate of \$16,000 each. As regards the Lower Provinces, I submit that it cannot be shewn that their union with us will be to our detriment in money matters. They will contribute as large an amount per head to the general revenue as we do in Upper Canada, and if any financial effect will be felt by Upper Canada in consequence of the union of these provinces with us, I think it must be in the direction of lessening her burdens; such, at all events, is the conclusion I have arrived at, and such, I think, is the conclusion any man will arrive at who will take the trouble to inform himself of the position of these provinces as regards the financial questions between Upper and Lower Canada. I do not know where the honorable member gets his figures, nor can I very well understand them, but in regard to the subsidy of \$167,000 a year that he speaks of, what are the facts of the case? Let it be borne in mind, sir, that as Upper Canadians we claimed that we were paying an enormous price for the present union with Lower Canada, and that we urged this as one reason why we were entitled to the concession of representation by population as an act of justice, that we might have our due share of influence in controlling the expenditure of the revenues of the country to which we contributed so largely. We complained, and it was advanced in this Assembly over and over again, as one of the reasons for demanding representation by population, that our money was given away to sections which contributed little or nothing to the general revenue; that while we paid seventy per cent. of the revenue and Lower Canada only thirty per cent., an equal proportion of the expenditure was enjoyed by Lower Canada; and that under this system Upper Canada was paying not only for its own local improvements

and sustaining not only the cost of carrying on its own local affairs, but contributing largely as well to the local wants of Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) Now, it was in reference to these local matters that the evil was chiefly felt and that complaints were louder than with reference to general expenditure, for they were tangible grievances, things that were easily understood, and that presented themselves as an injustice every year in the estimates presented to this House. There was a sum of two millions, or more voted every year for the support of local interests and to promote local works or improvements, including such items as the support of education, hospitals and charities, and the opening up of colonization roads; and of this sum one-half was applied to local purposes in Lower Canada. Now, our argument was, that of this money taken out of the public chest, Upper Canada contributed seventy per cent., and Lower Canada the remainder. If this was true—and I think it was incontrovertibly so—then it was perfectly clear that we in Upper Canada had to pay not only the appropriations made for local purposes in that section, but also nearly one-half of the appropriations for local purposes in Lower Canada. Let me remark here that I do not think any man will complain that we in Upper Canada are paying this large portion of the public revenue. Under our system of indirect taxation, or indeed under any system, it must be that the richest part of the community shall bear the largest share of the public burdens, and they have a right to do so. I do not complain that the people of Upper Canada pay a larger amount of the revenue of the country than those of Lower Canada, because if they choose to consume the imported articles upon which duties are levied, they do so because they are able to pay for them. They are not required to consume them, but if they do, and are made to pay indirectly to the public exchequer, they have no right to complain that the people of Lower Canada, more frugal and economical, consume less dutiable goods and therefore contribute less to the revenue. We in Upper Canada do not complain of this, but we give it as a reason why we should have our just share of influence in the legislature and government of the country. We do not argue that because we contribute more we ought to have a larger representation than Lower Canada; but we say that if we really do pay more to the public exchequer, it is an additional reason—our population being greater—that we should have

an equal voice with Lower Canada, in proportion to our numbers, in controlling the expenditure of the country. (Hear, hear.) Well, this being the case that Upper Canada contributes the largest share of the revenue, it is perfectly clear to my mind—and I think it will be to that of any man who examines the subject intelligently—that Upper Canada pays to Lower Canada, under our present system, a considerable sum of money, amounting to half a million of dollars yearly, for the support of its local interests and institutions; and if the honorable member for North Ontario will balance the proportion that Upper Canada pays of the eighty cents per head proposed to be paid to Lower Canada with the amount now paid to it by Upper Canada, he will find that a large saving will be effected by the plan now proposed for our acceptance. (Hear, hear.) We have thus, I think, gained by this scheme, not only representation by population, saving us from the imputation of having sacrificed this principle in order to obtain Confederation, but we have also, by the same measure, gained a substantial redress of the grievances to remove which representation by population was demanded. (Hear, hear.) Not only has a saving of money been effected, but also a removal from this Legislature of those subjects upon which angry, intemperate, and painful discussions have taken place in times past. For these reasons, I think it is a most desirable thing that the scheme should be carried out. (Hear, hear.) It is marvellous how inconsistent some honorable gentlemen show themselves to be in their desire to oppose this measure. The honorable member for Lotbinière, speaking of it from a sectional point of view, has also, I think, exposed himself to this charge. He charges the Honorable Attorney General East with inconsistency, if not something worse, in occupying the position he now does as affecting the interests of Lower Canada, forgetful of his own relative position. He said:—

If the member for South Oxford had earned his popularity by attacking the institutions of Lower Canada through the agitation for representation by population, it might be said of the Hon. Attorney General East that he had risen to popularity by defending or by affecting to defend those institutions. (Hear, hear.) He had so well succeeded in obtaining the good graces of the people of this section of the province, and in securing their confidence, that it was extremely difficult for any of those who were politically opposed to him to attempt to speak in the interests of their fellow-countrymen. (Hear, hear.)

The hon. member for South Oxford (Hon.

Mr. BROWN) is here represented as having earned his popularity by attacking the institutions of Lower Canada, and the honorable member for Montreal East (Hon. Mr. CARTIER) as having earned his by defending these same institutions, and the insinuation is that he has now abandoned the defence of these institutions and handed them over to the tender mercies of the Honorable President of the Council. Let me ask the honorable member for Lothinière, if being in company with the honorable member for South Oxford be evidence of hostility to the institutions of Lower Canada, how he explains his own position, and that of his party, when they cast in their lot with the honorable member for South Oxford, while earning his popularity by, as he says, attacking the institutions of Lower Canada, and abandoned the Honorable Attorney General East when doing battle in defence of those institutions? (Hear, hear.) I think the question is one not easily answered. The honorable gentleman must either have been politically dishonest before, or politically dishonest now, and he can take either horn of the dilemma he pleases.

MR. JOLY—I never supported the Honorable Attorney General East, and if I have been forced upon the same side as the honorable member for South Oxford, it was because we were united together in opposition to that honorable gentleman. That was the only bond of union that connected us together. On the question of representation by population we were always divided. What I meant in the observation I made, that has been alluded to by the honorable member, is this, that the Honorable President of the Council had gained the position he occupies now by attacking Lower Canada, and the Honorable Attorney General East his, by assuming to defend it; and when at length they found that the game would no longer answer, when the Honorable President of the Council saw himself excluded forever from a seat in the Ministry if he continued to play it, they banded together, and we now see the result. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

MR. H. MACKENZIE—At all events, Mr. SPEAKER, the hon. member makes it clear that he has changed sides. For when the Hon Attorney General East was defending the institutions of Lower Canada, he opposed him, and now he opposes him because he says he has adopted the contrary policy.

MR. JOLY—I opposed him for other reasons—not for that reason.

MR. H. MACKENZIE—At all events the

hon. member has contributed his mite to the influence the hon. member for South Oxford had in this House, by attacking, as he declares, the institutions of Lower Canada. I have already said that all parties are not satisfied with this scheme; and while on this point, I wish to allude for a moment to the constitution of the Legislative Council. It is the only reference I shall make on this branch of the subject. When addressing my constituents, I took exception to this portion of the resolutions. I did so, not because I cared very much whether we had in this country a Legislative Council nominated by the Crown or elected by the people, but, the nominative system having been superseded by the elective, I preferred to have it as it was. It was in these terms that I spoke to the people. After having addressed one or two meetings, I saw the despatch of the Colonial Secretary, and I noticed that this matter of the constitution of the Council was pointed out as one which required revision; and I took it for granted that communications would be opened between the several Colonial Governments such as would possibly lead to a change. Doubtless there are sufficient reasons why this has not been done. But, although I would have liked it to have been so, and although it would have concurred more closely with the views of Upper Canada, I do not think it of sufficient importance to warrant me in rejecting the scheme on that account. (Hear, hear.) If it involves the rejection of the whole scheme, I do not feel myself warranted in pressing for an amendment on the point. (Hear.) In framing a constitution of this kind, everybody must be aware that an agreement could never have been arrived at except on the principle of compromise and concession. It is perfectly useless—it is worse than useless—to suppose that any of the several sections of a wide-spread territory could come together with a view to the formation of a union among themselves, unless each one of these sections was prepared to sacrifice and give up something. What right, I would ask, had we to expect that all the other colonies would agree to the views of Upper Canada, or to the views of Canada as a whole? What right had we to expect that the Province of Nova Scotia would agree with us in our views with reference to every particular matter? What right had we in Upper Canada to expect that in framing this scheme we would be able to expunge the separate school clauses from the School Act? If that could

be done, it would no doubt be agreeable to the people of Upper Canada, because we think that in our Common School system there should be no element of sectarianism. As a people, we are desirous of having our School law without any provision for separate schools. It is perhaps a bold statement to make, but I believe the people of Upper Canada as a whole, Roman Catholics as well as Protestants, would be content with our school system without a particle of sectarianism in it. We could scarcely expect that if we were to succeed in framing a basis of union under a new Constitution, we could get the sectarian clauses of the School Act removed, if they were insisted upon as *sine qua non* by the Roman Catholics in Lower Canada in conjunction with the adherents of the same faith in Upper Canada. But notwithstanding this, although it is a sensitive point in Upper Canada, and particularly among my own constituents, I venture to say that the people of the west generally, in their willingness at all times to listen to reason, will be quite content to accept the scheme as a whole, as it has been presented to us. (Hear, hear.) I hope that no attempt will be made to increase the privileges of the advocates of separate schools, but that the question will be left where we now find it. (Hear, hear.) It is worth while, perhaps, to read a single passage, written by a distinguished man, in reference to this principle of concession. I have already instanced the views of the framers of the American Constitution when they set to work to do away with the first Federation scheme and to adopt a new Constitution. When they had framed the new Constitution, we find WASHINGTON accompanying the document with a letter, in which this passage occurs :—

It is obviously impracticable in the Federal Government of these states to secure all rights of independent sovereignty to each, and yet provide for the interest and safety of all. Individuals entering into society must give up a share of liberty to preserve the rest. The magnitude of the sacrifice must depend as well on situation and circumstances as on the object to be attained. It is at all times difficult to draw with precision the line between those rights which *must be surrendered* and those which *may be reserved*.

Doubtless, sir, the members of the Quebec Conference encountered the same difficulties as the framers of the American Constitution did. They must have found it difficult to

draw the line exactly where it should be drawn. I presume it could not be done, and that each one felt it incumbent upon him to make certain concessions, and that all they could hope to do was to have some broad margin, some neutral ground, on which to draw the line, so as to be able to say they did the best they could to unite the sectional interests of the provinces and to further something like a nationality for the country. (Hear, hear.) I do not desire to trespass upon the House; I have purposely passed over much that I intended to have said, had the Government desired to encourage discussion at greater length; and I pass on rapidly to a conclusion. (Cries of "Go on!") I think the union desirable, not only as a benefit to ourselves, but as a means for consolidating the British Empire on this continent, and to save us from a degrading dependency on the United States, especially as we have the means within ourselves of making them to a certain extent dependent upon us. Look at the map of this country, look at the position we occupy geographically; see the outlet we possess to the ocean; look at the magnificent St. Lawrence, with the vast grain growing country beyond it. Is it not in our power to draw the trade of the Great West through this its natural outlet to the ocean? Is it not possible to so improve this channel as to bring the produce of the great Western States to market through our territory? Is it not possible, by means of a little judicious outlay, to make the people of the United States dependent on us, instead of us being dependent on them? (Hear, hear.) There is much that could be said on this subject, and the means that might be resorted to for securing to us these benefits of trade and commerce. It is not so much to the enlargement of the Welland and St. Lawrence canals, although that is necessary, as to the construction of a ship canal to Lake Huron through the Ottawa country, that in my opinion we must look for the ultimate commercial greatness of this country, as furnishing the shortest and safest route for the conveyance of the contents of the great granaries of the west to foreign markets. The proposed Ottawa canal may not run through a country as fertile as the valley of the St. Lawrence; it is of a different geological formation; nevertheless, I believe it to be a country of great riches, whose resources are as yet undeveloped. I think that

a ship canal from Georgian Bay in that direction would not only furnish a satisfactory outlet for the produce of the west, but would lead to a splendid market for the lumber trade, and find employment for a class of vessels to which we cannot at present give profitable occupation; and, besides, it would open a channel for such vessels and implements of war as may be necessary for the defence of the country. (Hear, hear.) I would conclude by saying that I think union desirable, not only because of its present advantages, but on account of our future prospects. Looking at the future, I do not think it desirable that one government should exercise sway over the whole of the North American continent. (Hear, hear.) Nor do I think it desirable that such a government should be a republican government. (Hear, hear.) Taking this view of the case; looking back to the history of the past; reflecting upon the evils which have followed hasty constitution-making, and the troubles that have occurred in consequence of blundering at the outset, it becomes us to consider whether the scheme which has now been laid before us has in it the elements of stability. I think it has, so far as human foresight can determine. (Hear, hear.) Geographically this country covers a vast extent of territory. We can lean our backs on the snows of the north, and from that quarter no enemy can attack us; and if we have no great breadth from north to south, we have a large expanse westwards. Although, too, we are in a northern clime, although our latitude is higher than that of our southern neighbor, yet this is no obstacle to the growth of population or to the increase of prosperity. (Hear, hear.) Teeming millions will in future inhabit this land, and we are called upon now to lay deep and broad the foundations of a great empire. Let us shew that we value the free institutions of Britain transplanted to this soil; institutions founded upon principles of freedom and universal toleration; institutions that have made the parent land great, and that mark it out as the one bright spot in the old world to which the eyes of the nations turn when their liberties are imperilled, and as the city of refuge to which crowned heads, as well as the victims of their misrule, can alike flee for safety in the hour of their misfortune. (Hear, hear.) I have no hesitation, MR. SPEAKER, in endorsing the scheme before us. I do so

87

because I believe its leading principles are in harmony with the principles upon which the British constitutional system is founded, and because I think it is a fair arrangement between all the provinces; and, as an Upper Canadian, I accept it because I think it concedes to us the *status* we are entitled to occupy. I accept it, further, because of the prospect it holds out to us of building up a great nationality here, and of handing down to our children institutions which our fathers have bought with their blood. (Loud cheers.)

MR. M. C. CAMERON—I wish to shew the honorable member for North Oxford the figures upon which I have based my calculation. I find that under the scheme—

The Federal aid to Lower Canada is \$	888,531
do do Upper Canada..	1,117,590
	<u>\$2,006,121</u>

Of the aid to Lower Canada—

The Maritime Provinces contribute, say 1-5th.....	\$ 177,706
Upper Canada contributes $\frac{1}{3}$ rd of the balance, or.....	473,884
Lower Canada contributes $\frac{1}{3}$ rd do .	236,941
	<u>\$888,531</u>

Of the aid to Upper Canada—

The Maritime Provinces contribute, say 1-5th.....	\$ 223,514
Lower Canada, $\frac{1}{3}$ rd of balance.....	298,025
Upper Canada, $\frac{1}{3}$ rd do .	596,051
	<u>\$1,117,590</u>

Contribution by U.C. to L.C.....	\$473,884
do by L.C. to U.C.....	298,025
	<u>\$175,859</u>

Expenses of General Government..	<u>\$8,553,379</u>
----------------------------------	--------------------

Contribution by Mar. Pro. according to Mr. GALT.	\$1,929,272
Contribution by L. C., at $\frac{1}{3}$ rd of balance.....	2,208,035
Contribution by U. C., at $\frac{1}{3}$ rd of balance.....	4,416,072
	<u>\$8,553,379</u>

U. C. in excess of Mar. Prov.....	\$2,486,800
U. C. in excess of L. C.....	2,208,035

U. C. in excess of both.....	<u>\$ 278,765</u>
------------------------------	-------------------

This sum divided by 17, the additional representatives to Upper Canada, makes the cost of each \$16,397 annually.

HON. MR. DORION—MR. SPEAKER, the intelligence received from New Brunswick since the last sitting has caused the question of Confederation, now under discussion, to lose much of its interest. Every one is now convinced that it is a question which no longer has any real existence, and which may safely be shelved for some time to come at all events. I deem it, however, to be my duty to make a few observations in reply to the hon. member for Montmorency, and to allude in passing to the speech of the Hon. Solicitor General East (Honorable Mr. LANGEVIN). The honorable member for Montmorency began his speech by saying that the members of this House ought to raise their views above all paltry considerations of a personal or party character, and discuss the question of Confederation upon its own merits, that thereby its advantages or disadvantages might be made apparent. And yet the honorable member has devoted at least one-third of his speech to calling to mind and discussing what I may or may not have said in past times. I have already said, and I repeat it, that I defy any member of this House to cite a single passage from any one of my speeches, or one single line of anything I may have ever written, to prove that I have ever been in favor of a Confederation of the British North American Provinces. In order to produce a semblance of proof, and with the view of making me contradict myself, it has been necessary to torture my words, to falsify my speeches, to make false translations of them; and even then with all the skill that has been used, the attempt has been unsuccessful. The speech which has been quoted with the greatest complacency, to show that I was in favor of the Confederation of all the provinces, is that which I delivered on the 3rd May, 1860. This speech, which occupied nearly two hours in its delivery, was reported in about twenty-five lines of the *Morning Chronicle*, and only occupied a column in the *Mirror of Parliament*. These two reports are completely at variance one with the other, and neither of them is exact; but they are sufficient, nevertheless, to establish the contrary of what it has been tried to prove. When it was desired to shew that I was in favor of representation based upon population, a part of the report in the *Mirror* has been cited, and when it is sought to establish that I was in favor of Confederation, the report of the *Chronicle*

is triumphantly brought forward. But the portion of the *Mirror* report, which is cited in relation to representation, is so absurd that it suffices to read it to be convinced that I could never have made use of the expressions which it contains. For instance, on the occasion of a discussion which has but an incidental relation to representation based on population, but which relates to a Confederation of the two provinces, I am made to say that I have always been opposed to representation by population, but that if Upper Canada desired to have it, that I was ready to concede it. This is nearly the contrary of what I said on that occasion, for I invariably make my speeches coincide with my votes; and as I have invariably voted against every proposition tending to the concession of representation based upon population, so I have never declared that I was in favor of that measure, but on the contrary, I have always declared that Lower Canada could never consent to such a proposition, because it offered no guarantee for her institutions. (Hear, hear.) But now that the question of Confederation is under discussion, the *Mirror* report is set aside and that of the *Chronicle* is quoted. This report made me say, in substance, that I looked upon the Federal union of Upper and Lower Canada as the nucleus of the great Confederation of the British North American Provinces, that every one foresaw must sooner or later be effected. The expression used in the report is "to which all looked forward." The hon. member for Montmorency, who has brought this report to light, although he could not be ignorant that an entirely different one was contained in the *Mirror of Parliament*, has given the text of it by substituting the word "he" for the word "all," and has translated it so as to make me say, in speaking of the Confederation of all the provinces, "*que je l'appelais de tous mes vœux*," and in translating this last expression into English, in the pamphlet written by him in 1865, he makes me say, "which (Confederation) I strongly desire to see." It is enough to read the report in the *Mirror*, imperfect though it be, to shew that I never said anything of the kind. This is what I said in speaking of Confederation:—

He urged that the principle of the double majority could only be applied by giving to each section of the province the control of its local affairs, and that when populations differed so

much as did those of Upper and Lower Canada, it was the only way to govern them in a satisfactory manner. He hoped, however, that a time might come when it would be desirable to effect a Confederation with the Lower Provinces, but the time had not yet arrived for a measure of this kind.

But those who were in favor of a Federal union of all the provinces ought to bear in mind that a Federal union between Upper and Lower Canada was the best means of establishing a nucleus around which the great Confederation might be formed when the proper time arrived.

If in this citation the word "believed" were substituted for the word "hoped," my idea would be correctly given, in very nearly the language I made use of in May, 1860. As is quite clear, there is a great difference between what I said and the report given by the *Chronicle*, which the hon. member for Montmorency has been obliged to disguise in citing it, and which he has translated in the most absurd manner, and all to make it appear that I had expressed myself in a manner favorable to Confederation, and thereby shew that I have contradicted myself. That I may have declared that at some future period, when the population of the different provinces should have so increased as to render the settlements contiguous, when the means of communication should have been improved, and when, by commercial intercourse, our interests should have become identical, and the different populations should constitute, so to speak, one united people, it might be of advantage to have a Confederation of all the provinces, this I am quite willing to admit; but there is a great difference between this anticipation and the expression of a desire for a Confederation to which I have always been opposed, because I did not consider it advisable under present circumstances. I find no change in the circumstances of the country to lead me now to desire what I expressed my disapproval of in 1860. I again assert that I no more pronounced myself in favor of Confederation then than I have since; only speaking of a proposition for establishing a Confederation of the two Canadas, and after several members had spoken in favor of a Confederation of all the provinces, I made use of the very natural argument, "That for those who desired the great Confederation, there could be no objection to the proposition then under consideration, because that Confederation would be the nucleus around which the other provinces

might gather when the proper time arrived." The hon. member for Montmorency has spoken of the contradictions which he has imagined to exist between the opinions which I expressed in 1856, 1858 and 1860, and those which I entertain at the present time on the subject of the Confederation of the provinces. But these contradictions do not really exist. I have never expressed an opinion in favor of a Confederation of all the provinces, but of the two Canadas only, and that Confederation to which I would have agreed as a remedy for the difficulties created by the question of the representation, had no resemblance whatever to that which is now proposed to us. By that plan Lower Canada would have had complete control of all her local affairs; under the present scheme her control is surrounded by so many restrictions, that in fact it is the central government which has the control, not only of what relates to all the provinces, but also of what may relate to one of the provinces only. (Hear, hear.) Before speaking of contradictions, the hon. member for Montmorency ought to bear in mind that he is more vulnerable on this head than any one else. He ought to remember his two pamphlets—one published in 1858, and the other in 1865; one going to prove the absurdity of a Confederation of all the British North American Provinces, and the other pointing out the advantages we should derive from such a Confederation. In the first of these pamphlets the hon. member, after having proposed 27 questions with a view to examine under all its different aspects the question of a Federal union of the two Canadas and that of a Federal or Legislative union of all the provinces, rejects alike both these projects, because he only saw in them the annihilation of Lower Canada. The hon. member was so thoroughly convinced of that, that of all the propositions he gave the preference to a legislative union, because it would come to an end all the sooner. He found it more logical, looking at the immediate results of the union. "In fact, if we must have a union of some kind of all the provinces, and if Lower Canada is destined to lose the little influence which she yet exercises on legislation under the existing union, it would be better to attain our object by a machinery more simple, less complicated and less costly." And a little further on he adds, "As far as we are concerned, we are opposed to it. We want no union under any form, as it is certain to attain the same

end, no matter under what form it may be imposed upon us." That is the conclusion at which the hon. member arrived in 1858, after a careful examination of the whole question. In 1865, matters are completely changed, and the hon. member has discovered that the only possible safety for Lower Canada is to be found in that very Confederation of all the provinces which he rejected with all his might in 1858. This is the conclusion at which he arrived in his latest pamphlet. "After having carefully considered the various schemes of union with their various conditions of existence we, have proved that Confederation was, in our present circumstances, the system best calculated for our protection and for securing our prosperity in the future." The hon. member for Montmorency explains this complete change in his views since 1858, as follows :—

Until lately we admit we were more in favor of a Confederation of the two Canadas than of the grander scheme, because then we had no national aspirations, and we believed that we should find in it more protection for the interests of Lower Canada. We acted as though we had to deal with present or probable enemies, and like a good tactician we desired to have as few enemies arrayed against us as possible ; but since our constant communications during the sittings of the Convention with the eminent statesmen of the Atlantic Provinces, many of these apprehensions, and indeed the motives of opposition, have been dispelled from our mind.

So that the mere contact which the hon. member enjoyed with the political men of the Maritime Provinces, during the fifteen days they were here, has been sufficient to dispel all his apprehensions for the fate of the institutions of Lower Canada in the Confederation of all the provinces. It is the confidence with which these gentlemen have inspired him, and not the guarantees offered by the plan of Confederation, which have changed his opinions of 1858. I find in the *Journal de Québec*, a newspaper edited by the honorable member for Montmorency, a few very amusing passages upon the question of the confidence which ought to be reposed in political friends. These articles also date from 1858. The honorable member was then in opposition. It is true that he did not look at the honorable member for South Oxford and myself in such an unfavorable light as he has since done. At that time he was laying the whip pretty severely upon the shoulders of his present friends. But the doctrines he then held appear to be still

applicable. On the 26th of August, 1858, the honorable member wrote an article under the heading "*Les Amis les Ennemis*," in which he said :—

The *friends*, the ministerial supporters from Upper Canada, have endeavored, during the present session, to impose upon us representation based upon population, and the abolition of separate schools. A minister, Mr. SMITH, even voted for representation based on population ! The *enemies*—the members of the Opposition—have left the initiative of these odious matters to be taken by our friends the ministerialists ; and moreover, to prove that though they were enemies, they would treat us better than our friends the ministerialists, they were willing to pay the seigniors all the casual rights due by the censitaires (£500,000). After that we do not ask too much when we ask that our enemies may have justice

And a little further on he adds :—

Mr. CARTIER galvanises a corpse, which starts up in its hideousness only to fall back never to rise again. The lamp in going out casts some few pale and feeble rays, and soon we shall have the darkness of night. The days of the very worst government which has ever weighed down the destinies of Canada are numbered. There are not many of them, and all the re-constructions that are possible will not add one to their number.

On the 28th August, in an article on representation based on population, the hon. member for Montmorency expressed himself as follows :—

• • • • •
But friends may do anything they like ; whatever they do is well done ! Mr. FERGUSON, a ministerialist, will demand the abolition of separate schools ; he is a *friend* ; one must have confidence in him and kiss the Orange hand which strikes the blow. Mr. MALCOLM CAMERON will ask for representation by population ; he is another *friend*, and Mr. BROWN is the criminal, Mr. BROWN is the *enemy*. The Administration, for the first time in our parliamentary annals, makes the question of the representation an open question. The Ministry is composed of ten of our most ardent and loyal friends ; will they deceive and betray us ? Mr. SMITH, the first among them, votes in the face of astonished Lower Canada for representation by population. He is an Orangeman, one of our kindest friends, and of course in his extreme friendship it is his duty so to vote. The members from Lower Canada ought to accept all this, and they have accepted it with gratitude ! But for a *rouge*—an enemy—to seek even the tenth part of all this, is odious, it is immoral, it is to sap the foundation of the country, it is to deserve the shame and death of Calvary. And would you believe it ?—all this indignation is expended for the benefit of a power which has soiled, blemish-

ed and corrupted everything in the order of morality and political integrity.

The hon. member for Montmorency then proceeded to speak of his present friends, and of the excuses offered by the Ministerial supporters for blindly voting for and approving whatever their friends desired them to vote for. Did an Orangeman demand anything at which their Catholic consciences might take alarm, their consciences were soon quieted by the fact that "it was a friend," and the Orangeman obtained at once what he sought; and the hon. member for Montmorency declared that all this had been done by a power which had soiled and corrupted everything in the order of morality and political integrity. Now, he heartily approves of all that he then held to be abominable and atrocious, so long as it was proposed by his friends. Then he was opposed to Confederation of any kind, because it was a certain means of obliterating the influence of Lower Canada, and he preferred a legislative union to a Confederation. But now his friends propose a Confederation of all the provinces, and he heartily approves of it. I quote again from what he said on the 28th August, 1858:—

During this session Confederation was found to be so unpopular, that Mr. GALT did not dare to ask a vote on his informal resolutions. But hardly had he obtained power and his views were triumphant, and Canada is to bow her head to a new order of things which an instant before had been considered replete with danger and ruin. The policy of the Government as regards Confederation is not more defined or tangible than that of Mr. GALT on the same subject, and yet the men who, two days before, furiously demanded that Messrs. BROWN and DORION should give explicit explanations, accept it with confidence and with closed eyes, doubtless because it came from their friends and friend GALT. Friendship has the power of transforming principles and things, good into evil and evil into good, immorality into morality, injustice into justice, and consciences into inert machines, bending to the movement given to it by the firm hand of friends.

I quote from the paper of the hon. member for Montmorency.—I do not say this myself:—

More than this, the Ministry take upon themselves to make a Constitution for the people, and to change the condition of Canada without consulting them, without taking the trouble even of telling them what they are going to do for them. Not less than four members of the Government, they say, are going to negotiate

our destinies either in Downing-street or in Lombard-street, but most probably in the latter. If Confederation suits the ideas of the Grand Trunk, depend upon it we shall have it, even though the whole of Canada should reject it. The *Journal* asks what will become of the French element in the Confederation. Eh! *grand Dieu*, you may see its fate already in the fact that out of four Ministers sent to negotiate the transformation, not a single one is French, the happy individuals being Messrs. GALT, ROSS, MACDONALD and ROSE.

At that time the enemies, that is to say the present friends of the hon. member, were desirous of changing the Constitution without consulting the people, and he considered that an atrocity; but now they propose to effect a revolution in our political institutions without giving the people an opportunity of pronouncing on their scheme, and the hon. member for Montmorency warmly approves. It seems, when the other day I asserted that this scheme of Confederation was planned by the Grand Trunk Company, that I did but express the opinion of the hon. member for Montmorency. It was he who first made this assertion, and not I. "If the Grand Trunk," said he, "wants Confederation, we are sure to have it." In those days his *friends* the *enemies* desired to sell the country; now he seeks to save it by exactly the same means that they took to ruin it. Now he no longer seeks to ascertain whether the plan of Confederation is good or bad; he only looks to see that it comes from his friends, and that is sufficient to secure for it his hearty approval. This scheme being proposed by the *friends* and supporters of good principles, it cannot contain anything that may endanger the institutions of Lower Canada. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) But formerly it was quite a different matter, when the same scheme was proposed by *enemies*, the present friends of the honorable member for Montmorency. What constitutes the excellence of this scheme in the eyes of the honorable member, is that it is not submitted by *rouges* or annexationists, but by the representatives of good principles, the guardians of the interests of Lower Canada. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) Besides, the delegates from the Lower Provinces, whom he had looked upon as enemies to Lower Canada, inspired him with such confidence during the dinners and balls of the Conference, as to have removed any apprehensions under which the honorable member might before have labored. He told us so himself. For my part I do not believe that the communication which the honorable member enjoyed with the delegates from the Lower

Provinces during their sojourn here had the effect of changing his opinion on this question. He looked to see from what side the proposition came, and seeing that it came from the side on which his friends sat, he was at once convinced that it contained nothing that could endanger the institutions of Lower Canada. It is evident that he votes for it with certainty. In 1858 he reproached those members who, like the honorable member for Montcalm (Mr. Jos. DUFRESNE), look quietly to see from which side measures come before pronouncing upon them, with only thinking and acting according to word of command given by the present Ministers. Has not he also been obliged to write a pamphlet of 150 pages in 1865 to refute the one of forty pages which he then wrote? Then he held to be absurd all that was connected, either nearly or remotely, with Confederation; now he holds everything to be right and perfect; he is quite satisfied, and gets the promise of all his members to vote for the scheme before us without amendment. He throws his hat in the air and exclaims—"Let us vote for Confederation and for our friends." (Hear, hear, and laughter.) That honorable member may be able to discover contradictions in my conduct. He sees a mote in his neighbor's eyes and seeth not the beam in his own. But let us continue our examination of that pamphlet of 1858. It contains most precious information. At page 15 I find the following passage:—

The best possible condition under which Confederation could exist, would be that in which the two chambers would be elected and would both have population as the basis of their number, for no other system excepting that of having but one chamber only with the number of its members based on population, would give us absolutely one vote in three in the Federal Legislature.

So in 1858 he found that the best we could hope for, under Confederation, was that we might have two elective chambers, with a number of members proportioned to the population in each province, which would have given us one vote in three. It was the elective system, with representation based on population in each chamber. In view of the Confederation of all the provinces, that plan was decidedly better than the one now proposed to us, in which Lower Canada is only to have 65 out of 194 in the Lower House, and 24 out of 76 in the Legislative Council, less than the proportion which we should have had under the elective system, without taking

into account, that as the legislative councillors are to be appointed by the General Government, Lower Canada will exercise but little influence as regards the appointment of her councillors. But let us see what the honorable member for Montmorency now thinks of the elective system. After having, in 1856, himself brought in the bill to render the Legislative Council elective, and having thus done more than anyone else to effect the change which then took place in the constitution of that body, and after having, in 1858, declared in writing that "the best possible terms that could be obtained in Confederation would be the making of the two chambers elective," in 1865 he says, at page 65 of his second pamphlet:—

It was in obedience to the general sentiment, and not by conviction, that he who now writes gave up, in 1856, an opinion which he had always held, and himself drafted the present constitution of the Legislative Council, and it is with genuine satisfaction, and a conviction strengthened by experience, that we greet the revival of the principle of Crown nomination to the Legislative Council under conditions superior to those of former times.

It would seem, then, that in 1856 the honorable member altered the Constitution, not as the result of conviction, and because he considered it was defective, but in obedience to the general sentiment; that is to say, that being a Minister, he did not wish to displease his friends, who demanded that this change should be made, and that, rather than sacrifice his portfolio as a Minister, he preferred to sacrifice his principles and convictions. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) Now, the honorable member has no other sacrifice to make than that of his personal dignity; this is but a trifling one; and he returns to his old opinions, so as not to displease his present friends. He clung to power in 1856; to-day he pays homage to it; that is the whole difference. When the wind blew in the direction of reform, the honorable member was a Reformer, not from conviction but from interest; and when it blows in the direction of absolutism, the honorable member becomes by instinct a Conservative and a Tory. So he who, in 1856, obtained the passing of an act to render the Council elective; who, in 1858, again pronounced himself in favor of the elective principle as applied to the Council, tells us in 1865 that he greets with genuine satisfaction the revival of the principle of Crown nomination of the Legislative Councillors. (Hear, hear.) Ministers went on their knees to the Lower

Provinces beseeching them to come to an understanding as regarded a change of the Constitution, and with respect to a scheme of Confederation. Explanations were the result, which have only been given on a few important points; the delegates of the Lower Provinces, after having obtained the most favorable financial stipulations for those whom they represented, have still further imposed their views and have modified the scheme of Confederation in a manner at variance with the views of our Ministers; and yet, after the Maritime Provinces have repudiated the action of their delegates, the Government still obstinately persists in obtaining the adoption of the scheme without any amendment whatsoever. If that resolution passes, we shall ask England to change our Constitution, and to give us one which will not be in accordance with the views of our ministers, and still less with those of the people of this province. But let us see what the honorable member for Montmorency said in 1858 on this subject. I cite from page 12:—

To ask England to change the Constitution is to give her an opportunity of changing it to suit her own views or those of our enemies. Nay, more, to ask that we should take the first step is to claim it for all the provinces, it is to call upon them too to say upon what conditions they will accept the Federal union.

But in the conflict of all these voices one only will never be heard from the Imperial Throne, because it would be in the French language. It is no prejudice, it is but the history of our fifty years of trial and sorrow.

Have circumstances so greatly changed since 1858? What has occurred since that period to give the honorable member for Montmorency more confidence now in the justice of England, or in the efficacy of our petitions than he then had? Is not the history of our fifty years of sufferings vivid in the memories of all? When we asked the Imperial Government to change the constitution of the Legislative Council, did they not unnecessarily, and without our having sought it, repeal the clause which rendered necessary a two-thirds vote to change the basis of the representation? That safeguard of the interests of Lower Canada was taken away from us without our knowing, and at the present moment we do not know at whose instance that clause of the Union Act was expunged. Have we not similar reason to fear that they may impose on Lower Canada a new Constitution, with conditions which will encroach upon the rights solemnly guaranteed to us by treaty? And this is the more

probable from the fact that, this scheme having been rejected by the Lower Provinces, England will not be desirous of enforcing it upon them, and that if it is adopted by the Imperial Parliament, it can only be so adopted with such modifications as will make it applicable to Canada alone, leaving to the Lower Provinces the right of accepting it hereafter; and Heaven alone knows what these modifications will be, and how they may affect our institutions. (Hear. hear.) If the Imperial Parliament thinks proper to take up this Constitution without the acceptance of it by the Maritime Provinces, it will come back to us, as did the answer to the Address in relation to the Legislative Council, entirely different from the Address we are about to vote.

HON. MR. EVANTUREL—I thought I understood, when explanations were given to-day by the Hon. Atty. Gen. West, that the Government intended to lay before Her Majesty the Address to be passed by this House, then to ask the advice of the Imperial Government as to what they had better do under the circumstances, and then return and report to the House.

HON. MR. DORION—I enquired, in language as explicit as it was possible to use, of the Hon. Atty. Gen. West, whether the Government would submit a new Constitution for ratification by the Legislature, and he only replied that the Government would submit the whole matter to the Imperial Government, that is to say, the Address to be passed by this House, and an explanation of the present state of matters in view of the defeat of the scheme of Confederation in the Lower Provinces. He refused to say that the Government would come back to the House with the measure.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—The honorable member for Hochelaga would like to make the House believe that it is the intention of the Government to cause a measure to be passed by the Imperial Government against the wishes of this House; but no such conclusion can be drawn from the explanations given by my honorable friend the Hon. Atty. Gen. West. He stated that a deputation would go to England, and that they would submit to the Imperial Government the addresses of the two Houses, containing the plan of Confederation adopted by the delegates of all the provinces, and that they would urge upon the Imperial Government to bring down a measure that should apply to all the provinces.

HON. MR. LAFRAMBOISE—That is

not saying, however, that the new Constitution will be submitted to the House on the return of the deputation. (Hear, hear.)

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—Nor is it saying, either, that it is without the consent of the House.

HON. MR. DORION—What I wish to say is, that it is perfectly clear that the House will not be called upon to pronounce upon the new Constitution which is to be given to us, no matter what changes may be introduced into the resolutions on which we are now called upon to vote. (Hear, hear.) The Hon. Atty. Gen. East cannot say that the Government will submit to the House the result of the advice which they may receive from the Imperial Government. (Hear, hear.) All that we can understand from the Government is, that they will press the adoption of the measure by this House, and that, if they can pass it, they will ask the Imperial Government to give us a Constitution based on these resolutions, and that this Constitution will be imposed on the country without either the House or the people being called upon to ratify it, even although it be altogether different from the resolutions now submitted to us. (Hear, hear.) As in 1856 we saw the clause of the Union Act, which required the concurrence of two-thirds of the members of the House to authorize a change in the basis of the representation, repealed without any application on our part for its repeal, so we shall perhaps see in this new Constitution which is to be given to us, that the principle of Confederation will have been sacrificed in order that a legislative union, pure and simple, may be imposed upon us. (Hear, hear.) And this is the more probable now, that it is well known that the Maritime Provinces have repudiated the plan of Confederation in its present shape.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—We shall make a small Confederation by dividing Canada into four parts. (Laughter.) That is what the honorable member for Hochelaga promised the honorable member for South Oxford when he formed his Government. There should be little men, little provinces, and a little Confederation. (Laughter.)

A VOICE—Now-a-days the Government has only great projects.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—Yes; we propose great measures, and what is more, we carry them.

HON. MR. DORION—Yet the Honorable Attorney General has undertaken to grant a little Confederation, and to divide us into

little provinces if the grander scheme does not pass, and he has a very fair chance to come back to little matters. (Hear, hear.) The honorable member for Montmorency, after having expressed his opinion with respect to the constitution which ought to be provided for the Legislative Council, in order to the protection of our interests, said in that pamphlet of 1858, on the subject of Confederation:—

The object of Confederation is external protection; it can defend itself from enemies from without, but it could not defend itself against itself. It was not with a view to social improvement, not to attain a more perfect and complete internal political organization, that the American colonies and the small states of Germany, who wished to remain independent, had recourse to Confederation; it was for mutual protection against enemies from without, and for that only. Now we have England to protect us, the political Confederation of the provinces is therefore absurd. But if it be at once absurd and fatal, why should we persist in demanding it?

These are the opinions of the honorable member for Montmorency:—

Were we to have a Confederation of the provinces, they would soon range themselves into two distinct camps; and if we are to judge of the past by the present, it is needless to say to what dangers Lower Canada would be exposed. [And a little further on, he adds]: When once we have admitted a principle, not only we have to admit the consequences, but even to suffer them to our ruin. The consequences of Confederation would be the ruin of Lower Canada.

The honorable member for Montmorency was convinced that the Confederation of the provinces could not be effected without having recourse to direct taxation, which loomed up constantly before his eyes—(hear, hear):—

Direct taxation for the maintenance and to carry out the objects of the local legislatures, are a necessity of the Federal system; and if Lower Canada was to refuse to tax herself to pay the expenses of its Government and Legislature, it would be forced into doing it; bearing in mind the refusal in days past of its House of Assembly to vote the supplies, they would treat her as they did in 1840.

Thus the great Confederation, so fatal and absurd, would be the ruin of Lower Canada. Now for a little description of our new friends in the Maritime Provinces:—

What advantage can Canada hope to obtain in the consolidation of the revenues of all the provinces?

Whilst the united revenues of the four Atlantic provinces hardly reach the sum of four hundred

thousand pounds, and whilst not one of these provinces has much in the future with the exception of New Brunswick, Newfoundland with its cold climate, its barren soil, like that of the north shore of our Lower St. Lawrence, will never be more than a fishing station, to which, besides, we have access in common with all the other nations of the world. Nova Scotia is another fishing station, to which also we have access in common with everyone else. It has no soil fit for cultivation. Its revenue remains stationary, or diminishes like the population of its capital, Halifax (although situated at the extremity of one of the most magnificent harbors in the world), which, in 1840, had 25,000 inhabitants in its wooten houses, and which now affords shelter to fifteen thousand human beings only.

They are poor, and seek an alliance with the rich. They have good reason; were we in their place, we would do the same.

That is his account of the new allies he now proposes to give us. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) And now passing to the question of religion, this is what we find:—

In the existing union the Protestants are slightly the most numerous, at least according to the census of 1850. The proposed union would increase the Protestant strength, for the very great majority of the populations of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick is Protestant, and Newfoundland, in which Catholicism prevails, is too poor, both at present and in prospective, with its barren soil, to give any strength, or even hope, to Catholicism. Protestantism would thus be more powerful in a union of all the provinces than it is now in the existing union of the Canadas.

I think I need say no more. I think that the reasons adduced by the honorable member for Montmorency from the French-Canadian point of view, against the union of the provinces in 1858, exist at the present day, and that they have greater force now than they had then; and this is the more evident when we see all the members from Upper Canada declare that Confederation is not what they want, but that they would prefer a legislative union. This fact ought to add to our alarm, and convince us of the danger to which we should be exposed by this union. The honorable member for Montmorency now encourages his friends to proceed to England and obtain its adoption by the Imperial Government, and its imposition on the Maritime Provinces as well as upon Canada. It is an appeal to Great Britain to pass a measure upon the application of the Canadian Government, and to impose it upon the Lower Provinces, after making such modifications to it as would satisfy them. The honorable member for Montmorency, animadverting upon a

88

letter which I wrote last autumn to my constituents, in which I asserted that no precedent existed for a Federal union between mere colonies, has cited, in refutation of my statement, the case of New Zealand. New Zealand is composed of three islands, divided into eleven provinces, each of which possesses a sort of municipal council which is called a government, just as the municipalities are called provinces. Each province has a head or executive officer, elected by the people, and charged with the carrying out of the laws. The municipal councils have the power of legislating, but their powers are restricted within very narrow limits. They cannot interfere even with the laws relating to wills and successions, whilst, on the other hand, the Central Government has the right to legislate on all matters affecting the colony. The political system of New Zealand is exactly like our county and parish municipal system. Our county municipalities represent the central power, and our parish municipalities represent the local governments. Had the hon. member for Montmorency examined the Constitution of Belgium, he would have seen that there, there are provinces which each have a Governor and a Local Parliament, and these parliaments have much greater powers than the local councils in New Zealand, and are much more important; yet no one has ever ventured to assert that Belgium was a Confederation, although it was divided into provinces. Neither is the French Empire a Confederation, although its departments are governed by *Préfets*. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member for Montmorency has told us that our interests would be perfectly protected by the proposed Constitution. I find that the powers assigned to the General Parliament enable it to legislate on all subjects whatsoever. It is an error to imagine that these powers are defined and limited by the 29th clause of the resolutions. Were it desirous of legislating on subjects placed under the jurisdiction of the local legislatures, there is not a word in these resolutions which can be construed to prevent it, and if the local legislatures complain, Parliament may turn away and refuse to hear their complaints, because all the sovereignty is vested in the General Government, and there is no authority to define its functions and attributes and those of the local governments.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—What do you understand by sovereign power—please explain?

HON. MR. DORION—I will tell you in a

moment. I say that the Federal Parliament will exercise sovereign power, inasmuch as it can always trespass upon the rights of the local governments without there being any authority to prevent it. What authority have you constituted which can come forward and say to the Federal Parliament—"You shall not do such and such a thing, you shall not legislate upon such and such a subject, because these matters are reserved to the local governments." There will be no such authority, and consequently it will have sovereign power, and can do all that it pleases, and may encroach upon all the rights and attributes of the local governments whenever it may think proper. We shall be—I speak as a Lower Canadian—we shall be at its mercy, because it may exercise its right of veto on all the legislation of the local parliaments, and there again we shall have no remedy. In case of difference between the Federal power and the local governments, what authority will intervene for its settlement?

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—It will be the Imperial Government.

HON. MR. DORION—In effect there will be no other authority than that of the Imperial Government, and we know too well the value assigned to the complaints of Lower Canadians by the Imperial Government.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—The delegates understood the matter better than that. Neither the Imperial Government nor the General Government will interfere, but the courts of justice will decide all questions in relation to which there may be differences between the two powers.

A VOICE—The Commissioners' courts. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. DORION—Undoubtedly. One magistrate will decide that a law passed by the Federal Legislature is not law, whilst another will decide that it is law, and thus the difference, instead of being between the legislatures, will be between the several courts of justice.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—Should the General Legislature pass a law beyond the limits of its functions, it will be null and void *pleno jure*.

HON. MR. DORION—Yes, I understand that, and it is doubtless to decide questions of this kind that it is proposed to establish Federal courts.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—No, no! They will be established solely to apply and adjudicate upon the Federal laws.

HON. MR. DORION—In Great Britain,

Parliament is all-powerful, every one admits it—and I would like to know whether it is proposed to give to the Federal Parliament the omnipotence enjoyed by the Imperial Parliament. Without that, the system proposed to be established is no longer a political monarchical system, but rather a vast municipality. If all the courts of justice are to have the right of deciding as to the legality of the laws, the Federal Parliament will not be able to make them without a justice of the peace or commissioner of small causes setting them aside, under the pretext that they are not within the jurisdiction of the central power, as is now done in the case of a *procès-verbal* of road work. That is not the monarchical system; it is the republican system. In England, as it is here at the present moment, the Legislature is all-powerful, and I believe that that was the principle which it was sought to adopt. If the differences between the Federal and the Local Parliaments are not to be submitted to the decision of a Supreme Federal Court, I do not see who can possibly decide them. (Hear, hear.) We are told that the Federal Court of Appeals will not be charged with the decision of matters in dispute between the legislatures, but they will only have to give final judgments in cases decided by the local inferior courts. Well, for my part I cannot approve of the creation of this court. The great inconveniences of it to us Lower Canadians may easily be seen. Thus, when a cause shall have been argued and decided in all our courts, we shall still have to go before a Federal Court of Appeal composed of judges of all the provinces, and in which we shall probably have only one judge, who may be selected out of the English population. And this is the protection afforded to us. I repeat that I see no protection whatever for our interests, as Lower Canadians, in the constitution of the political and judicial powers, for the Federal Parliament can encroach upon our rights without any authority having the power to interfere, and then we shall have a Federal Court of Appeal in which we shall only be represented by one judge against six or seven of other origins. (Hear, hear.) There is another and very important question to be considered, and that is as to what is meant by paragraph 30 of the 29th resolution, in relation to marriage and divorce. I see, not without apprehension, that it is left to the General Parliament to legislate on all matters relating to marriage and divorce. The question of marriage is intimately connected with a large portion of our

code and civil rights, for upon marriage depends the settlement of family interests and successions, and the civil condition of the population. If the right of legislating on all matters connected with marriage is left to the Federal Parliament, it will have the right to declare that a marriage contracted elsewhere will be valid in the Confederacy, provided it has been contracted in accordance with the laws of the country in which it took place, as stated by the Honorable Solicitor General East, for it is a principle of international law perfectly understood in every country of the civilized world, and which it would be impossible to alter, and it was of no use whatever to insert it in the Constitution. I say, then, that not only will the Federal Government have this power, but they will also be able to change the civil conditions of marriage which now constitute a part of our code. But if it is sought to remove from the local legislatures the right of legislating respecting the conditions under which a marriage may be contracted, the age at which marriage is to be allowed, the degree of relationship which shall be an impediment to marriage, the consent of the relations, and the requisite dispensations which are now required to be obtained from the ecclesiastical authorities, then I can understand why this article has been inserted in the resolutions, and that the right to do all this is to be vested in the Federal Parliament. If it is desired that a minor should be allowed to marry, as he can in countries in which the laws of England prevail, without the consent of his relations, I can conceive the reason for placing the right to legislate respecting marriage in the hands of the Federal power; but if that was not the object in view, I see no reason why the right to legislate on this subject has not been left to the local governments. (Hear, hear.) I should see with considerable apprehension and alarm this power given to the General Parliament, because it will be composed of men who have ideas entirely at variance with ours in relation to marriage. As regards the question of divorce, we have had every kind of explanation as to the meaning of the resolution of the Conference. The Honorable Solicitor General of Lower Canada (Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN), who last year made so great a fuss because a divorce suit came before the House, and who even moved the rejection of the bill at its first reading, has been brought to terms on the subject, and has discovered that it would be a good thing to have an authority for the settlement of this matter. Last year

he said that it was impossible for a Catholic to sanction even the first reading of a divorce bill, and he made us a long speech on the subject, but he has found out his mistake, and he is unwilling that the local legislature should legislate on divorce, but he vests this right in the Federal Parliament, and authorizes it to do so. He cannot himself legislate, but he allows another to do so for him. Well, I do not think that this is any improvement on the existing state of things, and I think that divorce is more likely to be prevented by leaving the subject among the functions of the local legislatures, at all events as far as Lower Canada is concerned, than by leaving it to the Federal Parliament. But I go further, and I say that the leaving of this question to the Federal Legislature is to introduce divorce among the Catholics. It is certain that at present no Catholic could obtain a divorce either in the present House or from the Local Legislature of Lower Canada under Confederation. But suppose that the Federal Parliament were to enact that there shall be divorce courts in each section of the province, the Catholics will have the same access to them as the Protestants. And who is to prevent the Federal Legislature from establishing a tribunal of this kind in Lower Canada, if they are established elsewhere? In that case—if tribunals of this kind are established—will not the Honorable Solicitor General, if he votes for this resolution, have voted for the establishment of divorce courts over the whole country, to which Catholics and Protestants can have recourse for obtaining a divorce? That is the only conclusion it is possible to arrive at, and the legitimate consequence of the votes of those Catholics who will vote to vest this power in the Federal Parliament. (Hear, hear.) It is evident that a Catholic who thinks that he cannot vote for a Divorce bill ought not to vote indirectly for the establishment of Divorce courts, any more than to vote directly for it. The Honorable Solicitor General East told us the other day that he had recently obtained the annulment of a marriage, because the parties, being relations, had married without dispensation.

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—I never pretended that that was a divorce. I said that if the case of annulment of marriage to which I referred had arisen in Upper Canada, the Ecclesiastical courts might have declared the marriage null as far as the canon law was concerned, but not as regarded the civil laws, for the law of Upper Canada does not recog-

nize the impediments to marriage provided by the Canon law, and that the husband and wife would have been obliged to apply to Parliament to obtain their separation. And I stated that this separation could not be looked upon as a divorce from a Catholic point of view, although the Act of Parliament might be called a Divorce bill.

MR. GEOFFRION—Would Parliament grant a divorce on the ground of relationship?

HON. SOL GEN. LANGEVIN—I can cite other cases, as, for instance, that of a Catholic married to an infidel who had not been baptized, without being aware at the time of the marriage that this impediment existed. If he discovers the fact afterwards, he is not married as far as the Canon law is concerned. If the wife is not willing to consent to the obtaining of the necessary dispensations to render her marriage valid, she may, in Lower Canada, apply to the Ecclesiastical court to have it annulled, but in Upper Canada she would also have to apply to Parliament.

MR. GEOFFRION—Could a divorce be obtained from Parliament on the ground of relationship?

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—It would be proved before Parliament that the marriage contracted under these circumstances is null as regards the Canon law and the law of Lower Canada. There are ecclesiastical authorities in Upper Canada just as there are in Lower Canada, but as the Civil law there is not the same as it is here, the couple whose marriage would be void under the Canon law but not under the Civil law—for in the eyes of the law the marriage would be valid and binding, and neither husband nor wife could remarry without having obtained a divorce—the couple, I say, would have the right of applying to Parliament, who might legally declare that marriage null which had been so declared by the ecclesiastical authorities. But the nullity of the marriage must first be proved to the satisfaction of the ecclesiastical authorities and under the Canon law, and then Parliament might annul it on that evidence, for it would be omnipotent.

HON. MR. DORION—Then the Federal Parliament will be omnipotent?

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—Yes, in that respect.

HON. MR. DORION—But even supposing that the Federal Parliament would interfere in such a case, which is a matter of doubt, the Local Government would also have had the right to interfere if the power so to do had been given to it. Moreover, this would

not be a case of divorce; it would simply be the declaration that no marriage had ever taken place, which is quite a different matter. In Lower Canada the Canon law forms part of our Civil law, but in Upper Canada it is not so, and the law there does not recognize the right of the ecclesiastical authorities to declare a marriage null. (Hear, hear.) I think, then, that the explanation of the Hon. Solicitor General is not of more value than that which he gave us on the subject of marriage, for it does not in the least prove that the Federal Parliament have not the power to establish Divorce courts in all the provinces, and the resolution does not admit of the construction that the Federal Parliament will only have the right of declaring void marriages declared to be so by the Catholic ecclesiastical authorities. (Hear, hear.) I perceive that the subject of immigration is left to the General Government, concurrently with the local governments. I think that danger lies in the provision that the General Government is to appoint all our judges. It is said, as the Honorable Attorney General East stated the other day, that there will be French-Canadians in the Executive of the Federal Government, but their number will be limited, and if the Executive is composed of fifteen members for instance, there will only be one or two French-Canadians at the most. Well, suppose the French-Canadian Ministers recommend the appointment of a person as judge, and that all their colleagues oppose it, the former will have the right to protest, but the majority will carry the day, and all that the minority can do will be to retire from the Government. But in that case they will be replaced, and things will go on as before. That is all. The same argument applies to the appointment of legislative councillors; and when I call to mind all the injustices committed by the Legislative Council of Lower Canada, which was nominated by the Crown, and in a spirit hostile to the great mass of the population, I cannot conceive that French-Canadians can be found who are willing to return to that system. Will they not remember that it was that system which closed our common schools, by refusing to vote the supplies granted by the Legislative Assembly, and thereby delayed, for years and years, the progress of education in Lower Canada. The honorable member for Montmorency says that we must have a conservative chamber, and that our Legislative Council, under Confederation, will be less conservative than the Belgian Senate, be-

cause the elective qualification of the Belgian senators is higher than that of our legislative councillors. The Belgian Senate is elected for eight years, and is renewed by one-fourth at a time.

HON. MR. CAUCHON—Every four years, by one-half.

HON. MR. DORION—Yes; the honorable member is right. The term for which each senator is elected is eight years, and the elections take place for one-half of them every four years, and another change in the composition of the Senate can also take place, because it may be dissolved like the Lower House. Now, under these circumstances, there can be no clashing of any duration between the two Belgian Chambers, and the Senate cannot obstruct, for an indefinite period, the action of the Lower House. If a difference should arise between the two bodies, the Government can remedy it by new elections, by which senators would be returned favorable to the views of the people. Thus the Senate is not conservative, from the sole fact of the electoral qualification of the senators being very high. What I consider excessive and of a too conservative character in the constitution of the Legislative Council of the Confederation, is that no power exists which can change its composition in the case of a collision between it and the House of Commons. The councillors will be appointed for life, and their number is fixed. By what means shall we be able to prevent the Legislative Council from stopping the progress of business if a difference should arise with the Lower House? The honorable member for Montmorency says that the obstacle will be broken down; but if no other remedy than that is provided, I say that the principle is faulty. It does not do, when we frame a Constitution, to open the door to obstacles which can only be surmounted by breaking them down. (Hear, hear.) In England, where the House of Lords is very conservative, the Crown has power to name new peers, and it is precisely the possession of that power of creating new peers which has prevented the breaking down of the obstacle—which prevented a revolution in 1832. The honorable member for Montmorency himself admits that at that period England was on the eve of a revolution, and that it would have happened if the House had any longer refused to sanction the measures of reform passed by the House of Commons and demanded by the people; and that revolution was only avoided because the King, having

declared that he would create new peers, a certain number of the lords, to escape this danger, absented themselves and permitted the passing of the Parliamentary Reform Bill. (Hear, hear.) There are two or three other matters which are left to the joint jurisdiction of the Federal and Local Legislatures, such as agriculture, emigration, and the fisheries; but the laws of the Federal Parliament will always prevail in these matters over those of the local parliaments; thus, for instance, a Local Legislature may pass a law in relation to agriculture, but it may be overridden the next day by a law of the Federal Legislature. (Hear, hear.) I shall not touch upon the question of the finances, but I must say that the figures given by the Hon. Solicitor General East do not agree with those in the Public Accounts. I do not know where he obtained them, but for my part I have been unable to find them. When I enquired whether Lower Canada was to pay the Municipal Loan Fund debt, he did not think proper to answer. When I asked the Hon. Minister of Finance whether Lower Canada would be charged with the debt contracted for the redemption of the Seigniorial dues, with the Common School Fund, the Municipal Loan Fund, and the indemnity payable to the townships, amounting in the whole to \$4,500,000, he replied that he would bring down a proposition at some future period for the settlement of these questions, but he has not thought proper to give any explanations. Well, I have stated that besides the debt of \$67,000,000 due by the province, there are more than \$3,000,000 due to Upper Canada as compensation for the Seigniorial indemnity, and that in fixing at \$62,500,000 the debt to be assumed by the Federal Government, there will remain about \$9,000,000 to divide between Upper and Lower Canada. With the amount of the Municipal Loan Fund debt and of the other items which I have mentioned, Lower Canada will find herself charged with a local debt of \$4,500,000. (Hear, hear.) When we entered the union we had a debt of \$500,000; we have expended since the union, on public works in Lower Canada, about \$13,000,000, and we go out of the union with a debt of \$27,500,000 as our proportion of the Federal debt, besides our own special debt of \$4,500,000, whilst Upper Canada will go out of it without any local debt on giving up the indemnity to which she is entitled under the Seigniorial Act of 1859. Well, I assert that it is an unjust

treaty, and that it is also unfair that the Ministry should refuse us all explanations on this point, before we are called upon to give our votes on the resolutions. (Hear.) The Hon. Solicitor General East told us the other day that in the plan of Confederation which I had proposed for the two Canadas, I intended to leave the administration and ownership of the Crown lands to the General Government, and he said that under Confederation the Crown lands would belong to the local governments, and this, in his opinion, was a great improvement on the plan which I proposed. Well, it must be observed that a very large amount is due on sales of Crown lands; there is about \$1,000,000 due in Lower Canada, and \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000 in Upper Canada. If these lands had remained in the union there would have been about one million from Lower Canada, and five or six millions from Upper Canada towards the payment of the general debt. We should have benefited to that amount by the extinction of so much of the public debt; instead of that, under the plan of the Government, Upper Canada is to have the benefit of the five or six millions due on the lands sold in Upper Canada, whilst Lower Canada will only have one million of dollars at the outside. If it were only the public lands, there would be no injustice in leaving them to the local governments, but the difference in the amounts due on the lands sold gives a considerable advantage to Upper Canada. There is another very serious objection to the Constitution of the Legislative Council. The honorable member for Montmorency said that the Legislative Council would serve as a protection and safeguard to the interests of the French-Canadians, because in it we would have an equality of members with the other provinces. A curious equality that will be! That of which the honorable member for Montmorency spoke when he pronounced himself in favor of two elective chambers, because in that case we should have one member in three, was infinitely preferable. In the Lower House we shall not have one member in three, nor shall we in the Upper House either, for we shall only have twenty-four councillors out of seventy-six. Thus we shall have equality neither in the Lower House nor in the Council. (Hear, hear.) But then the General Government will nominate the councillors, and we shall be in a great minority in the Executive Council. Another objection is that the nomination of the legislative councillors on the recommendation of the Executive Coun-

oil of the General Government, and this offers no guarantee for the institutions of Lower Canada, because the predominating influence in that Council will not be that of the majority of Lower Canada. To offer an effectual guarantee, it would be necessary that they should be elected by the people, or, at all events, only appointed on the recommendation of the local governments. These resolutions, we are told, are only as it were the headings to the chapters of the new Constitution, and the new Constitution may be anything else than what is now under consideration. It will come back to us in the form of an Imperial Act, to which we shall have *volentes volentes* to submit. (Hear, hear.) Supposing even that the scheme should not be modified, I could not approve it. I cannot with a joyful heart give up the imprescriptible rights of the people who have sent me here to represent them. I cannot consent to a change which is neither more nor less than a revolution, a political revolution it is true, but which does not the less, on that account, affect the rights and interests of a million of inhabitants, the descendants of the first settlers in America, of those who have given their names to the vast regions which they discovered, and whose careers have been rendered famous by so many heroic traits. (Hear, hear.) I am opposed to this Confederation in which the militia, the appointment of the judges, the administration of justice and our most important civil rights, will be under the control of a General Government the majority of which will be hostile to Lower Canada, of a General Government invested with the most ample powers, whilst the powers of the local governments will be restricted, first, by the limitation of the powers delegated to it, by the *veto* reserved to the central authority, and further, by the concurrent jurisdiction of the general authority or government. Petitions, with more than 20,000 signatures attached to them, have already been presented to this House against the scheme of Confederation. Numerous public meetings have been held in nineteen counties in Lower Canada, and one in the city of Montreal. Everywhere this scheme has been protested against, and an appeal to the people demanded; and yet, in defiance of the expressed opinions of our constituents, we are about to give them a Constitution, the effect of which will be to snatch from them the little influence which they still enjoy under the existing union. We are about, on their behalf, to surrender all the rights and

privileges which are dearest to them, and that without consulting them. It would be madness—it would be more, it would be a crime. On these grounds I shall oppose this scheme with all the power at my command, and insist that under any circumstances it shall be submitted to the people before its final adoption. (Cheers.)

HON. MR. CAUCHON—MR. SPEAKER, I received intelligence this evening that the Hon. member for Hochelaga was about to reply to my speech of the 2nd of March, and that is why I came here. Otherwise, as I have not yet quite recovered, I should have remained at home; but I frankly acknowledge that if I had foreseen that I should have had to listen to such a speech as that which we have just heard, I should not have put myself out of the way for so little. Any one hearing him speak must have said: "Either he is not a very powerful reasoner, or this hon. member has but a poor idea of the intelligence of this House and but little respect for his colleagues." But for my two pamphlets and for the speech of the Hon. Solicitor General, which he read and commented upon as he knows how to do, he would very speedily have found himself aground; but by deriving assistance in the way I have mentioned, he contrived to find the means of speaking for three hours. (Hear, hear.) Is it necessary for me to repeat that I have never denied the opinions which I held in former days? Nor will I deny them to-night. I acknowledge freely that my opinions on certain matters have changed. Of what advantage, then, can it be to him to spend his time in repeating what I admit myself? If I proved to him that he had changed several times himself, I did not do so to lay blame upon him, but to reproach him with denying his past career, in order that he might be more at his ease in that which he is at present following. (Hear, hear.) But, for that matter, what does it signify to the country that he or I held one opinion yesterday and that we hold another to-day? What the country requires to know is whether the scheme of Confederation which is submitted to us by the Government is good or bad. (Hear, hear.) The man who declares that he has never changed his opinion on any subject whatever is, to my thinking, a simpleton. The public requirements change with circumstances, and necessarily bring with them other ideas. (Hear, hear.) We do not eat when we are

no longer hungry, nor drink when our thirst is satisfied. Did the hon. member, for instance, put in practice, when in power, the doctrine which he enunciated respecting the double majority, when he was seated on the Opposition benches? When the House was engaged in debating a resolution, the object of which was to affirm the principle of the double majority, the present Hon. President of the Council having got up to say that he would never have governed Upper Canada by means of a Lower Canada majority, the hon. member for Hochelaga rose in his turn to declare that he also would never consent to govern in opposition to the will of Lower Canada. And yet, in 1858, did he not enter a Cabinet which was refused by nearly all the members from Lower Canada?

HON. MR. DORION—I said that at the time of the formation of the BROWN-DORION Ministry. I told the Hon. President of the Council (Hon. Mr. BROWN) that I would not undertake to carry through the Legislature the four great measures which were then in question, without the consent of the majority of the representatives from Lower Canada.

HON. MR. CAUCHON—Ah, yes! An excellent reason can always be found for retaining power when we have it, in spite of our own declarations. In 1862, did he not form part of a Government situated in the same position? And from 1863 to 1864 did he not govern Lower Canada with a rod of iron, supported only by a weak Lower Canadian minority?

HON. MR. DORION—The only measure passed in 1863, that relating to Separate Schools in Upper Canada, was carried by a majority in both provinces.

HON. MR. CAUCHON—That is not so, as the Upper Canadian majority voted against that bill, which owed its safety to Lower Canadians only. But it is the principle which is in question here, and the hon. member cannot divert the attention of the House from that fact. If the double majority was good in one case, it must be so in all cases, in legislation as in administration, but more especially in administration, which cannot and ought not to be based on anything except public opinion. Now, the hon. member for Hochelaga certainly governed his country despite the majority of its representatives. (Hear, hear.) He has spoken to us of the petitions presented to this House against the scheme of Confeder-

ation, but what do those petitions amount to? The way in which they were covered with signatures is well known. (Hear, hear.) I shall here cite an anecdote relating to the parliamentary history of Upper Canada, at a period shortly before the Union. A member was talking a great deal about petitions in a debate upon a bill. "Petitions!" said his opponent, "I will undertake within a fortnight to present a petition to this House praying that you may be hanged, and which shall be covered with good and valid signatures!" The challenge was accepted, and at the end of three weeks the petition arrived, praying for the hanging of the man who had so much faith in the virtue of petitions! How had it been obtained? By posting at a tavern situated at four cross-roads a skilful and knowing agent, who incessantly said to the frequenters of the tavern—"Do you like good roads?" "Yes." "Well, then, sign this petition." All signed, without reading it. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) Exactly in this manner were obtained most of the signatures against Confederation. At Montreal, agents went from tavern to tavern and induced all who were there to sign, or signed for those who resided in the vicinity without even consulting them. (Hear, hear.) Have we not also seen petitions coming from counties in which the Opposition were not even able to find candidates? They may easily obtain signatures of this description, and by this means; but that does not constitute an expression of the opinion of Lower Canada, and those petitions will not carry elections. The hon. member ought to know something about it, he who was in power at the time of the last general election. (Hear, hear.) He endeavored to explain away his contradictions by saying that he had never been in favor of the Confederation of all the provinces. I did not state that he was in favor of this Confederation of all the provinces; I only said that he was willing, as a member of the BROWN-DORION Government, in 1858, to have representation based on population, with checks, guarantees and assurances; that then, in 1859, he proposed as an alternative to that measure, in his Montreal manifesto, Confederation of the two Canadas; and then, in 1860-'61 he was ready to accept any possible change, even Confederation of all British North America. (Hear, hear.) To prove that he was in favor of Confederation of all the provinces, I quoted one of his speeches, in which he said, on the 6th July, 1858:—

"The repeal of the union, a Federal union, representation based on population, or some other great change, must of necessity take place, and for my part I am disposed to examine the question of representation based on population, with the view of ascertaining whether it might not be conceded with guarantees for the protection of the religion, the language and the laws of the Lower Canadians. I am likewise prepared to take into consideration the scheme for a Confederation of the provinces, &c., &c."

Then another, of the 3rd May, 1860, of which I gave two versions—the first from the *Mirror of Parliament*, and the second from the *Morning Chronicle*, to which I was referred as being more authentic and more orthodox by the organ of the hon. member for Hochelaga:—

I hope, however, that the day will come in which it will be desirable for Canada to federate with the Lower Provinces, &c. Those in favor of a Federal union of the provinces must see that this proposed Federation of Upper and Lower Canada is the best means to form a nucleus around which the great Confederation of all the provinces could be formed in the course of time.—*Mirror of Parliament*.

I look upon the Federal union of Upper and Lower Canada as the nucleus of the great Confederation of the Provinces of North America to which all look forward. I believe that time will bring about the union of all the provinces.—*Morning Chronicle*.

Could anything be more explicit?

HON. MR. DORION—The word "he" is not in the report.

HON. MR. CAUCHON—No; and I corrected that error the other night; but I maintained with reason that the words "to which all look forward" meant that all persons directed their attention towards Confederation. Now, if all persons expect Confederation, if all persons direct their attention towards it as towards the promised land, the hon. member for Hochelaga must be included to a small extent in this term "all persons." (Hear, hear.) Did he not, moreover, declare that the Confederation of the two Canadas, which he proposed, was to be but the nucleus of the great Confederation, the necessary nucleus for the Confederation of all the American Provinces, which we are considering at present?

HON. MR. DORION—I did not say the necessary nucleus.

HON. MR. CAUCHON—The hon. member always seeks loop-holes by which to escape from his speeches and to evade the consequences of his past opinions; but as I

did not interrupt him, I hope that he will not interrupt me either. Did he not say the other day :—

Of course I do not say that I shall be opposed to their Confederation for all time to come. Population may extend over the wilderness that now lies between the Maritime Provinces and ourselves, and commercial intercourse may increase sufficiently to render Confederation desirable.

Is not this admitting everything? Is it not saying that there is nothing between us but a question of time and of expediency? Why then should he make the opinions of us, the majority, such a crime, when he himself arrives, at the end of a four hours' speech, at the conclusion that Confederation will be good or necessary at a time which is more or less near? In his manifesto against the scheme of Confederation he adheres so far to his previous opinions as to consider the scheme which is submitted to us as merely premature. There again, then, it was only a question of time, and in declaring himself to-day opposed to Confederation, he therefore changes his opinion as to the very basis of the question. I do not cast it up to him as a reproach; for, as I said but a minute ago, he who maintains that he has never changed, conveys but a poor opinion of his judgment and of his aptitude for public affairs. Events, in changing, absolutely compel men to change also. (Hear.) A general was once boasting to the great SURENNE that he had never committed an error of strategy. "He who boasts that he has never been mistaken," returned SURENNE, "proves thereby that he knows nothing of the art of war." These words, which are full of wisdom, may be applied to the hon. member for Hochelaga, who, by his persistence in maintaining that he has never contradicted himself nor been mistaken, proves that he is no statesman. (Hear, hear.) But, I say it again, it would have been better for him to lay aside personal questions. (Hear, hear.) On the 6th July, 1858, he said :—

Before long it will become impossible to resist the demand of Upper Canada. If representation based on population is not granted to her now, she will infallibly obtain it hereafter, but then without any guarantee for the protection of the French-Canadians.

But to-day he changes his opinion. Then he was willing to grant representation by population, or Confederation based on the same principle. It had to be conceded in

order that we might not be carried away by the tempest. But to-day, according to his shewing, the storm no longer impends; the whole sky is calm and serene; public opinion in Upper Canada no longer threatens to break asunder the frail bands of the union, and changes are useless. Ah! and yet we have had as many as three ministerial crises in one year. (Hear, hear.) He mistakes then; the difficulties have but increased, and it is better to-day to provide against the storm, than to be carried away by it at a later period. The greatest wisdom directs its efforts, not to cure the disease, but to prevent it; this truth is as applicable to politics as it is to medicine. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member for Hochelaga talked to us of conflicts between the Federal Parliament and the local Houses, and of the sovereign power of the Central Government over the legislatures of the provinces. But what, then, is this sovereign power over the attributes of the provincial legislatures? If it exists it must be in the Constitution. If it is not to be found there, it is because it does not exist. He says that the Federal Legislature will always predominate; and why? Who then will decide between the one and the others?—the judicial tribunals being sworn to respect the laws and the Constitution in their entirety, and charged by the very nature of their functions to declare whether such a law of the Federal Parliament or of the local legislatures does or does not affect the Constitution. (Hear, hear.) There will be no absolute sovereign power, each legislature having its distinct and independent attributes, not proceeding from one or the other by delegation, either from above or from below. The Federal Parliament will have legislative sovereign power in all questions submitted to its control in the Constitution. So also the local legislatures will be sovereign in all matters which are specifically assigned to them. How is the question of a conflict now settled in the United States, when it arises between the legislation of Congress and that of individual states? I do not speak of the present time when nearly the whole of the territory of that great country is under military rule, and overrun in every direction by an army of 500,000 soldiers. I allude to what occurs in their normal condition. (Hear.) The sovereign power is vested in the Federal Government with respect to all Federal matters, and in the states with respect to all matters connected with their special attributes. By

reading STOREY, or rather the Constitution, the hon. member will ascertain that the states are not paramount with respect to questions of war and peace, the tariff, trade, treaties and all relations with foreign countries. Their authority is void so far as relates to those questions, and the sovereign power is vested exclusively in the Federal Government. If any conflict arises between the Federal Legislature and that of the states, it is decided by the judicial tribunals. I am not aware that any difficulty of this nature has ever arisen, and so far as relates to the legislative attributes of the states, that Federal legislation has ever predominated over local legislation. (Hear, hear.) Why then should the case be otherwise so far as we are concerned? Is it because we are differently constituted, and because our nature is subservient to other laws? These are wretched arguments, and he has even been reduced to splitting hairs since he has attended the school of the member for Brome, whose place he almost fills since he has been ill. (Laughter.) The honorable member for Hochelaga considered my first pamphlet much better written than my last, doubtless for the same reason that he considered my speeches of 1858 greatly superior to that which I delivered here the other day. He thinks now as I thought in 1858; he has therefore receded by six years. Alluding to my speech of the 2nd March, he appears to impute it to me as a crime, that I yielded to the influence of my relations with the delegates from the Maritime Provinces, and that under the action of that influence, I changed my opinions respecting Confederation. I admit the fact of that influence legitimately exercised. We lose nothing by coming in contact with intelligent men. The members of this House, who last autumn visited those provinces, returned amazed at what they had seen. They were convinced that those provinces were possessed of great resources. Contact with the most eminent men of those countries could be productive of no evil, and the hon. member would have gained by it. Perhaps if he had experienced that contact, he would not to-day have recourse to the means which he is employing to cast discredit on the scheme of Confederation, and to cause it to be rejected. (Hear, hear.) Among those men there are some who are endowed with magnificent abilities, and at whose side I should be happy and proud to sit in a deliberative assembly. (Hear, hear.) Yes, we were gainers by coming in contact

with them, and I venture to believe that, on their parts, they were divested of many prejudices which they may possibly have entertained against us, just as we had some such against them. The hon. member quoted certain articles from the *Journal de Québec* of 1856 and 1858 to prove that I said that then the Government was the worst I had ever seen. Perhaps I was right at the time, but I could not say the same thing since it has been my lot to look upon the hon. member's Government! (Hear, and laughter.) If there was ever a tyrannical and dishonest Government, it was certainly that of 1868, and accordingly it succumbed before the attacks of all honest men. Except for some accident, such as that which occurred in 1862, who ventures to hope to see the hon. member return to power? (Hear, hear.) He told us that it was not expedient to change the Constitution without first having recourse to an appeal to the people. But the first question to be decided is the constitutional question, and the question of expediency and convenience comes after. He talks to us without ceasing of consulting the electors. His doing so may be easily understood; on the elections rest his only hopes. Always deceived in every election, he hopes, but hopes in vain, that the next will give him the victory. He ought to know, however, that our Constitution is constructed upon the model of the British Constitution, and that members do not and cannot receive an imperative order from their electors. Each representative, although elected by one particular county, represents the whole country, and his legislative responsibility extends to the whole of it. If, therefore, I am convinced that any legislative measure presented by the Government or by a member of this House, is of a nature to save Lower Canada, I must vote for that measure, even though my constituents are opposed to it. My electors might punish me afterwards, but they could not impose upon me duties which I consider to be entirely beyond their jurisdiction, and to relate to the very Constitution of the country. (Hear, hear.) If there are any members who consider that the scheme of Confederation is a bad one and opposed to the interests of Lower Canada, even if the majority of our people think otherwise, it is their duty to oppose it on precisely the same principle. They may also, if they choose, demand an appeal to the people. But would they be justified in so doing, and ought this House

to demand it simply in order to compensate for that absence of opposition which gives incessant trouble to the hon. member for Hochelaga? (Hear, hear.) The honorable member for Hochelaga spoke of public meetings held in certain counties in the district of Montreal; but those meetings are far from possessing the importance which he assigns to them. We all know how they can be got up everywhere, and what they amount to. However the case may be there, there have been none such in the district of Quebec, and even in the district of Three Rivers, against Confederation, and it cannot be said that the members who represent those districts, and who vote for this measure, are acting in opposition to the wishes of their constituents. Such meetings are only found to occur in the district of Montreal, where the party of the honorable member is most strongly represented; but an opinion may be formed as to those meetings from what is going on at Quebec at this moment. While the whole body of citizens are calling for the suspension of the present municipal council, some individuals interested in keeping it in authority are calling public meetings in the nooks and corners of the suburbs. (Hear, hear.) The honorable member made tremendous efforts to prove that the interests of our religion, our nationality and our institutions would be in a position of much greater safety in his hands than they would be in those of the majority. For my part, I am willing to leave to public opinion the care of deciding that question; and as he declares himself to hold that opinion in great respect, I must suppose that he will agree with me on this point. (Hear, hear.) I would not assert that the honorable member is himself personally hostile to the religion and the institutions of Lower Canada; but I may say that all the tendencies of the party which he represents are adverse to those same institutions. (Hear, hear.) There is sufficient proof of this in the writings and the acts of that party. As to my opinion respecting Confederation, I may repeat here what I have already said on a former occasion, and that is, that no one knew what that opinion was, how I should write, and on what side I should write, when I began my work. I kept silence that I might not be annoyed either by friends or by opponents, and in order that I might be able to judge of the question in the fulness of my liberty.

(Hear.) Mention has been made of the dangers of Confederation. I know that every question has its dangers, and it is probable that this one presents some such in the same way as all others do; but the greatest danger that we could incur would be the bringing on of a conflict between the Catholics and Protestants, by appeals like those which certain members on the left have made to the religious passions of our population. (Hear, hear.) In what position should we find ourselves, we Catholics, if we provoked such a conflict? The 258,000 Catholics of Upper Canada are represented in this House by but two members, those for Cornwall and Glengarry (Hon. J. S. and Mr. D. A. MACDONALD), whilst the Protestants of Lower Canada are represented by fifteen or sixteen members; and in case of a conflict between the Catholics and the Protestants, what would become of us? (Hear, hear.) From the justice, the wisdom and the liberality of our acts alone have we hitherto found our strength and our protection to proceed, and from them shall we again find them to proceed under Confederation. (Hear.) The honorable member for Hochelaga quoted a garbled portion of my first pamphlet, to give it a meaning which it does not convey; he then accuses me of having changed my opinion as to the Constitution of the Legislative Council. But I can tell him that I have never changed my opinion on that question; I have never been in favor of the elective principle being applied to the Legislative Council; and if in 1858 I prepared and introduced the law which changed the constitution of that body, it was only that I might gratify the universal opinion which desired an elective Legislative Council. But, the honorable member for Hochelaga will reply, did you not write in 1858:—

The best possible condition under which Confederation could exist would be that in which the two chambers would be elective, and would both have population as the basis of their number; for no other system, excepting that of having but one chamber only, with the number of its members based on population, would give us absolutely one vote in three in the Federal Legislature.

Was the question then whether the elective principle was preferable to that of appointment? No; we were discussing a question of much greater importance, that of ascertaining in what condition of constitutional existence we should find the greatest protec-

tion, and having to select from two alternatives, numbers or the State, I preferred numbers, because it would have conferred upon us a larger share of representation and of influence. The words which follow, and which I will give, clearly prove my thought at that time:—

The Constitution of the United States, on which, perhaps, ours would be modeled, would not give to us Lower Canadians the same protection and the same guarantee of safety, as by it we should in reality enjoy a little protection only in the House of Representatives, in which we should be one to three.

Thus the protection would have been vested in the Legislative Council itself, if it had been created on the principle of the State and not of numbers. To shew that my mind was then filled with but one idea—that of obtaining the greatest share of influence in the Federal Legislature for Lower Canada, by any constitutional system whatever, I also wrote in the same pamphlet:—

Under the Federal principle, small and great provinces will carry equal weight in the single (general) legislature; the little island of Prince Edward as much as the twelve hundred and fifty thousand souls of Lower Canada.

Having no information to go upon, I then thought that the American system would be adopted, which gives in the Federal Senate to the little states of Rhode Island, Jersey, Maine, Vermont and Connecticut the same representation as it gives to the large states of New York, Pennsylvania and Ohio. But the scheme that we have before us proves that I was mistaken, as Prince Edward's Island, instead of having as many representatives in the Legislative Council as we shall have, will only have one-sixth of the number. For the purpose of representation in the Legislative Council, the three Atlantic Provinces are grouped together, and are to be represented together by but twenty-four votes, just the same as Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) As the question was as to the establishment of equilibrium between the provinces, if the scheme of the Quebec Conference gives me the same result as an elective Legislative Council, what contradiction is there in my returning to the nominative principle, which I always preferred to the elective principle? The conditions of equilibrium being the same, I give the preference to the principle which confers on legislation the best guarantee of wisdom and

mature judgment. (Hear, hear.) But supposing—what is not the case—that I had contradicted myself, in what way could my contradictions have affected the merits of the question under discussion? If it can be proved that my opinions of to-day are not based on reasonable grounds, let it be proved. If it cannot be proved, do not let anyone imagine that he has answered me by saying: "You thought differently six years ago." Because I reasoned in 1858 on hypotheses which are controverted by facts to-day, must I then, in order to appear consistent, adhere to those suppositions which substantive truths so completely contradict? (Hear, hear.) The hon. member for Hochelaga told us that the Constitution of the Belgian Senate is less conservative than that of the Legislative Council which we propose to establish under the Confederation, because the members of the Belgian Senate are in part changed every four years. To this I reply, that the conservative principle may be found elsewhere than in the manner of selecting the councillors or the senators, and that in Belgium it is found in the excessively high standard of qualification which is required of candidates for the Senate; so much so that only men of large fortune, who are everywhere few in number, can aspire to enter it. In Belgium the Constitution requires that there shall be one man qualified in every six thousand souls of population, and that man must pay one thousand florins of direct taxes. Will it be said that the Belgian Senate, so constituted, is not more conservative than our Legislative Council will be—the Belgian Senate, in which none can sit but very rich men and large landed proprietors? (Hear, hear.) I am answered that one-half this Senate is renewed every four years, and that the Crown may dissolve it at pleasure. But can the Crown prevent men of large fortune and large landed proprietors from entering it? It is proved that it is with difficulty that there can be found in the House of Lords any scions of the great families who flourished there under CHARLES II.; but that House is constantly recruited from among the territorial nobility and from among men who render great political or military services to the state. By renewing it thus with the same elements, does the Crown take away its conservative character? (Hear, hear.) The hon. member stands in perpetual dread of conflicts and disagreements. Supposing that the House of Lords had persisted in its opposition to

the Reform Bill in 1832, what would have happened if WILLIAM IV. had refused to overwhelm it by numerous nominations to the peerage? Does any one believe that it would have persisted to the last? No; after having long resisted, it would have bent before the storm which threatened to sweep it away. (Hear, hear.) In 1832 the struggle was between the great proprietors and the middle classes, who wished to make their way; for the English people, properly termed the populace, have no political privileges; they are of no account in the Constitution, they hold no political position, and have no energy for the struggle, which, moreover, would not be productive of any benefit to them. It resembles in no respect the populations of the great towns in France, which make and unmake governments by insurrections or revolutions. In England it is the middle classes who make revolutions or who threaten to make them. Growing richer daily, they advance slowly but surely towards the securing of political privileges and immunities. The Radical school of Manchester at bottom wishes for nothing more, although it asserts that it is desirous of obtaining privileges for the people. If the great nobility, in 1832, offered such determined opposition to the Reform Bill, it was because they feared that it would annihilate their influence and place them at the mercy of the will of the masses. But we have no *caste* here, and fortune, like political honors, is the property of every man who labors to attain it. Here every one, if he chooses, can almost without an effort become a proprietor and possess the right of having a deliberative voice in the discussion of national questions of the highest importance. To be a legislative councillor it will be sufficient to possess real estate of the value of four thousand dollars. The legislative councillors will form part of the people, will live with the people and by their opinions, and will know and appreciate their wants; the only difference that there will be between them and the members of the House of Commons will be, that being appointed for life, they will not be as directly brought under external influence; that they will have more freedom of action and of thought, and that they will be able to judge with greater calmness of the legislation which will be submitted to them. For what reason then would they provoke contests which would neither be conducive to their interests nor in accordance with their feelings; they

will not, like the House of Lords, have privileges to save from destruction. In the Constitution they will have but one part to play, that of maturing legislation in the interests of the people. The hon. member for Hochelaga said in his last manifesto, and repeated here, that if we applied to England to amend our Constitution, we should expose ourselves to having alterations, for which we do not ask, made by some mischievous hand. The thing is possible I admit. It is possible, as it is also possible for the Imperial Parliament to change our Constitution without even waiting for us to take the initiative, as it did in 1840, but if there is any harm now in asking Great Britain for the Confederation of all the provinces, because she may subject us to something which is not contained in the scheme, why did the member for Hochelaga wish for constitutional changes in 1858? Did he hope to change the Constitutional Act of 1840 without the concurrence of the Imperial Parliament? And will he be good enough to tell us by what supernatural proceeding he hoped to succeed in doing so? If there is danger in 1865, there must also have been danger in 1858. Why then should he, to day, impute to others as a crime that which he wished to do himself then? Has he forgotten all that? Does he wish to deny it? Differing slightly from the Bourbons, he has learned nothing and has forgotten everything. (Hear, and laughter.) To frighten us, he also spoke of direct taxation, to which we should have to submit, if we had Confederation. Now, in his constitutional scheme of 1858, with which we are all acquainted, he gave to the Federal Government the customs revenue. We should, therefore, have had to have recourse to direct taxation to meet the expenditure of the local governments. The plan of Constitution which is submitted to us treats us better than that, for it gives us enough, and more than we require, to ensure the easy working of the local organizations.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Hear! hear!

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—Yes, hear! hear! just so!

HON. MR. CAUCHON—The hon. member for Chateauguay, who cries "Hear, hear," ought to be satisfied if he thinks himself in the right; for when he was Minister of Finance he told us that in order to fill up the deficit left by his predecessors, he must necessarily have recourse to direct taxation. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member for Hochelaga has long wept over the mis-

fortunes of his country. He has long lamented, like JEREMIAH, over the thought of the disasters which were overwhelming it. And at last, in 1858, enlightened by the intelligence of his luminous friend the member for Chateauguay, he thought he had discovered in direct taxation the remedy for the evils which were bringing it to its grave. (Hear, hear.) But to-day he rejects a scheme which may save the country without its being necessary to have recourse to this extreme and objectionable remedy. (Hear, hear.) If the scheme becomes law, not only shall we have a sufficient revenue to meet our local expenditure, but we shall also have a surplus with which, if we practise wise economy, to pay off by degrees the residue of the debt which will remain to us. The hon. member for Hochelaga tells us that Lower Canada will be burthened with a local debt of more than \$4,500,000; but we have clear and palpable proof that the debt of Canada, deducting the part of the Sinking Fund which has been paid, amounts to only \$67,500,000. Now our share of the Federal debt is established at \$62,500,000. There will consequently remain less than \$5,000,000 to be divided between the two Canadas, and all the arguments of the hon. member will not change so incontestable a fact as this. (Hear, hear.) We do not get these figures from the Hon. Minister of Finance. They are given to us by a man who is perfectly independent of all Ministers and of all parties—a man whom I myself formerly reproached with being too much so; I allude to Mr. LANGTON, the Auditor of Accounts. (Hear, hear.) We do not yet know, it is true, how this debt of four millions and some hundred thousand dollars will be divided between the two Canadas, but we do know, without any possibility of doubt, that the local revenues will belong to the local governments, and that they will amply suffice for all their requirements. (Hear, hear.) The honorable member for Hochelaga complains that Upper Canada retains her public lands and what is owing to Government on those lands, and he maintains that Lower Canada ought to have her share of what those lands produce. But did those lands belong to us before the union, and have we not our own public lands, together with the revenue accruing from them? Have we not more lands to settle than Upper Canada? Since the discovery of our gold and copper mines the amount produced by the sale of our public

lands has increased fivefold, whilst Upper Canada has hardly any land left to sell. Let our mines be opened, and we shall find that we have no reason to envy Upper Canada. (Hear, hear.) Everything is well adjusted; for if we have a less considerable revenue than Upper Canada, our population is also less numerous. Upper Canada possesses a more considerable revenue, but one which must diminish with the decrease of the quantity of land to be sold, whilst we have a revenue which is gradually increasing. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member would no doubt hand over the public lands to the Confederation so as to be in accordance with his plan of 1859, as set forth in the Montreal manifesto; but I am certain that Lower Canada does not share his opinion. He talked to us also of marriage and divorce. He said: "Now, you will not vote directly for divorce, but you vote to establish divorce courts." Well! no one condemns divorce more than I do myself, and I am convinced that the hon. member for Hochelaga would accept it sooner than I would. But if no mention was made of divorce in the Constitution, if it was not assigned to the Federal Parliament, it would of necessity belong to the local parliaments as it belongs to our Legislature now, although there is not one word respecting it in the Union Act. For my part, I would rather see that power removed to a distance from us, since it must exist somewhere in spite of us. (Hear, hear.) These reasonings on the question of marriage are extraordinary to a degree, coming from a man holding a position at the bar. They are so extraordinary, and so inconsistent with all logic and all law, that I shall not take the trouble of controverting them. The explanations of the Government have satisfied me on that point. The legislative power of the Federal Parliament in relation to marriage will only be that which is conferred by the Constitution, notwithstanding the singular assertions of the honorable member. (Hear, hear, and cheers.)

On motion of Dr. PARKER, the debate was then adjourned.

—o—

TUESDAY, 7th March, 1865.

The Order of the Day being read for resuming the adjourned debate on Confederation,—

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD said—Before the debate is resumed, I wish to say a few words. I would call the attention of the House to the telegram received to-day—which is rather confused in its terms—with reference to a debate in the House of Lords on the subject of the defences of Canada. According to this telegram, “Earl DE GREY, Secretary of State for War, admitted the importance of the question, but regretted that any doubt should be expressed of the conciliatory intentions of the Americans. The Government would ask a vote of £50,000 for the Quebec defences, while the Canadians would undertake the defences of Montreal and westward.” The amount, according to another statement, is £30,000. The figures are apparently a mistake for £300,000. My object in rising was to state that so far as we could gather from this confused summary of the debate, the Imperial Government were about to ask a certain amount for the defences of Quebec, while the Canadians would undertake the defence of Montreal and the country westward. I may state it is quite true that the Imperial Government made a proposition some time ago to the effect that they were willing and prepared to recommend to Parliament a vote for the defence of Quebec, as is here stated, provided this province undertook the defence of Montreal and points westward. Negotiations have been going on on this question between the Imperial Government and the Canadian Government ever since, and I think that there is every reason to believe that these negotiations will result most favorably, and that arrangements will be made in a manner such as to secure the defence of Canada, both east and west—in a manner such as to ensure the fullest protection to the country, and as at the same time will not press unduly on the energies of the people. (Hear.) Sir, those negotiations are still proceeding—they have not yet concluded—and it must be obvious to every honorable member who has read this short synopsis of the debate in the Imperial Parliament, that it is of the greatest possible importance that Canada should not be unrepresented in England at the present time. (Cheers.) It must be evident to all that some of the leading members of the Administration should be in England at this juncture, for the purpose of attending to Canadian interests, and of concluding these negotiations without any loss of time whatever. (Hear, hear.) It is desirable, as I stated yesterday, that the two questions of Federation and Defence should be discussed

at the same moment, and that the opportunity should be taken of exactly ascertaining the position of British North America with respect to her degree of reliance on the Imperial Government in a political sense, as well as with regard to the question of defence. Therefore, there should not be any loss of time whatever, and with that view the Government would ask this House—as the discussion has already gone on to a considerable length, and a great many honorable gentlemen have spoken on the subject—that it will offer no undue delay in coming to a conclusion in this matter. Of course the Government would not attempt to shut down the floodgates against all discussion; but they would merely ask and invite the House to consider the importance of as early a vote as the House can properly allow to be taken upon this question. It is for the House to determine whether the Federation scheme which has been proposed by the Government and laid before the House is one which, with all its faults, should be adopted, or whether we shall be thrown upon an uncertain future. In order that the House may at once come to an understanding in the matter, I shall, as I stated yesterday, take every possible step known to parliamentary usage to get a vote as soon as it can conveniently be got, and I have therefore now to move the previous question. (Ironical Opposition cheers and counter cheering.) I move, sir, that the main question be now put. (More cheering.) Honorable gentlemen opposite know very well that my making this motion does not in any way stop the debate. (Hear, hear.) The House will be gratified to hear, and will still have an opportunity of hearing, from the honorable member from Chateaugay (Hon. Mr. HOLTON), who cries “Hear, hear,” an expression of opinion whether this scheme is so objectionable that the House would be wise in rejecting it, with nothing now offered as a substitute, and no future to look to. It will afford us all great pleasure to hear the honorable gentleman say whether we should adopt this scheme. There is an independent motion on the paper of my honorable friend from Peel (Hon. J. H. CAMERON). My motion does not interfere with that. But if the House should consider that this scheme ought to be adopted, my honorable friend will then have an opportunity of proposing his motion. (Hear, hear.)

THE SPEAKER—If honorable gentlemen desire it, I will read the rule of the House as to the previous question. The 35th rule of the House is as follows:—“The previous

question, until it is decided, shall preclude all amendments to the main question"—(ironical Opposition cheers)—"and shall be in the following word:—'That this question be now put.' If the previous question be resolved in the affirmative, the original question is put forthwith, without amendment or debate." (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. CARTIER—MR. SPEAKER, I second the motion. (Derisive Opposition cheers.)

THE SPEAKER—The motion is that this question be now put.

HON. MR. HOLTON—I shall not on this occasion, sir, make any remarks as to the mode of proceeding adopted by the Honorable Attorney General West, further than this, that a friend, an honorable member of this House, intimated to me yesterday that this course was likely to be pursued by the Government in order to crowd this measure through the House. I scouted the idea. I thought it was impossible that a government, numbering in its ranks public men who have played a prominent part in the parliamentary history of this country for some years, could resort to so base a trick—(cheers and counter cheers)—after having introduced this measure in the manner they have done—after having introduced it in a most unparliamentary and unconstitutional manner—and seeing that amendments would be made to several of the propositions contained in the resolutions adopted by the Conference which assembled in Quebec, they shut off all opportunity to amend the measure by moving the previous question. (Hear, hear.) Why was it not stated by the Honorable Attorney General West himself that we would be able to get at the sense of the House upon every one of the propositions, by moving amendments? (Hear, hear.) In full confidence that that pledge would be kept, when my honorable friend who sits near me told me he had reason to believe that this very course was in contemplation, I repeat I scouted the idea. (Hear, hear.) I shall not offer any further observations on this point at the present moment, beyond remarking that if the object be to curtail debate, as the honorable gentleman says it is—if his real motive be in truth to arrive at an early vote upon this question—his own statement shows how utterly futile his motion is to accomplish that end. It was not at all necessary that the honorable gentleman should have told us that we may discuss the previous question. We are now, by a compact which I presume will not be

violated—although I do not know what attempt will be made next—we are practically in Committee of the Whole, with liberty to speak as often as we please on this question. Therefore, the object stated by the honorable gentleman cannot be attained, but another object can be and will be attained—they will take their followers, whom they have already led on to do things of which they will bitterly repent when they come face to face with their constituents, and drag them still further through the mire—(cheers and counter cheers)—by depriving them of the opportunity of putting on record their views, even in the inconvenient form of amendments, upon the various propositions which are proposed to be embodied in this Address to the Crown. (Hear, hear.) Sir, the honorable gentleman says that the information received by telegraph in reference to the defences renders it necessary that an early decision should be come to in the matter of Federation. But what has been the course of the honorable gentlemen opposite, throughout this debate, when the subject of the defences has been referred to? When we have said—"Put us in possession of the necessary information to consider the subject of the defences, which must be discussed in connection with the scheme of Confederation," what has been the reply? Why, that there was no natural or necessary connection between the two subjects. (Hear, hear.) Thus, when the honorable gentlemen were asked to bring down the information in regard to the defences, they have maintained that there is no connection between the two questions; but when they have a purpose to serve by so doing, they reverse their position and say, "By all means rush this thing through with all possible speed, in order that the country may be placed in a position of defence." I think, sir, we are entitled at this stage of the debate, and under these circumstances, to demand that all the information in possession of the Government in regard to the defences, should be laid before the House. I believe there is no better recognized parliamentary rule than this, that when a Minister of the Crown rises in his place in Parliament and refers to despatches on matters of public importance, these despatches must be laid before the House. It is founded on the same rule which prevails in our courts, which requires that any paper referred to in evidence or argument, in order to be of use, must be in the possession of the court. I should like to ask the Hon. Attorney General West the question—and I pause for

an answer—whether it is the intention of the Government, before pressing this resolution to a vote, to place the House in possession of the information for which I am now seeking?

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—It certainly is not, and for reasons of the best kind.

HON. MR. HOLTON—The honorable gentleman says it certainly is not. And yet he asks us to give a vote, in view of information which he withholds, not merely on the question of the defences, but of Confederation as well. If the honorable gentleman had used the arguments for withholding information which he has put forth, if the proposition were simply a money vote to place the country in a state of defence, there might be some reason in it, but he is using them to induce us to vote for a political scheme embracing all sorts of things other than the question of defence. The position the hon. gentleman now assumes is unconstitutional; but being unconstitutional, it is in perfect keeping with the whole course of this Administration since its formation in June last, when it initiated its existence by pledging the Crown, in a written document, not to exercise the prerogative of dissolution until another session of this Parliament should have been held. (Hear, hear.) I say that their course in this instance is in keeping with every step they have taken since their formation. Well, sir, I have put one question to the Hon. Attorney General West, and I propose now, with the leave of my hon. friend the member for North Wellington, who is entitled to the floor, to put another question. He may answer it or not, as he thinks proper; but the country will draw its own inference from his reply. Yesterday, he stated that in consequence of the result of the New Brunswick elections, it had become tolerably apparent that this scheme had received its first check. In other words, he admitted plainly that the result of the New Brunswick elections was adverse to the scheme. I may add, that he knows very well a majority of the present Parliament of Nova Scotia is adverse to it.

HON. MR. BROWN—No! no!

HON. MR. HOLTON—I say, yes; and in the Island of Prince Edward, there is no probability whatever of the scheme being accepted. Well, notwithstanding this, he says that he shall press this measure to a vote. A question was put yesterday, which

was answered; but there is some misapprehension as to the purport of the answer, and I think it will be admitted to be a question in regard to which there should not be any misapprehension whatever.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—You could not understand it.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Well, I admit the obtuseness of my understanding. The question I desire to ask the leader of the Government is this—Is it the intention of the Government to press for Imperial legislation, under the Address which they are now inviting the House to adopt, affecting the Lower Provinces, or any of them, without the concurrence of those provinces? That is the question I desire to ask the hon. gentleman.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—It is not the intention of the Canadian Government to press the Imperial Government to pass any act whatever.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Then clearly the hon. gentleman was misunderstood yesterday. He then stated that it was of the highest possible importance this measure should pass without delay, in order that the Ministry might go home and consult with the Imperial Government in respect to the bill to be introduced to give effect to this Address.

HON. MR. BROWN—And that is correct.

MR. RANKIN—The Government do not intend to "press" for Imperial legislation.

HON. MR. HOLTON—I do not want to quibble about mere words. What I want to know is—whether, in pursuance of this Address, hon. gentlemen intend to ask, or have any reason to expect that the Imperial Government—(Hon. Mr. BROWN—"Oh! oh!")—or have any reason to expect that the Imperial Government will legislate without the concurrence of the Lower Provinces? Whether, in point of fact, if the concurrence of the Lower Provinces be withheld from the scheme of the Conference, he has reason to believe that legislation can be had thereon? I desire to know, first, whether he intends to ask for such legislation; and, second, whether he thinks it can be had?

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—I think the House, and even the hon. gentleman himself, must see the unreasonableness of the question he asks, which is, whether I have any expectation that the British Government will enact some compulsory law against the will of the Lower Pro-

vinces on the question of Federation. All that I can say is, that I have no better means of forming an opinion on the subject than the hon. gentleman himself. What I stated yesterday I repeat to-day, that the Canadian Government, knowing that the opinion of the people of New Brunswick has been expressed against Federation, would embrace the earliest opportunity of discussing with the Imperial Government the position of British North America, especially with reference to the present state of affairs in Canada, containing a population of four-fifths of the people of British North America, in favor of Federation, as against New Brunswick, with a population of two hundred odd thousand against it. In discussing the question with Her Majesty's Imperial advisers, we shall probably enter into the consideration of the whole matter; but what the nature of these discussions may be, or what they will lead to or will not lead to, I cannot possibly say. They may lead to conclusions, but what those conclusions may be no mortal man can tell. We cannot say to what conclusions the Imperial Government may come. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—I am obliged to the honorable gentleman for his courteous answer. I think it is, on the whole, a satisfactory answer, because the answer plainly implies this, that without the concurrence of the Lower Provinces this measure cannot go on. That is the plain implication. We know well that we shall not have the concurrence of the Lower Provinces, and therefore it is absurd to ask this House to vote a measure which the honorable gentlemen themselves, as they have risen one after another in the course of this debate, have declared to be an imperfect measure—a measure of compromise—not such a measure as they, in many respects, desired and advocated, but a measure which they had concurred in for the purpose of inducing the Lower Provinces to become parties to it. Why, I ask, should this House be called upon to vote for the objectionable features of a scheme, when there is no longer any reason for such a vote—when it is admitted that the Lower Provinces, for whose sake these objectionable features were introduced, will not consent and cannot be coerced into it? (Hear, hear.) The Hon. President of the Council told the people of Toronto, at the banquet recently held there, that he was entirely opposed to the new constitution of the Legislative Council, and that he op-

posed it in the Conference. We know also that that feature of the scheme is very objectionable to the whole of what might once have been called the Liberal party, but the Hon. President of the Council has destroyed that party, and it is not, perhaps, right to speak of it as the Liberal party any longer—they are only now to be known as those who once ranged themselves together, in Upper and Lower Canada, under the Liberal banner. The Hon. President of the Council stated, that as representing in the Conference the Liberal party of Upper Canada—the Liberal party of Lower Canada having no representation in the Conference at all—as representing the Liberal party of Upper Canada, the party from that section which is in a large majority in this House, the honorable gentleman stated that he was opposed to this feature of the scheme—a feature which is known to be as unpalatable to a large majority of this House as it is to the hon. gentleman himself. I merely mention this to illustrate my argument. Why should hon. gentlemen, who were disposed to accept this scheme as a whole, notwithstanding these objectionable features—who were disposed to accept it, on the grounds set forth by their leaders, as a measure of compromise—why, I ask, should they now be called upon to vote in opposition to their convictions, merely to gratify the *amour-propre* of the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, whose desire it is to carry through the House an Address which, by their own admission made to this House, must be of non-effect? (Hear, hear.)

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—But that it will be the Constitution of this country, I am satisfied.

HON. MR. HOLTON—The hon. gentleman boasts that it will be the Constitution of this country?

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—What I meant was, of all British North America.

HON. MR. HOLTON—The hon. gentleman said "of this country." The hon. gentleman, therefore, admits that if he fails in procuring the concurrence of the Lower Provinces to the measure—that if they cannot be brought into the scheme for reconstructing their Governments—they are going to ask the Imperial Government to found a Constitution for the two Canadas upon these resolutions.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—The

hon. gentleman has drawn erroneous inferences from what I stated. When I said I had no doubt that the resolutions now before the House would be the Constitution of this country, I meant to say I had no more doubt than that I stand here that it would be adopted not only by Canada, but by the other provinces.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Ah! The hon. gentleman has "no doubt."

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—You are trying to twist my words; but go on.

HON. MR. HOLTON—I have not had the same training as the honorable gentleman in the way of word twisting. I take his words in their plain and literal sense. He says he has no doubt that these resolutions will form the Constitution of this country. Then, sir, why do not honorable gentlemen keep faith? Why does not the Hon. President of the Council, in an especial manner, keep faith with his party, by giving us the scheme which he pledged himself, in the event of such a contingency as this, should be brought down during this session of Parliament? The honorable gentleman does not find it convenient to answer. I confess I did not expect an answer; but nevertheless I thought it desirable to put the question to him. I, equally with other members of the House, can draw my inferences from his silence. He knows very well it is a violation of the programme under which he entered the Government; and well he knows that it is a departure from the avowal which constituted, I will not say his justification, but his sole excuse for occupying the seat which he now fills. The question is now asked whether it is intended by the Government to go to England and ask the Imperial Parliament to establish a Constitution for this country, the principles of which have never been considered, because we are considering now the scheme of Federation for the whole country?

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—I stated that the first thing to be done by the Government, in the summer session, would be to submit a measure for fully carrying out the programme. First, carry Confederation, and when we met again we would bring in a scheme for the local governments of Upper and Lower Canada.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Yes, local governments. I am obliged to the honorable gentleman for reminding me of the local governments; but I was speaking of the

General Government of Canada. (Hear, hear.) I think it follows irresistibly from the admission of the hon. gentleman to-day, that it is their intention to seek a general Constitution for Canada under these resolutions, without ever having submitted that question to the House. Well, sir, there is another reason perhaps for the course taken by hon. gentlemen yesterday and pursued to-day. It has always been a theory of my own—perhaps it has not yet been demonstrated by facts—

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. HOLTON—I say it has always been a theory of my own, and facts are rapidly demonstrating the truth of that theory, that this Government was formed in consequence of the emergencies of certain gentlemen who were in office, and desired to retain office, and of certain other gentlemen who were out of office and who desired to come in. I believe that the whole constitutional difficulties, or alleged constitutional difficulties, of this country arose from the personal or rather the political emergencies into which certain hon. gentlemen found themselves, from causes to which I shall not now advert. (Hear, hear.) Well, sir, feeling that this scheme has failed—feeling that the pretext upon which they have held office for six or nine months is about to fail them, they devise other means, as a sort of lure to the country, whereby office may be kept for a further period. I admit the dexterity with which the thing is done—a dexterity for which the Hon. Attorney General West has long been famous in this country. His theory is: "Take care of to-day—when to-morrow comes we will see what can be done"—and by adhering to this maxim he has managed to lengthen out the term of his political existence. That, I believe, will be acknowledged to be the theory upon which the hon. gentleman acts.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—And a very sensible theory it is. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—A sensible theory no doubt it is. I am glad to hear that the hon. gentleman does not deny the fact; but while admitting that he has achieved a considerable measure of success in this way, whether, after all that success, he has earned the highest kind of reward of a public life—whether there is anybody who speaks or thinks of the hon. gentleman as a statesman, may perhaps be doubted. It is admitted

hat he is an adroit manager—his management being based on the theory of doing to-day what must be done to-day, and of leaving till to-morrow whatever can be deferred. I doubt, however, after all, whether, when the hon. gentleman comes to review his career, he will be satisfied that that sort of policy brings with it the highest rewards of public life.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—I shall be quite satisfied to allow the hon. member for Chateaugay to be my biographer. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—But while that has been his theory and his practice, and a certain degree of success has attended it, I would like to ask the Hon. President of the Council whether he has heretofore acted upon that theory, and whether he can quite afford to act upon it now? Most of us remember—those of us who have been for a few years in public life in this country, must remember a very striking speech delivered by the hon. member for South Oxford (Honorable Mr. BROWN), in Toronto, in the session of 1856 or 1857—he has delivered many striking speeches in his time, but this was one of the most striking—in which he described the path of the Hon. Attorney General West as being studded all along by the grave-stones of his slaughtered colleagues. (Hear, hear.) Well, there are not wanting those who think they deservy in the not very remote distance, a yawning grave waiting for the noblest victim of them all. (Laughter.) And I very much fear, that unless the hon. gentleman has the courage to assert his own original strength—and he has great strength—and to discard the blandishments and the sweets of office, and to plant himself where he stood formerly, in the affections and confidence of the people of this country, as the foremost defender of the rights of the people, as the foremost champion of the privileges of a free Parliament—unless he hastens to do that, I very much fear that he too may fall a victim—as I have said, the noblest victim of them all—to the arts, if not the arms, of the fell destroyer. (Laughter.) I desire, as I am on my feet—and am not at all certain that I shall, under the new phase of things, trouble the House with any lengthened observations—I desire to say a few words on the merits of this question of defence. Of course I hold, as I presume every man in this country holds, that the people that will not defend themselves are unworthy of free institutions. I hold

that we must defend ourselves against all aggressors, in the best way we can. I think the policy we have been pursuing for some years past, of enrolling our people and training them to the use of arms and in military exercise, and in the instructing of officers who might lead them, should necessarily require—I think all that is sound policy. I would even go somewhat further in that direction than we have gone heretofore. But if honorable gentlemen propose that we should establish a standing army—that we should equip a navy—that we should go into a costly system of permanent fortifications, they are proposing what is beyond the strength of the country—they are proposing what will speedily bring financial ruin on the country—and by bringing financial ruin on the country, and by creating thereby dissatisfaction among the people, they will prepare the way to that very event which they profess so strongly to deprecate. I believe, if it has not that effect, it will certainly result in depopulating our country. Already the work of depopulation is going on.

HON. MR. BROWN—Oh! oh!

HON. MR. HOLTON—Throughout the whole of the western counties of Canada, at the present moment, there is a greater amount of financial distress and of *malaise* than I have known for twenty-five years. I challenge the honorable gentlemen around me to contradict the statement. And I say we are not in a position to stand very great additional burdens on our resources. (Hear, hear.) Then what is the condition of our finances? The honorable gentleman who presides over our finances did not venture the other day to dispute the statement I made, that every branch of the revenue was falling off, and that we had an inevitable deficit for this current year staring us in the face. Is it not so?

HON. MR. GALT—The hon. gentleman may repeat his own statement, but he must not put it in my mouth.

HON. MR. HOLTON—The hon. gentleman did not venture to deny it, and I thought the gravity of the statement was such that he would have denied it, if he could.

HON. MR. GALT—Make your statement on your own responsibility, not mine.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Then, I say, on my own responsibility, that every branch of the revenue has been falling off since the

beginning of this year, except the comparatively small amount from bill stamps.

HON. MR. GALT—Do you say every branch of the revenue, with the exception you mention?

HON. MR. HOLTON—Yes.

HON. MR. GALT—Then you will be shewn that it is not so, when you sit down. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—Of course I shall be glad to hear it. That is the sort of information we want before we give hon. gentlemen a vote of credit, and allow them to go to England to do as they please for the next six months. It may be that the revenue has been brought up within the last few weeks from accidental causes. A rumor got abroad that the Hon. Finance Minister intended to make a change in the duties, and in two or three of our large cities a rush was made to the bonding warehouses, in order to save the additional amount that would be exacted by the change in duties. This, no doubt, increased the receipts for the time being, and it is just possible that from that cause the revenue may have regained something of what it had lost during the earlier weeks of the present year. Then, too, the state of our securities in England—which was so much improved, according to the statement of the Hon. President of the Council, by the action of the Quebec Conference,—is now anything indeed but satisfactory. I believe that with the exception of the point they touched at one time in October, or early in November, and which they touched then for a very brief space—they are lower now and have been lower for a longer time than they have been at any period before since the union. I think, therefore, we are not in a position to impose heavy and unmeasured burdens upon our people, for the purpose of establishing a standing army, or for the purpose of constructing permanent fortifications. (Hear, hear.) But I have said more than I intended when I rose, and shall no longer deprive my hon. friend from North Wellington (Dr. PARKER) of the floor.

HON. MR. BROWN—I shall detain the House but a very few minutes in replying to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. As regards his statement that the revenue has fallen off to the extent of which he speaks, in every branch, it is entirely erroneous. It will be shewn when the proper time comes, when the House is asked to grant supplies, that the revenue is very far from being in the hopeless position which

the hon. gentleman has stated. And I apprehend his assertion with regard to the condition of the province is as greatly exaggerated as his other statement. It is very true that many portions of our country unfortunately labor at this moment under considerable depression; but no intelligent person, who considers the circumstances, will think that this is at all extraordinary. We are alongside a country engaged in a fearful war. Our commercial relations with that country, with which we usually have immense transactions, are very greatly disturbed. Then we have had short crops for several years, and our banks are all very properly under close-reefed topsails. These and other causes have contributed to produce the stagnation that now exists, and a general disposition to curtail business operations. (Hear, hear.) But with all this—notwithstanding the scarcity of money, and a good deal of embarrassment and suffering from its scarcity—I venture to affirm that the great branches of our national industry were never on a sounder basis; that business men have not for years owed less debt than at this moment; and when a better state of things sets in, the evils of which the hon. gentleman speaks will not be found to have been very deep-seated. (Hear, hear.) The hon. gentleman is exceedingly anxious that I should fulfil the promises I made to the country at the time I entered this Administration. The hon. gentleman, I think, would show a little more discretion if he allowed me to judge for myself of the best way in which I should fulfil those promises. When, in the short space of six months, the Government have come down with a matured scheme, involving such important changes, and placed it before Parliament in the candid way in which they have submitted it, I think the country has no good cause to complain, either of time having been lost in the fulfilment of my promises, or in the manner of fulfilling them. (Hear, hear.) And I think it ill-becomes the hon. gentleman—when he has heard it declared that, notwithstanding what has occurred in New Brunswick, we still adhere to the basis on which the Government was formed—that all we ask is time to ascertain how our scheme can best be carried into effect—and that in the brief period of a very few weeks we will be prepared to meet Parliament again, and declare the result of our enquiries—I do say it ill becomes an honorable gentleman, professing to be in favor of constitutional changes, to get up

here and endeavor to create an unfounded prejudice against those who are thus shewing in every way their determination to discharge fully and promptly their duty to the country. The honorable gentleman says I have broken up the Liberal party. He says there was a Liberal party in Upper Canada and a Liberal party in Lower Canada, who were acting cordially together, and that I have destroyed the harmony which existed between them. I shall not enter into that discussion now. The time will come when it can be fully gone into without danger to public interests, and I promise the honorable gentleman to give him his answer. But I have this to state in the meantime to the honorable gentleman, that I think it is not for him at least to throw such taunts across the table, when he recollects that in a speech he made in this House only last session, on the announcement of this Coalition, he stated that he could make no complaint as to the course I had taken; that under the circumstances I could only act as I had done. (Hear, hear.) If he can find any act of mine in contradiction of the course I took then, he has a right to blame me. But so long as I am carrying out in good faith the pledges I gave to the country, to my supporters, and to this House, it is not from that honorable gentleman at all events that any charge against me should come. (Hear, hear.) The honorable gentleman says that the proposal for a union of all the colonies has failed. I totally deny it. (Hear, hear.) I am not prepared to admit—I do not believe—that the representatives of New Brunswick, when the subject is fairly discussed in Parliament, and the proposition has been presented in all its lights, will reject it. When they do so, it will be time enough for the honorable gentleman to assert that the scheme has failed. Strange indeed would it have been had so large a scheme suffered no check in its progress—but stranger still would it be were the promoters of the measure to abandon it from such a check as this. (Cheers.) The honorable member for Chateauguay is mistaken also when he asserts that the majority of the members of the Nova Scotia Legislature are against this measure of Confederation.

HON. MR. HOLTON—I believe so.

HON. MR. BROWN—Having heard that the honorable member for Hochelaga had made such a statement to this House—

HON. MR. DORION—On the best authority.

MR. A. MACKENZIE—Give us your authority.

HON. MR. BROWN—I think it better not to ask for the honorable gentleman's authority, or to use any names in such a matter as this. But I wish to say that the moment I heard that the statement had been made, I telegraphed to a friend in the Nova Scotia Legislature, and received an answer entirely contradicting the statement which had been made.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Why then don't they go on with the question?

HON. MR. BROWN—I apprehend it is for them to decide when they shall go on—what is the right moment for them to go on—and not for the honorable member for Chateauguay, who is entirely opposed to this measure.

HON. MR. DORION—There is strong presumptive evidence in favor of my authority against yours.

HON. MR. BROWN—That I must leave to the House to judge. The honorable member for Chateauguay says the motion made by the Hon. Attorney General West does not meet the point at which it is aimed, namely, to bring this debate to a speedy conclusion. He says it may cut off amendments, but that it will not stop debate. But that is an entire mistake. It is the only mode by which the debate can speedily be brought to an end.

HON. MR. DORION—Honorable gentlemen opposite want to stop the debate, besides stopping the amendments. That is the object.

HON. MR. BROWN—If the honorable member for Hochelaga had waited till he had heard me out, he would have found I had no such meaning. With regard to the main proposition, honorable gentlemen may speak as long as they like. So long as the House does not come to the conclusion that the time has arrived for getting a vote upon that, they can talk.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—Thank you!

HON. MR. BROWN—Of course, no one can prevent them. And, so far as I am concerned, I can assure the honorable member for Cornwall that I have no desire to prevent him or any one else from being heard to the fullest extent they desire. But, since the beginning of this debate, we have constantly seen incidental questions raised and the same members getting up night after night to make long speeches upon them and kill time, to a degree never witnessed before, I venture to assert, in this or in any other legislative body. And it is evident that if this motion were not put, we should have these debates continued on a variety of amendments, and

that this discussion would be kept up to an extent which would utterly frustrate the prompt accomplishment of those great purposes for which this Government was formed. (Hear, hear)

HON. MR. EVANTUREL—As one of the friends of the present Administration, I must say that I am surprised by the conduct of the Government and the extreme position in which they choose to place themselves. For my part, I am in favour of the principle of Confederation, and one of those who maintain that by means of that principle the rights and liberties of each of the contracting parties may be preserved; but, on the other hand, I am of opinion, and I do not disguise it from myself, that it may be so applied as to endanger and even destroy, or nearly so, the rights and privileges of a state which is a party to this Confederation. Everything, therefore, depends on the conditions of the contract. As a friend of the Administration I can understand, as well as any one, that any Confederation and particularly such a one as this which is now laid before us, can only be brought about by means of a compromise; and, on this account, Mr. SPEAKER—and it is probably needless to proclaim it here—I am ready and disposed to go to as great a length as it is possible for any man to go. I am also one of those who, when we are called upon to unite, under the ægis of a strong government, the different provinces of British North America, and when I see that the general interest calls for such a union, will give my cordial support to all who seek to establish such a government. I shall always be prepared to meet them halfway; but when the question assumes a different shape, as it now does, and when, in consequence of the events announced to this House yesterday, the Constitution proposed to us seems to concern none but the provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, I say, Mr. SPEAKER, that the compromise between the different provinces no longer existing, we are no longer called upon to be so generous. I say that if we admit that New Brunswick, by its recent repudiation, and Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island are no longer parties to the contracts agreed on between the provinces, and we have now to ask of England to modify the Constitution only in relation to the two Canadas, I say that the conditions are no longer the same as they concern us—(hear, hear)—and that I am on that account much less disposed to allow the Government to proceed to present in England, as the basis of our future Constitution, the resolutions

which we have been compelled to accept in very unfavorable circumstances. I do not hesitate in saying that the position assumed by the Government is a very dangerous one for themselves, and for those who would gladly assist them to pass a good scheme of Confederation. If I understand aright, the intention of the Government, in moving the previous question, is to place their friends in the awkward position of not being able to move any modification of the plan. In our altered position we are going, therefore, to say to England that we were obliged to submit to such and such concessions in order to come to an understanding; that the other provinces have backed out of the bargain, notwithstanding these onerous concessions and the compromise which we were obliged to make, and which have not been accepted by the other parties; and that, in the face of all this, we come to pray that our Constitution may be altered so as to accord with those very same onerous conditions which we had accepted at the Quebec Conference. Why tie us down so strictly now? Why should we not avail ourselves of the retrogression of the provinces to make alterations in the scheme which will be less onerous for us? I think it my duty to declare that the Government, in acting as they have done, place their friends in a very awkward position. For my part, Mr. SPEAKER, I am strongly in favor of Confederation, and am ready to support the Government in their efforts to release the chariot of the state from the position in which it now lies; but I wish, on the other hand—and I think it is but bare justice to say it—I wish that Ministers should place us in such a position before the country, that I and all others may be able to say that we have done our best to improve the situation. This is why I so deeply regret that the Government have thought fit to take their present arbitrary attitude. (Hear, hear.) I acknowledge, with the Administration, that time is precious; but we ought not, in avoiding one danger, to risk falling into another. I acknowledge also that the course of events which has taken place within a few days gives reason to apprehend that British rule in the provinces of British North America may cease altogether in a few years. I admit all these dangers, Mr. SPEAKER; but on the other hand I do not conceal from myself that the extreme position in which we are placed does not tend to diminish them. On the contrary, I am greatly afraid that if public opinion be too deeply stirred by the imposition of a new

Constitution, without liberty on our part to amend it, the danger will be increased rather than diminished. So far, Lower Canada has sufficiently showed, by the voice of her leaders, that she is prepared to make all possible concessions; but after that, would it be prudent to render her dissatisfied by denying us the right of modifying the proposed plan in some degree. We have been obliged, in order to satisfy the public mind, to allege, and truly, that the Ministry had been compelled to make some concessions to the provinces for the general satisfaction; but now that the contracting parties to the plan of Confederation retreat from their engagements, after having imposed on us compromises and exacted concessions, why should we, at a critical time like the present, proceed to submit our position to the Imperial Parliament, exactly as if the Provinces had been true to their pledges? I am of opinion, Mr. SPEAKER, that this is asking too much of us, and that as the Lower provinces are evidently no longer in the mind to be united with us, we French-Canadians should be greatly in the wrong if we presented our case with the same conditions as we were led to accept, in compliance with the requirements of the sister colonies. I think that both Upper and Lower Canada are now entitled to present themselves much more favorably before the Imperial Parliament, and that they may say—"These are concessions which we had made, it is true, for the sake of the common good; but the Maritime Provinces have now gone back from their engagements, and their present desire is either to remain independent or to enter the American Republic! We have done our duty, and we are still ready to remain faithful to our engagements, which we had entered into with the contracting parties; but as they gave us up, and the concessions which we made are not now held by them to be sufficient, we are come to plead our own cause before you, and to tell you that the interests of Lower Canada now require better guarantees than we had been obliged to accept from the Maritime Provinces, for the sake of coming to an amicable conclusion. We now come to request that England will be more favourable to us, and relieve us from our difficulties by making constitutional changes less disadvantageous to us." In such a case, I believe that the Imperial Government would not venture to impose a Constitution on us without our consent, but would be favourable to our wishes. That the French-Canadians are all loyal subjects of Her Britannic Majesty,

no one will doubt; but it would be an act of folly on the part of English statesmen to impose on them a Constitution which they would reject or very strongly resist. I say this out of a feeling of loyalty, for I know that there are statesmen in England who understand that the loyalty of Upper and Lower Canadians most depend on their being satisfied with their new Constitution. How would it benefit England to give us a Constitution which might suit her, as tending to perpetuate her rule in Lower Canada, but which would not be at the same time satisfactory to the majority in both Upper and Lower Canada? A spirit of discontent would be soon aroused which would cool our zeal in defending our country. This is a self-evident truth, intelligible to all the world. I trust, therefore, Mr. SPEAKER, that if the measure of Confederation is passed, it will not be forced upon us, without the present House having an opportunity of weighing its merits, and amending it. I am prepared, I confess, to go as far as any man, and to make the greatest concessions, to extricate the country from its difficulties, and come to a good understanding, that we may make sure of a Confederation with the immense advantages which it might bring with it; but I am bound to confess, when I am told, in presence of the events which have just passed, that we must submit to the conditions imposed on us by the contracting parties, who have, so soon after making it, refused to ratify it—I say that I think it wrong to tie down Lower Canada absolutely to the first conditions. I wish the extreme position which the Government have taken up in the face of the country may be productive of the greatest amount of good to it; but, for my part, Mr. SPEAKER, I cannot help thinking and confessing that I have very strong fears on that subject. It seems to me that in the present circumstances, the Government ought to have granted the fullest opportunity, both to Upper and to Lower Canada, to make such suggestions as they might think fit, and not to insist on the adoption of the scheme in its present form. By such a proceeding they would have afforded members who have amendments to move a fair and constitutional way of setting themselves right in the opinion of their fellow-countrymen, by recording them at least on the *Journals* of the House. The position in which we are placed is tantamount in its effects to the cry of "all or nothing." But, Mr. SPEAKER, I have always been averse to such a system; and if we look back to our past

history, we shall find that it has never produced aught but lamentable dissension. (Hear, hear.) What is the present cry of the Opposition as regards the scheme of Confederation? It is this: you refuse an appeal to the people; you most unjustly hurry on the debate; you deny us all opportunity of moving amendments to the plan, or recording them on the journals of the House; and you are bent on imposing on us, without our consent, a Constitution no detail of which is made known to us, and of the general tenor of which our knowledge is also very imperfect. Now, Mr. SPEAKER, I beg to ask Ministers whether it would not be infinitely better for them to quiet all these apprehensions, and silence all complaints? Why should they hurry on the debate, I do not say unconstitutionally, but I do say with dangerous precipitancy? Why should they bar the moving of any amendment to the scheme, particularly as there is nothing pressing in the occasion, and as the aspect of the question is in many respects altered from what it was previous to these late events? I shall probably be told that I am wrong in saying there is nothing pressing in the occasion; that, on the contrary, events render the immediate passing of the measure absolutely necessary; that the defence of our frontier is a question which must be settled at once—that there is not a moment to be lost. Well, Mr. SPEAKER, I acknowledge, for my part, that if I vote in favor of the scheme of Confederation, it is not out of a feeling of the necessity of setting about our defence; for hitherto I have never had a thought that the Confederation of the provinces afforded any better means of defending the frontier than that which we have at present—(hear, hear)—inasmuch as we have already all opportunity of combined action to the fullest extent under the protecting arm of England; but this seems not to have entered the minds of the authors of the scheme. But I go further than this, and assert that the discussion which is daily going on on the subject of the proposed constitutional changes is agitating the public mind very strongly. As at a former epoch of our history, such changes necessarily tend to disturb the minds of the many; and this very natural agitation is attended with its dangers, and affords another proof that constitutions are not the work of a day—that time, and even a great deal of time, is necessary to settle the foundation of the social and constitutional edifice of the best disposed of the nations. The present Constitution of Great Britain is a proof of this. That is certainly well established,

but it has taken ages to bring it to what it now is. I say, then, that we should not be in too great a hurry, so as to raise discontent among the people, but that we ought to proceed with the more care and deliberation now that, as the Ministers themselves acknowledge, we are in imminent danger of war. If we are so liable to have war, I say that we are not in the best condition to undergo a sudden change of our Constitution, and that far from placing ourselves in a good attitude of defence to meet the imminent danger, we are perhaps weakening our position, by acting too strongly or prematurely on public opinion. I say then again, that those who would force our representatives to accept the measure without amendments, for the bare reason that we must prepare to defend ourselves in arms without loss of time, are acting without justifiable or sufficient reason. I regret deeply that the previous question has been moved, so as to reduce the friends of the Government to the necessity of voting on the measure before us without being able to move any amendment, and that in the face of a total change of circumstances I pray for the forgiveness of the House for having spoken on the subject, but I considered it a duty to protest at once against the proceeding of the Government which I had not foreseen. I shall vote therefore against the motion before us, because I am in favor of amending the scheme of the Constitution, laying on the Government the whole responsibility for their conduct if they persist in denying us an opportunity of making some modifications in the present plan of Confederation.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—I am glad that the hon. member for the county of Quebec has, with his customary candor, communicated to us his apprehensions. I have listened to him with great attention, and I am certain that there is no difference between his views and ours. We are perfectly agreed. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) I knew perfectly well, Mr. SPEAKER, before I rose to give explanations to the hon. member for the county of Quebec and to the House, that the few words I have just uttered would excite the laughter of the Opposition; for the moment these hon. gentlemen see a member who is usually a supporter of the Government, rise in this House and speak with some degree of animation on any measure of the Government, they are ready to conclude, from his animation, that the hon. member is opposed to the measure. I say again, Mr. SPEAKER,

the Government is, in the present case, perfectly of the same mind as the hon. member for the county of Quebec. If they now request that the House would hasten their decision on the grand question of a Confederation of all the British Provinces of this continent (not of the two Canadas, as the hon. member for the county of Quebec terms it), it is because they are desirous, as the Hon. Attorney General for Upper Canada observed yesterday, to despatch delegates to England, to lay before the Imperial Parliament the resolutions adopted at the Conference. The Government wish to give effect to the compromise entered into between the Maritime Provinces and Canada, to enable the Imperial Government to offer their counsel to the governments of the provinces, who have backed out from their agreement, and show them that the document to which they would have their sanction is a compromise. They would prove to Great Britain that if one of the Maritime Provinces, or all of them, refuse to carry out the terms of the compromise after their solemn engagement with the Canadian Government to observe it—if, in short, they have failed to fulfil the terms of the treaty—Canada has been true to them, and desires its fulfilment. The Constitution prayed for is not a Constitution for the two Canadas only, as the hon. member for Chateauguay said it was, putting a false construction on the explanations of my hon. colleague the Attorney General for Upper Canada, but, on the contrary, a Constitution for all British North America. (Hear, hear.) If the Government now press the House for a decision, it is not to enable them to go to England and ask for a Constitution for the Canadas, under a pretext that the other contracting provinces have failed to fulfil the treaty into which they had entered. By no means, Mr. SPEAKER. I have always had the interests of Lower Canada at heart, and have guarded them more sedulously than the hon. member for Hochelaga and his partisans have ever done.

A MEMBER—A proof of that is your sending the seat of government to Ottawa!

HON. ATTY GEN. CARTIER—Well, Mr. SPEAKER, I do not hesitate to maintain that that question of the seat of government was decided favorably for Lower Canada. I have always maintained this, and I will maintain it always and against all comers. I now come to the observations of the hon. member for the county of Quebec. This is

what the Government propose to do: We shall represent to the Imperial Government that Canada consented to compromises and sacrifices, and that the Lower Provinces failed in the fulfilment of their part of the treaty at the last moment. We shall entreat the Imperial Government to offer their advice to the governments of those provinces, and we entertain a hope that the influence which England necessarily exercises over those colonies will have the effect of inducing them to reflect on their proceeding with reference to us. I pray the honorable member for the county of Quebec to lay aside his fears. I assure him that not a single member of the Government has the slightest intention of asking Great Britain to legislate on the Address which we are to present, and to pass a Constitution for the two Canadas. Our whole intention is to lay before the Government of the Mother Country our position, as it now is, in consequence of the breaking of the treaty by the Maritime Provinces, in order that they may bring some pressure to bear on them to bring about the Federal union which was designed. Even though the legislatures of those provinces should rue the part they took in the plan of Confederation, the adoption of it would be only a question of time; for probably within twelve months they will amend their decision and accept the compromise. We say that as far as we are concerned, we can do neither more nor less than carry out the compromise; that we are desirous of acquitting ourselves of the duty we owe to the Imperial Government, as they thought fit to sanction it in the despatch laid before this House, as well as by the honorable mention made of it in Her Most Gracious Majesty's Speech from the Throne. It is of consequence, I say, that we should show the Imperial Government that Canada, which contains more than three-fourths of the population of all the provinces on this continent, has not failed to fulfil her part in the compromise, but that the Maritime Provinces it is which have broken their sworn engagement, and that if the compromise is not to be carried into effect, English supremacy over the American colonies may at no distant day be endangered. We trust that all these considerations may have a salutary effect, that they will dissipate the unfounded apprehensions of the Maritime Provinces, and that hereafter the Constitution, based on the compromise which we

shall submit to the Imperial Government, will bear sway over the several English provinces on this continent, united in one great Confederation. (Hear, hear.) I can assure the hon. member for the county of Quebec, therefore, that the only purpose of the Government of which I am a member, in urging forward the adoption of the scheme submitted to the House, is to despatch it to England in order that the Imperial Parliament may merely sanction the letter of the measure. The Government never had a thought of taking the House and the people by surprise. If we were to go to England and pray for a Constitution different from that which is mentioned in the Address, we should be branded with disgrace, and deservedly so, and should render ourselves unworthy of the position which we now fill. These reasons are sufficient, I think, to shew that there is not so much difference between the opinion of the Government and that of the hon. member for the county of Quebec, as that hon. gentleman supposes. We are agreed on the point to which he takes exception; and as he has declared that he would vote in favor of the new Constitution if the Maritime Provinces continued to be parties to it, I have reason to trust that he will do so, as the Government will be in no way bound to abide by that Constitution, unless the other contracting parties shall accept it.

MR. POWELL—I must express my deep regret, Mr. SPEAKER, that the leader of the House should have been induced to submit to the House a motion of the character of that which you hold in your hands. (Hear, hear.) I distinctly avow myself a friend of the Administration, and as one anxious to assist them in carrying out the important scheme they have undertaken; and while according to them the fullest confidence, I must express my regret that their course in relation to this question, in this House, has certainly not been what I would have advised or been inclined to support. They selected their own mode, in the first place, as regards the manner in which this debate should be conducted, and from that mode they have departed. I did feel that when, as between the Opposition and the Government, there was something in the nature of a compact, that compact should be carried out. (Hear, hear.) I think the Opposition has its rights and privileges, and is especially entitled to have these respected by the Government, who have

so powerful a majority at their back. (Hear, hear.) When the Government departed from the understanding originally come to, as to the way in which the debate should be conducted, I believed that that departure was in the interests of the House and in the interests of the public. I do not hesitate to say it had my approbation, as far as my individual opinion was concerned. But, notwithstanding that it had my approbation, as tending to the convenience of the House and the advantage of the public, I did not feel that the Government were justified, so long as the Opposition were dissenting parties, in departing from the original understanding. That was my first ground of objection; and I think, in the present instance, the Government are taking a still more extraordinary course. I do not know whether a case can be found in the records of our own House, or of the English House of Commons, where the leader of the House has availed himself of technical rules to prevent a question being fairly presented.

HON. MR. DORION—To move the previous question to his own motion!

MR. POWELL—I do not know if such a thing is usual, or if a precedent can be cited for it. All I can say is, that if a precedent can be cited, I regret extremely that such a course should be adopted on the present occasion. We are here engaged in the discussion of a great constitutional question, with regard to which the Administration have submitted to us the resolutions of the Conference—I do not say of self-constituted delegates, or that they acted without the sanction of the people—but certainly they have taken upon themselves a great responsibility, which I readily admit they have well fulfilled, and I am quite prepared to endorse their course, in the framing of this scheme, from beginning to end. They first of all adopt those resolutions at the Conference, and they then come down to this House and say: "Accept them in their entirety, without amendment, without variation, or the scheme falls to the ground." That may be all very well. It may be all very well to deny the right of an appeal to the people. It may be all very well for us as a Legislature to arrogate to ourselves the right to change our whole constitutional system. That may be all very well. But, by this motion of the Hon. Attorney General West, they stop any gentlemen who dissent from their views from putting their

opinions on record. (Hear, hear.) I think that is going a little too far, and it is as a friend of the Administration that I express that opinion.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—We do not require your advice.

MR. POWELL—The hon. gentleman may accept it or not, as he pleases.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—I do not accept it.

MR. POWELL—Then he may take the other alternative. I think the House and the country have extended an enormous degree of consideration to this Government, but I tell the hon. gentlemen that if they continue the course they are now pursuing, a reaction will take place in the House and the country. (Hear, hear.) I hope that this House is not to drop down into being the mere echo of the Executive—so that we shall not have opinions of our own at all, or be allowed to offer any advice whatever to the Executive. If the hon. gentleman accepts these remarks in a hostile spirit, he may do so. All I can say is that I do not mean them to be so received. But I consider the course taken by the Government this afternoon is a most extraordinary one. The reason assigned is, that hon. gentlemen opposite have been offering a factious opposition, and that they intend to continue it by moving motion after motion. But even if they do, I ask, can that involve above a couple of weeks more of discussion? And I say that it is not for the credit or the character of the Government, that to shorten the discussion they should take such a course as this. I believe they have undertaken the great work they have in hand in a most patriotic spirit. I believe that my hon. friend—though he rejects my advice—is animated in the course he is taking by a purely patriotic spirit. But, while I believe that, I think he ought to accord to me the right of expressing my opinion as to the mode in which this debate should be conducted. I do not know whether the friends of the Administration are to be gagged as well as its opponents—(laughter)—whether it is intended that we shall all be prevented from expressing our views. But I do trust the leader of the Government will withdraw this motion—(hear, hear)—which is unworthy of him, when he has in hand this grand and magnificent project. He has all the advantages he can wish on his side, and I would advise him to avail himself of those advantages, and not to give—by pursuing a course

that is certainly unusual, extraordinary, and unprecedented—the enemies of this great scheme the opportunity of saying that it was forced down the throats of this Legislature and of the people of this country. (Hear, hear.) I believe that he has the people at his back—that they endorse his scheme—that they are fully with him—and that the large majority of this House truly represent the feelings and wishes of the people in endorsing the scheme. (Hear, hear.) I say, therefore, that he can well afford to be magnanimous and liberal to the Opposition—who are feeble in numbers, though energetic in the stand they take—and that he can carry out this scheme without having to call to his aid the technical rules of the House. (Hear, hear.)

HON. J. H. CAMERON—I desire to inquire whether the motion for the “previous question” made by the Government, if carried, will throw any impediment in the way of the resolution of which I have given notice? Of course I know that it can be moved; but if a discussion arises upon it, I am afraid we shall not reach a vote upon it until the session is closed. I hope the word of promise is not to be kept to the ear and broken to the hope.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—I have no desire to choke off the honorable gentleman's resolution in any way. He will have an opportunity of moving and pressing his motion after the resolutions have been adopted.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—But it is quite clear that the moving of the previous question shuts off all amendments.

HON. J. H. CAMERON—My motion is not proposed as an amendment. I propose to move it after a decision has been come to on the question now before the House. It is for the purpose of having an expression of the people's will upon the Address, before it is sent to the Imperial authorities.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—Well, that is an amendment, but I will not argue the point just now.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—I do not know that I can claim, like my honorable friend from Carleton (Mr. POWELL), to be a friend of the Government, and so any advice that I may offer will not be considered as coming from a warm friend of theirs; but I apprehend that I do entertain that kind of friendly feeling for the Hon. Attorney General West that would induce me to advise him most strongly against the course he has been induced to adopt, had my advice been asked. I can scarcely think that that honorable

gentleman would have adopted the policy which he has become a party to, unless he had been urged on to it by his colleagues in the Government. I am very well aware that those who are in the habit of talking most loudly of the rights and liberties of the people, when they find themselves in places of position and power, may frequently forget those rights. (Hear, hear.) I am quite satisfied that if the Honorable President of the Council had been in opposition just now, we would have heard the course that is now adopted by the Government called the grossest tyranny and worst kind of outrage that could have been perpetrated upon a free Parliament such as ours. (Hear, hear.) And not only would we have heard such language on the floor of this House, but through that engine in Toronto which he moves with so much power, we should have had it sent throughout the whole country. There would not have been a man who voted for it who would not have been held up as the greatest foe to the rights and liberties of the people that could be imagined. (Hear, hear.) And now we find that hon. gentleman endeavoring to stifle, not exactly the discussion of the question, for we cannot be deprived of the right of speech, but to stifle the expression of the opinion of the House with reference to the merits of this scheme in the only way it could be effective and valuable, and in a proper parliamentary manner. The motion now made prevents our taking the sense of the House as to whether some modification of the scheme might not be adopted, or some other plan of union agreed upon that would prove more advantageous. I have given notice of an amendment that I intended proposing in favor of a legislative union of the provinces, with provisions that the laws, the language, and the religion of Lower Canada should not be interfered with; that no legislation should take place for that section, unless that legislation was originated by a member from Lower Canada, and should not become law unless carried by a majority of the representatives from that section of the country. I propose those provisions in order that the rights of Lower Canadians might be fully protected, and that their institutions should not be in danger of destruction, and that they might have no opportunity of saying that a change of this kind was desired for their injury rather than for their benefit, as well as for the best interests of the provinces at large. I had intended to take the sense of the House upon this proposition, mainly for the reason that a legislative union

would be more economical and more stable. The commissioners who were sent out to Canada by the Imperial Government to ascertain what defences were required, and what they would cost, reported that £1,300,000 sterling would be sufficient for the purpose. I find the local governments to be created under this Federal scheme are to receive for their working expenses no less a sum than \$3,981,914; so that in two years, if the expenses of these local governments were saved to the country, they would amount to a sufficient sum to construct all the defences that are said to be necessary for the protection of the country against attack from any quarter. But we are not to have the opportunity, it seems, of taking the sense of this House as to whether that would be better than the scheme submitted for our adoption. And we are also prevented from ascertaining whether the people of Canada approve of the scheme or not. It would seem that the Honorable Attorney General West, for whose ability I entertain a very high degree of respect, has forgotten the conservative character that he has heretofore so nobly maintained upon the floor of this House, and in forgetting that character, that he has also forgotten the rights and liberties of the people. I am not surprised that those rights and liberties should have been forgotten and trampled upon by the Honorable President of the Council and the Honorable Provincial Secretary. They have been too loud-mouthed in their pretended championship of those rights in times past to render them above suspicion of forsaking them now; but I am surprised that the Honorable Attorney General West should go with them in stifling the voice of the people. (Hear, hear.) And I am very sorry to hear it stated that members of the Government are to go to England, there to appear carrying as it were from the people of this country to the Imperial Government, opinions favorable to Confederation. Now in truth they will not do so. They cannot do so in point of fact, because they have not taken the sense of the people, and have refused even to allow Parliament to say whether or not the scheme shall be referred to the people, or whether some other scheme would not be more acceptable, and much better in every way, than the one now under consideration. They find that the people of the Lower Provinces are strongly opposed to the scheme, and yet they propose to go home and ask the Imperial Government to carry out the measure, though they well know it cannot

be enforced upon the people of the Lower Provinces. If the great urgency which they profess to see for the carrying out of this scheme arises from a desire to have the defences made secure, why do not they ask Parliament for power to place the country in a proper position of defence? Why do not they ask for that if it is so urgently demanded, and leave this great Confederation question in abeyance until the people in all parts of the country have had fair opportunity of understanding it in every point of view. They have not yet had that opportunity, and I think the honorable gentlemen on the Treasury benches, in depriving them of that opportunity, and especially in doing it in the manner in which they are now doing, have taken a course which will redound to their own and to the country's disadvantage. The people only require to be awakened to the course that is being pursued, to understand that these opinions and views are to be disregarded, or are of no consequence, to call forth that sentence of condemnation which will hurl honorable gentlemen on the Treasury benches from place and power, and cause names honored in the past, to sink into dishonored oblivion. If the proper steps had been taken, gentlemen from Lower Canada would never have been able to say that representation by population could not be safely given to Upper Canada, and would have no grounds for fearing that their rights would not be protected, and that therefore they must reject it. If they refused to grant representation according to population when full provision is offered them for the protection of their institutions, it would be without other reason than that of the sulky woman or the spoiled child, and I do not believe that the representatives of the people of Lower Canada are made up of that kind of stuff. They only wish to be assured that their rights are not to be interfered with. If they desired more, let them reflect that the hon. member for Montmorency (Hon. Mr. CAUCHON) in addressing the House the other evening, instanced the position in which the English House of Lords stood when the country was in danger of being plunged into a revolution by their resistance to a just popular demand. He gave us to understand that that body might have been swept away before the indignation of the people, if it had not yielded to the pressure and allowed the Reform Bill to pass. If that was the case in reference to so strong and highly respected a body as the English House of Lords, let them reflect upon what might be the result of

resisting a legislative union and forcing a scheme so expensive as the present one, so full of elements of contention and dissolution, upon the people of Canada. If the people of Lower Canada, comparatively few in numbers, with the Government to aid them, continue to persist in refusing to give the people of Upper Canada that which is their right, and which can do no wrong to any other portion of the country, perhaps they will find that the people of these provinces will take the same stand that endangered the House of Lords, in England, and the same results follow, and then it will be too late to ask or offer terms. The Honorable Attorney General West ought not to have allowed a free expression of the views of the members of this House to be stifled in the way that it is now being done. The Government ought to have allowed the amendment to be put respecting which I have given notice, and also that providing for taking the sense of the people. Perhaps it was thought that the motion to be made by the honorable member for Peel (Hon. Mr. CAMERON) would answer the purpose as well; but it cannot do so, because it is not to be proposed until after this scheme has been carried. That amendment, to be of any service to the purpose I had in view, ought to be made before these resolutions are voted upon. After the House has expressed itself in favor of the resolutions, the representatives become leaders to the people. They should lead us, but we should then be leading them by seeming to pronounce our opinion on the subject beforehand in favor of Federal union, although I am satisfied that a majority, or at all events a very respectable minority of this House, is not in favor of the scheme now presented, and most of the honorable gentlemen who have spoken have declared a preference for legislative union. If the scheme is forced through the House under this motion for the previous question, no amendments being allowed to be placed on record, it will not appear to the Imperial authorities that there is that great amount of dissatisfaction with the scheme which is well known to exist, nor will it appear to them that any other scheme might have proved more satisfactory to the people, giving, in their opinion, greater stability of government, economy in management, and a means of maintaining our connection with the British Crown by better and stronger bonds, than is likely to be the case with a Federal Government. For these reasons Mr. SPEAKER, I repeat that I sincerely regret that the Honorable Attorney General West has been led to make the motion

which has been placed in your hands. (Cheers.)

HON. MR. McDOUGALL—I am not surprised, Mr. SPEAKER, that honorable gentlemen who are opposed to the policy of the Government on this question, and desirous of overthrowing it, should feel a little disappointment at the course that has been announced to-day. But I cannot understand how honorable gentlemen who are friendly to that policy, and desire that it should prevail, should, at this stage of the discussion, find fault with the course of proceeding which we have felt it our duty to propose. Sir, we have been discussing this question now for nearly four weeks, and I am sure no honorable member will venture to deny that the discussion has, for the last ten days, dragged very heavily; that there has been a marked disinclination on the part of honorable gentlemen opposite to go on with it.

HON. MR. DORION—No, no.

HON. MR. McDOUGALL—The honorable gentleman says "No," but the fact is that adjournments have been moved several times as early as half-past nine o'clock, because no honorable gentleman was ready or inclined to speak against the measure.

HON. MR. DORION—Only once, and that on account of the illness of the honorable member for Brome.

HON. MR. McDOUGALL—The honorable gentleman is mistaken. On another occasion the honorable member for Hochelaga himself moved the adjournment at an early hour, because his friends were not ready to go on with the discussion, and hon. members who were in favor of the scheme have several times been obliged to speak, when they were not disposed to do so, in order to fill up the time and drag the discussion along. Well, sir, the Honorable Attorney General West stated to the House yesterday, in such terms that no one could have misunderstood him, that the Government felt it to be their duty to avail themselves of every parliamentary expedient for the purpose of ascertaining the opinion of this House upon the question as promptly as possible. To-day the announcement has been repeated, and good and sufficient reasons given for the adoption of this policy. The hon. members for Carleton and for North Ontario complain that there has been a departure from the usual practice of this House in making this motion, and charge us with stifling discussion; but these honorable gentlemen surely do not need to be informed that this motion does not stop the debate. The House can discuss the "pre-

vious question" to any extent. Strictly, perhaps, honorable members are limited to giving reasons why the question should not now be put, but among those reasons are all the arguments yet to be adduced, *pro* and *con*, on the main motion.

MR. POWELL—Then what good will it do?

HON. MR. McDOUGALL—The good it will do is this: it will prevent factious and irrelevant amendments, and enable us to get a decisive expression of the opinion of the House upon the real question before it. (Hear, hear.) It is all very well for the honorable member for North Ontario to tell us that he wishes to propose his scheme of a legislative union, with local legislation controlled by the members of each province; but sir, it happens that he occupies a seat on that side of the House, and not on this. It is the duty of the Government, who are responsible to Parliament and to the people, to propose their measures, and if the honorable gentleman can convince the House that those measures are not adapted to the circumstances and interests of the country, we shall be obliged to leave this side of the House, and then the honorable gentleman from North Ontario can come over here and submit his scheme to Parliament. (Hear, hear.) But as we are here, and have taken it upon us to submit these resolutions, we are determined to obtain as early as possible (without, however, preventing any honorable member from expressing his views upon them) a vote of this House. The outcry raised by gentlemen opposite against the propositions of the Government to facilitate the discussion by giving the whole time of the House to it, proves that delay is their real object. If they have any arguments to offer against the scheme, they have had ample opportunity to present them. They have thought proper to talk of everything but the merits or demerits of the scheme itself, until the patience of this House, and I think also of the country, is exhausted. I am happy to believe that a very considerable majority of the members of this House are ready and willing to vote yea on the question, and they ought not to be any longer detained from doing so, especially in view of circumstances that have arisen on this as well as on the other side of the Atlantic, to which my colleague the Hon. Attorney General has already directed the attention of the House.

HON. MR. EVANTUREL—I understood that the Government had stated that the question of Confederation was an open one.

I never understood that they had stated that amendments could not be proposed. It was to be treated not as a party question, but the fullest latitude was to be allowed, as if in committee of the whole; but now the Government shuts down upon friends as well as opponents. I think their course most illogical, and I would like to have the Hon. Provincial Secretary explain it.

HON. MR. McDUGALL—I apprehend there are few honorable gentlemen in the House whose impressions on the subject are similar to those of the honorable gentleman. (Hear, hear.) It was fully understood by the House that the scheme was brought before Parliament as the result of the Conference of all the colonial governments, and as a Government measure. I think, sir, it was further distinctly stated that being in the nature of a treaty, it was absurd to suppose that it would be competent for any of the legislatures to amend the scheme, because the moment the door is thrown open to amendments in one legislature, the same privilege would be claimed by each of the others. What kind of a scheme would it be after each legislature had tinkered it to suit its own views, and what length of time does the honorable gentleman think it would take to arrive at a common agreement if that course were pursued? In the very nature of things, whether this is the best or the worst scheme that could have been devised, we cannot get around the fact that it is of the nature of a treaty, and, therefore, must be voted upon by a simple yea and nay. (Hear, hear.) It is in that view that the Government have submitted it to this House, and it is upon that view that the verdict of this House must be pronounced. As I have already stated, the determination to which the Government has come is to press the main motion, pure and simple, upon the attention of the House, and to use every legitimate parliamentary means to get a decision, and by that decision we are prepared to stand or fall. I hope there will be no misunderstanding on the part of honorable members. It is not the intention of the Government, in any manner, to deprive honorable gentlemen of the opportunity—the fullest opportunity—of expressing their views on this scheme. But what we do intend to prevent, if we can, is the attempt to divert the attention of the House from the resolutions of the Conference to propositions like that of the honorable member for North Ontario, who desires to submit another and a totally different scheme, which he knows well must be rejected by every member of the proposed Con-

federation. This proposition must be discussed, if discussed at all, in some other way than as an amendment to, or substitute for, the scheme of the Quebec Conference.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—I think, sir, that the large majority of the members of this House will agree with me that the proposition made by the leader of the Government to prevent amendments being submitted by moving “the previous question,” has taken us all by surprise. I think this House should hold this step to be a gross breach of the understanding which was entered into at the time it was agreed that the House should be considered as in committee of the whole, with you, sir, in the chair. For it was then fully understood that though no amendment would be allowed to be adopted, if the Government could prevent it, yet there would be no objection to their being moved in the ordinary way. It was therefore understood that this House was, for all practical purposes, in Committee of the Whole, and as “the previous question” could not be moved in Committee of the Whole, it was consequently out of order to move it now. I would ask hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, if they did not solemnly enter into a compact of that nature with this House? If they committed an error in deciding to retain the SPEAKER in the chair on the conditions referred to, they are now taking advantage of their own wrong. Sir, the Opposition proper have abstained from placing on the paper any notice of amendments. They found that several amendments which embraced their views were to be moved by gentlemen who were friendly to the Administration. Those gentlemen could not suppose for a moment that their motions were to be choked off, whatever might be the intention of the Government in relation to similar amendments if proposed from this side of the House. But “the previous question,” thus moved, applies ruthlessly to friends and foes. To quote the language of the honorable member for Carleton:—“It is now quite clear that they (the Government) are going to put the same gag on their friends that they devised for their opponents.” (Hear, hear.) Let us enquire who are those who compose the Administration, and who, after violating their solemn agreement, now venture to trample upon the rights and privileges of the representatives of the people in this House? I need only remark that nine members of this Government, and who were in the Administration before the Coali-

tion was formed, had a vote of want of confidence recorded against them by this same House, for acts of malfeasance, which must be fresh in the memory of honorable members, since which time they have evaded an appeal to the country in order to test whether their new and strange combination would be ratified by the people. And these gentlemen who have hatched up a coalition, by inviting three members of the then Opposition to join them on the most monstrous terms ever known in any country, are at this moment proposing to ask this House for a vote of credit, and for plenipotentiary powers to authorize them in England to speak for the people of Canada. My hon. friend from West York (Hon. Mr. HOWLAND) stands in a different position from his two reform colleagues. He came generously to the aid of his friends who first joined the Coalition, but he stipulated that he must first go to his constituents. On a reference to his speech at the hustings, it will be found he said in effect, that the scheme of Confederation was now before the country—that he knew no more about it than they did themselves, and that he must say there were features in the scheme which he did not like. I acquit him of being in the same category with hon. gentlemen who have been voted down by this House, because he has obtained by his election a *quasi* authority to deal with this grave subject. But what have the others attempted to do, Mr. SPEAKER? How different is their conduct and their practice to-day from what they promised would be their conduct towards the House at the commencement of the debate! And how widely have they strayed from the programme laid down at the time the Coalition was formed! I shall read for the information of the House what were the views of the hon. member for South Oxford in 1864, when he stampeded himself, and took with him a large portion of the reform party to the enemy's camp so unexpectedly, and upon so short a notice:—

Mr. BROWN asked what the Government proposed as a remedy for the injustice complained of by Upper Canada, and as a settlement of the sectional trouble. Mr. MACDONALD and Mr. GALT replied that their remedy was a Federal union of all the British North American Provinces, local matters being committed to local bodies, and matters common to all, to a general legislature constituted on the well-understood principles of Federal Government. Mr. BROWN rejoined that this would not be acceptable to the people of Upper Canada as a remedy for existing evils; that he believed that Federation of all the Prov-

inces ought to come, and would come about ere long, but it had not yet been thoroughly considered by the people—(hear, hear)—and even were this otherwise, there were so many parties to be consulted, that its adoption was uncertain and remote. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. BROWN—What is the date of that?

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—The hon. gentleman knows very well that it is found in the ministerial explanations at the close of last session, little more than six months ago. Mark the words, Mr. SPEAKER. Mr. BROWN then stated that Federation had not been considered by the people, and that its adoption was therefore uncertain and remote. Is it because he found a good opportunity of getting into power, and because he visited the Lower Provinces, and negotiated, and got explanations from them, that the period so remote six months ago must now be considered immediate? He substitutes the word “immediate”—for “remote” a most extraordinary perversion of words:—

Mr. BROWN was then asked what his remedy was, when he stated that the measure acceptable to Upper Canada would be parliamentary reform based on population, without regard to a separating line between Upper and Lower Canada. To this both Mr. MACDONALD and Mr. GALT stated that it was impossible for them to accede, or for any Government to carry such a measure, and that unless a basis could be found on the Federation principle suggested by the report of Mr. BROWN's committee, it did not appear to them likely that any thing could be settled.

Further on I read:—

Mr. BROWN accordingly waited on the Governor General, and on his return the memorandum approved by Council and by the Governor General was handed to him, and another interview appointed for 6 P. M., Mr. BROWN stating that he did not feel at liberty either to accept or reject the proposal without consulting with his friends.

In that memorandum I find the following passages:—

The Government are prepared to state that immediately after the prorogation, they will address themselves, in the most earnest manner, to the negotiation for a Confederation of all the British North American Provinces.

That failing a successful issue to such negotiations, they are prepared to pledge themselves to legislation during the next session of Parliament—(hear, hear)—for the purpose of remedying existing difficulties by introducing the Federal principle for Canada alone, coupled with such provisions as will permit the Maritime Provinces and

the North Western Territory to be hereafter incorporated into the Canadian system.

Then the record proceeds:—

Shortly after six o'clock the parties met at the same place, when Mr. BROWN stated, that without communicating the contents of the confidential paper entrusted to him, he had seen a sufficient number of his friends to warrant him in expressing the belief that the bulk of his friends would, as a compromise, accept a measure for the Federative Union of Canada, with provision for the future admission of the Maritime Colonies and the North West Territory. To this it was replied that the Administration could not consent to waive the larger question; but after considerable discussion, an amendment to the original proposal was agreed to in the following terms, subject to the approval, on Monday, of the Cabinet and of His Excellency:—

"The Government are prepared to pledge themselves to bring in a measure, next session, for the purpose of removing existing difficulties, by introducing the Federal principle into Canada, coupled with such provision as will permit the Maritime Provinces and the North West Territory to be incorporated into the same system of Government."

The language of these quotations cannot be misunderstood; for nothing can be clearer than that the smaller scheme, that is, the scheme for the Federation of Upper and Lower Canada, was then promised and contemplated as the one which was to precede that now under consideration. Again I quote from a speech of the Premier made in the other House on the introduction of the resolutions now before us:—

The honorable member (Hon. Sir, E. P. TACHÉ) here gave a history of the several changes until the MACDONALD-DORION Administration died, as he stated, of absolute weakness, falling under the weight they were unable to carry. Their successors (the TACHÉ-MACDONALD Government) were not more successful, and being defeated, were thinking of appealing to the country, which they might have done with more or less success, gaining a constituency here and perhaps losing another elsewhere. They had assumed the charge of affairs with an understanding that they would have a right to this appeal, and while they were consulting about it, they received an intimation from the real chief of the Opposition (Mr. BROWN), through one of their own friends, to the effect that he was desirous of making overtures to them with the view of seeking to accommodate the difficulties. The honorable gentlemen and some of his friends then came into contact with the leaders of the Government, and it was agreed between them to try to devise a scheme which would put an end to the misunderstandings, and at the same time secure for Canada and the other provinces a position which would ensure their future safety, and procure them the respect and confidence of other na-

tions. They arranged a large scheme and a smaller one. If the larger failed, then they were to fall back upon the minor, which provided for a Federation of the two sections of the province.

Here is a recent declaration by the Premier that they had arranged a large scheme and a smaller one. Is it not important to us in Upper Canada to know what the nature of the latter scheme is? Assuredly, it is not too much to ask that the little scheme should be left with us, while they run away to Downing-street with the large one. We might be profitably employed in the meantime in digesting the various details which promise so much solace and contentment, and which for ever is to settle all sectional difficulties between Upper and Lower Canada. I hope the supporters of the Administration will insist at once upon the smaller bantling being left with us,—this House agreeing to pay all expense of its care and protection during their absence. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) Instead, therefore, of fulfilling their promise they boldly propose to their reform followers the scheme which the hon. member for South Oxford had declared to be premature, and which six months ago he insisted must be postponed to a remote period. It is scarcely possible to find words sufficiently strong to characterize in proper terms so flagrant a breach of a compact as the one which I have been describing. It was of course well known, last summer, that the several legislatures of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island had contemplated a legislative union of their provinces, and a resolution was passed by each body authorizing delegates to be appointed from their respective governments to meet for that object. Charlottetown having been selected as the place of meeting, the several delegates assembled there. Instead of permitting that Convention quietly to arrange a scheme such as was contemplated by their legislatures, and permit reasonable time for its promulgation, or a declaration of its failure to be made, the gentlemen on the Treasury benches bethought themselves of a plan by which to scatter the Charlottetown delegates, caring nothing for the disappointment which such an attack must have necessarily created among the people of the sister provinces. I blush to think that a fearful responsibility attaches to this Government for their interference with an arrangement which was to make the Maritime Provinces one people. But not satisfied with their visit to Charlottetown and breaking up the scheme which was

being discussed there, they now coolly ask us to give them authority to proceed to Downing-street to report the utter failure of their own grand scheme, which, as I remarked in a former debate, they yet hope to manufacture into a live constitution for these distracted provinces, through Downing-street influence. (Hear, hear.) It is well known that our financial condition is truly alarming, and instead of proceeding with the legislation of the several measures now before the House, and submitting, according to custom, the Budget, so that the real condition of our affairs may be fully exhibited to the people, the gentlemen on the Treasury benches have suddenly come to the conclusion, not only to withhold this important information, but, forsooth, we are asked to pass a vote of credit to be accounted for at the next session. A prorogation is shortly to follow, and the country will be left in a state of uncertainty as to its future, until it shall please these gentlemen to return from their mission. When we consider the effect which the blandishments of the Treasury benches but too frequently produce upon members sent to this House to carry out certain avowed principles and measures; when we see the class to which I allude violating the promises made to their constituents and going over "body and bones" to a Government they were elected specially to oppose, we need not be astonished shortly to learn that influences and blandishments in higher quarters will have the like effect on the gentlemen opposite when abroad, who will ever be ready to find a plausible excuse for any gross betrayal of the trusts reposed in them by pliant and subservient followers. The avowed object for the immediate prorogation of the session is the imminent danger which threatens this province, and yet we are kept in the dark as to the real cause for alarm. We are told, however, that a large outlay, but the amount is not stated, is to be devoted to fortifying certain portions of Canada by the Home Government; and that we are to be asked to contribute an unknown sum of money towards the same object. But when we ask for more definite information, we are met by the assurance that it would not be for the public interest to afford further information just now. We are told to wait patiently and to be content with the fact that certain gentlemen on the Treasury benches are to proceed to England with the view of arranging the amount to be appropriated by Canada for its defence, and towards the maintenance of a more effective militia or-

ganization then we have heretofore been called upon to make. I maintain, sir, that the understanding in respect to such contributions could be as well arrived at by means of dispatches and correspondence between this Government and the Colonial Office. (Hear, hear.) I protest against the transference of the negotiations on these matters to Downing-street, before we obtain some more satisfactory replies to the questions we have addressed to the gentlemen on the Treasury benches. The representatives of a people overburdened with heavy taxes, have a right to insist on knowing the limit beyond which the gentlemen on the Treasury benches should not consent to make this province liable. We know that it is a difficult matter to obtain money in England at present, and we are not even informed of the terms on which the Finance Minister is now borrowing. We have had no information upon this question. We are kept in ignorance of the position in which we are to be placed. Now, I think that the policy of the people of this country should be to vote what they think they can bear, and no more. There is no member of this House, there is no man in this country, I believe, who is unwilling to give his quota of taxes for the work of defence; but there must be a limit to everything. (Hear, hear.) The principle laid down by three of the honorable gentlemen on the Treasury Benches whom I now see on the other side of the House, when with myself they were members of a former administration, is as sound now as it was then; and if the force of the American army two years ago was not such as to induce us to recommend, by way of guarding against danger from that quarter, large outlays for defence, I do not see why my old colleagues should now consent to entertain a proposal involving an enormous sum of money at the present time. Now, I shall read extracts from a Minute of Council, dated 28th October 1862, in reply to the Duke of NEWCASTLE's suggestion that we should raise fifty thousand volunteers:—

The proposal of His Grace to organize and drill not less than 50,000 men is not now for the first time presented to the province. The measure prepared by the late Government and rejected by the Legislature, contemplated the formation of a force to that extent, and Your Excellency's advisers cannot disguise their opinion that the province is averse to the maintenance of a force which would seriously derange industry and tax its resources to a degree justifiable only in periods of imminent danger or actual war. The people

of Canada doing nothing to produce a rupture with the United States, and having no knowledge of any intention on the part of Her Majesty's Government to pursue a policy from which so dire a calamity would proceed, are unwilling to impose upon themselves extraordinary burthens. They feel that, should war occur, it will be produced by no act of theirs, and they have no inclination to do anything that may seem to fore-shadow, perhaps to provoke a state of things which would be disastrous to every interest of the province.

This was the opinion of the honorable gentlemen only two years ago. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—How many of them are on the Treasury benches now?

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—I have already said that there are three of those gentlemen there. (Hear, hear.) Well, to go on a little further, His Grace recommended direct taxation, to which we replied:—

Without entering into a discussion of the relative merits of direct or indirect taxation, Your Excellency's advisers feel that it would not be prudent, suddenly or to any large extent, to impose direct taxation for military purposes. This is not the occasion for adopting a principle hitherto unknown in the fiscal policy of the province, and assuredly this is not the time for plunging into an experiment for which the people of the province are unprepared. No more serious mistake can be committed than to conduct an argument upon the supposition that the ability of the Canadian people to sustain taxation is greater than has hitherto been acknowledged in the fiscal arrangements of the Government.

And I may remark that the condition of the country at this moment is much more calamitous than when this report was made. When the hon. member for South Oxford (Hon. Mr. BROWN) was on his feet a few minutes ago, he spoke of the prosperity of the merchants in Upper Canada, and said the condition of the country was not such as to justify the remarks of the hon. member for Chateauguay (Hon. Mr. HOLTON). Sir, he forgot to speak of the situation of the farmers, of which I shall speak presently more at length. This report goes on further to say:—

The wealth of the country is in its lands. If the people are in the enjoyment of comparative wealth, it is so invested as to be not readily available for the production of a large money income. Your Excellency's advisers believe that no government could exist that would attempt to carry out the suggestion of His Grace for the purpose designed.

That was the language of our Government when asked to train fifty thousand men and

to familiarise them to the use of arms. (Hear, hear.) I feel that the pressure which has been brought to bear upon the Imperial Government by the GOLDWIN SMITH politicians—by the Manchester School—to get rid of the colonies, is having its effect. The telegram received to-day indicates that the burden of the defences is to be borne by the colonies, as the telegram now before me states:—

* Earl RUSSELL regretted the discussion, and stated that the Government declined to make any movement while the Canadians declined to take measures themselves; but as they now showed a different disposition, the Government comes forward to assist them.

Mr. SPEAKER, I ask this House, if the honorable gentlemen on the Treasury benches have made any proposals to the Home Government, whether we are not entitled to know what they are? I say that we ought not to leave this House till we have advised them in this matter—till the opinion of this House, representing the people of this country, has been elicited. (Hear, hear.) We are the persons who ought to advise them in this matter; and without seeking that advice, they are taking a step in advance of their legitimate duty. (Hear, hear.) The Duke of NEWCASTLE asked us in the same despatch to place the money required for increased military organisation in Canada beyond the domain of Parliament! Such a proposal was met in fitting terms, becoming a people enjoying British freedom. We could not submit it to Parliament, and we did not. It was said in the same despatch that the credit of the country was endangered in the markets of Europe, and that if we were willing to show that we were prepared to defend ourselves, if we went to this vast outlay, we would materially assist in the maintenance of our credit abroad. Our reply to that was, that—

The maintenance of the provincial credit abroad is undoubtedly an object which the administrators of the affairs of the province should at any cost accomplish. Your Excellency's advisers submit that their various measures demonstrate the sincerity with which they are striving to preserve the public credit unimpaired. They contend, however, that not the least important of the agencies to be employed to this end is the exhibition of a due regard to the means at the command of the province. They hold that they are more likely to retain the confidence of European capitalists by carefully adjusting expenditure to income, than by embarking in schemes, however

landable in themselves, beyond the available resources of the Canadian people.

[It being six o'clock, the SPEAKER left the chair before the honorable gentleman concluded his remarks.]

After the recess,

HON. MR. HOLTON said—With the consent of my hon. friend from Cornwall, I desire, before the debate is renewed, to call the attention of the Hon. Attorney General West to the matter of the previous question which he has moved—to recall to his recollection the statements that were made when the agreement was come to that this debate should be conducted in all respects as if the House were in Committee of the Whole, and to appeal to his sense of justice to adhere to the letter and spirit of that agreement. It will be remembered that, on behalf of hon. gentlemen sitting on this side of the House, I objected very strongly to the proposition to consider these resolutions as a single resolution, and insisted that they were of a nature that required them to be considered in Committee of the Whole House. The hon. the leader of the Government objected to that on this ground. He said that the resolutions were a treaty—I do not think the position sound, but I am not combating that just now—and that the Government were bound to bring all their influence to bear to pass them in their entirety; and in reply to some objection made by myself, he said hon. gentlemen would have no difficulty in putting their views upon record by amendments moved to the scheme. I thought at the time that that was placing us at a very great disadvantage, and that we were entitled to have the propositions considered separately and a vote taken, yea or nay, on the several resolutions; but I was overruled and the agreement was come to, which you, sir, declared, rising in your place, to be that the debate should be conducted in all respects as in Committee of the Whole. Well, I have two things to urge—first, that in Committee of the Whole the previous question cannot be moved; and second, that a distinct assurance was given by the Government that amendments could be moved to the resolution. These are the very words of the hon. gentleman as given in the official report, which has been this moment put into my hands:—

Hon. Atty. Gen. MACDONALD said "no." The proposition submitted to this House is—That an Address be submitted to Her Majesty, praying

that a bill should be passed based on these resolutions. All amendments might be moved to that one resolution. It would be the same thing, in fact, as to move them upon each resolution separately.

Now, the hon. gentleman says that we may not move amendments, and none can be moved if he succeeds in getting the previous question affirmed by the House. I state—and I am sure I have only to state it to him to convince him of the justice of it—that a persistence in moving the previous question will be simply a violation of the assurance the hon. gentleman gave to the House, and of the distinct understanding arrived at by the House at the opening of the debate, and stated by you, sir, from the chair. (Hear, hear.) Am I to understand that the hon. gentleman adheres to his motion?

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—I certainly do adhere to it.

HON. MR. HOLTON—And has the hon. gentleman nothing to say to my objections?

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—To what?

HON. MR. HOLTON—In reference to cutting off amendments by this motion.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—Why did not the hon. gentleman put them?

HON. MR. HOLTON—We relied upon the assurance given by the hon. gentleman that there would be no attempt to cut short discussion, no attempt to prevent a full and free expression of the opinion of the House upon every feature of the scheme. I ask him now again if he intends to adhere to that declaration? (Hear, hear.)

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—I will, Mr. SPEAKER, on reflection, make a few remarks in answer to the hon. gentleman. He speaks as if it was a great concession to the majority of this House and to the Government that the arrangement was made at the opening of the debate. Why, sir, it was no concession whatever to the Government or to the majority of the House. (Hear, hear.) Acting on behalf of the Government, and with the full approbation of my colleagues, I made a motion that an Address should be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her sanction to the resolutions adopted at the Quebec Conference. That motion was quite parliamentary in its character, and there was no parliamentary reason whatever why it should be considered in Committee of the Whole. The hon. gentleman could not, by any rule known to

parliamentary practice, force us to go into committee or require us to discuss any one of these resolutions by itself. It was then quite open to me, according to the usage of the House, to make a motion for an Address to Her Majesty for the purpose stated, and it was not as a favor to the Government that the arrangement was made to discuss it as if the House were in Committee of the Whole. On the contrary, it was a concession of the Government to the minority in the House; for I stated, of my own mere motion, that although I had a right to proceed in the ordinary manner with the Speaker in the chair, and to restrict honorable gentlemen to a single speech in accordance with the rules that govern debate—that although this was my undoubted right according to parliamentary practice, yet, for the purpose of allowing the fullest and freest discussion, I suggested that the same rule should obtain as if the House were in Committee of the Whole, when every member could speak twenty times if he felt so disposed, and present his views fully on all the points of the scheme. That was the proposition made by the Government; it was a fair, liberal, even generous one. But how were we met by honorable gentlemen opposite? We were ready to proceed with the discussion at once, and to present the subject to the House without delay. But it was stated that that would be unfair—that the members of the Government should first make a statement, and allow it to go to the House and country, so that neither should be taken by surprise in a matter of so much importance, and that honorable gentlemen might have the fullest information upon which to make up their minds. We did make our statement, and when asked for a week's delay in order that these speeches might be fully considered, we consented to it. Supposing that after this postponement the debate would go on at once, we gave hon. gentlemen opposed to the scheme a whole week to consider our remarks, to prepare themselves for debate, to work out objections to our arguments, and pick out all the flaws they could find in the scheme itself. We did this because we thought it fair, and because we believed hon. gentlemen were sincere in their professed desire to have the fullest information upon the subject. Well, the debate began, it has gone on now for three weeks since that postponement, and

as my hon. colleague the Hon. Provincial Secretary has said, it has dragged on wearily, with no prospect of an early termination. And how have we been met by hon. gentlemen opposite? Has it been in the same spirit that actuated the Government throughout the debate? We asked them to come forward, and honestly and fairly, in the presence of the House and country, to discuss the scheme; but instead of so doing, they have deliberately trifled with the question and wasted the time of the House. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. HOLT—No, no!

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—The hon. gentleman as a man of honor cannot deny it, as a man of candor he cannot deny it; and if he should deny it, his character as a man of honor and candor would sink in the estimation of this House. (Hear, hear.) I say it distinctly that this was the plot of hon. gentlemen opposite, to delay the consideration of this subject. Their policy was to wait, like MICAWBER, for "something to turn up," to see what would happen favorable to them in New Brunswick, to learn what would be done in Nova Scotia, and to embrace every pretext of delay that presented itself. The hon. gentleman was playing, deliberately playing, a trick. He talked about a base trick having been played upon the Opposition, but was it not a base trick in him not to discuss this question, but to put it off upon every possible excuse, to interrupt hon. gentlemen when they discussed it, making innuendoes, suggesting motives for delay, trying to disparage the scheme and ourselves in the estimation of the House and country, and getting others to say what he would not dare to say himself. (Hear, hear.) That was the plan of the hon. gentleman. He complains of not being able to move an amendment, but the Opposition attempted to move none. It was friends of the Government who offered the only amendments yet presented. The policy of the Opposition was just this—they wished to spend the whole of March and the best part of April in the general discussion upon my motion; and then, when they could do nothing more to nauseate the House and disgust the country with the subject, when they had wearied the members and made the reporters sick with their talk—(laughter)—they were to spend the remainder of April, all May and June, and run the debate well into summer, upon the amendments they intended to propose

one after another. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) It is because these honorable gentlemen have not endeavored honestly and candidly to discuss the question, but have played the game of prolonging the debate to midsummer and preventing the House coming to a final decision upon it, that the Government have taken the step now proposed, and have said to these hon. gentlemen: "Here, you have had a month to move amendments and make speeches. You have been allowed to sit here discussing the question every night during that time, and sometimes till one or two o'clock in the morning. You have not fairly discussed the scheme, nor moved any amendments to it. You appear, on the contrary, determined to obstruct the measure by every means in your power. You have deliberately laid a plot to throw it back with the view of defeating it in this underhand manner. We are not going to allow that, nor should be worthy of the position we hold as a Government if we did allow it;" and, sir, I should be unworthy of the character the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. HOLTON) gives me of being a good parliamentary strategist, if I allowed this plot of preventing the House coming to a vote to succeed. (Hear, hear.) Now, in resorting to measures to prevent the success of this game played by the Opposition, we have not taken hon. gentlemen opposite or the House by surprise. We gave them from the middle of winter almost to the beginning of spring, and the opening of navigation, to discuss the question and propose amendments; and when we saw they were determined to waste the time of the House and country indefinitely, I came down yesterday and, on behalf of the Government and with the full approbation of my colleagues, stated fairly and frankly that it was of the greatest consequence, the utmost consequence, to the best interests of this country, that this question should not be allowed to drag on before Parliament, but that a vote should be taken without delay, in order that we might be able to tell the sister provinces and inform Her Majesty that the contract we made with them, the arrangement we entered into with the governments of those provinces, had met the full approbation and consent of the Parliament and people of Canada. (Hear, hear.) And I gave fair notice that the Government considered the recent political events in New Brunswick, and the state of affairs in that province, called not

only for action, but prompt action by this House; and that every proper and legitimate means known to parliamentary practice would be taken by the Government for the purpose of getting this House to come to a full and final decision upon the question. (Hear, hear.) We have never taken hon. gentlemen by surprise. On the contrary, we have allowed them every latitude in this debate, and have given them fair notice all through of what we intended to do. But how have we been met by them? Have we been met in the same spirit of frankness and sincerity? No—and I say it without hesitation, we have been met throughout in a spirit of obstruction and hostility; and, instead of discussing the question fairly on its merits, hon. gentlemen opposite are dragging on the debate slowly for months, in order to tire out the patience of the House and country. (Hear, hear.) I ask the House whether they will permit such a shabby, such a miserable game to be played successfully? Will they allow a question so closely identified with the best interests of Canada to be thrown across the floor of the House like a battle-dore between the hon. members for Cornwall and Chateauguay? Will they allow these hon. gentlemen to trifle with it, not so much because they are opposed to the scheme itself or disapprove of its general principles, as because of those by whom it is presented for the adoption of the House. (Hear, hear.) Sir, there has been some little misapprehension as to the effect of the motion I have proposed to the House, which it is as well should be removed. It has simply and only this effect—that it does not prevent hon. members expressing their views fully and freely upon the subject, but calls upon every hon. gentleman to give—if I may use an Americanism—a straight and square vote upon the question, and to state plainly whether or not he approves of the scheme of Confederation as a whole. (Hear, hear.) As I stated when I opened this debate upon my motion, and as has been over and over again stated by several of my colleagues, we agreed with the governments of the sister provinces upon a future Constitution for the whole of British North America, and we ask this House to approve or disapprove of that Constitution. We told the House that we had made this treaty with the sanction of Her Majesty and of the Imperial Government.

HON. MR. HOLTON—With some qualifications.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—No ; we told the House that we had the previous sanction of Her Majesty and of Her Majesty's representative to our meeting. The Conference met and sat under this authority, and we worked out a scheme for the Constitution of the provinces. That scheme may be a good or it may be a bad one ; but whether it be good or bad, we have a right to ask this House to approve or disapprove of it, to accept or reject it. We had the sanction of Her Majesty and the Imperial Government to our meeting—because this House knows that the union of these colonies is a matter of great Imperial as well as of great local interest—and under that sanction we have worked out a Constitution and made a bargain with the other provinces. We have pledged ourselves as a Government to come down to the Canadian Parliament and say—"Here is a Constitution which we have agreed upon for the future government of these provinces. We have agreed to submit it to this House, just as the governments of the other provinces have agreed to submit it to their respective legislatures. We have a right to ask the members of this House whether in their judgment it is a scheme that, with all the faults and imperfections it may have, ought to be entered into by the Parliament of this country. We exercise this right, and ask you to declare by your votes, yes or no, whether we were right in framing this measure, and whether it is such an one as ought to be adopted by this House." (Hear, hear.) This, MR. SPEAKER, is the position of the Government ; and what though amendments should be carried—what though the amendment of which the honorable member for North Ontario has given notice should succeed, and the House should declare in favor of a Legislative instead of a Federal union (supposing the honorable gentleman did present and carry such a motion)—what good could it possibly do ? The contract that we entered into with the other provinces would be broken ; this Legislature would be violating the solemn engagement under which we are to the other colonies, and we would have a Constitution drawn up which none of the other provinces would adopt. We know that they would reject it—we know that Lower Canada would go as one man against it. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—Well, the other provinces go against this.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—At

all events the governments of the other provinces will submit the question to their legislatures and take their opinion upon it, and we have a right to ask this House—"Do you or do you not approve of it ? If you disapprove of the scheme altogether because of its general principles, why vote it out. If you think that it ought to be a Legislative and not a Federal union, why vote it out. If you think it wrong to create a life peerage instead of an elective Legislative Council, why vote it out. Vote it out for any or all of these reasons if you like ; but give us at once an honest, candid and fair vote one way or the other, and let the sister colonies know without delay whether you approve of the arrangement or not." (Hear, hear.) And, sir, amendments are a mere matter of folly and absurdity. (Hear, hear, and ironical cheers from the Opposition.) Honorable gentlemen opposite cry "Hear, hear." I do not of course speak of the merits of any proposition in amendment for a legislative union, or an elective Legislative Council, or for any other change in the provisions of the scheme ; but I state this in all earnestness, that for all practical purposes the carrying of any amendment to this scheme is merely to lose the only chance of union we can ever hope to have with the Lower Provinces for the sake of some fancied superior Constitution which we cannot get any of the colonies to agree to. (Hear, hear.) All we ask this House to do is what the other branch of the Legislature has already candidly done, to discuss the matter fairly and honestly upon its merits, and then to come to a vote upon it. Those who think the Constitution likely to place the country in a worse position than it now occupies, will vote against it. Those who think, on the other hand, that it is an approximation at any rate to what is right, that it will bring the colonies together into closer communication, that it will form the basis of a powerful and enduring alliance with England, will vote for it with all its faults. (Hear, hear.) Now, as to the consequences of this motion which I have proposed, this House ought to know that not a single speech can be cut off or shorn of its dimensions by it, and that every honorable gentleman can discuss the question of Confederation, giving, as fully as he desires, the reasons why he will vote for or against the scheme proposed. All the motion will do, all the Government wish to do, is to keep the question before the House ; and the honorable member for North Ontario can speak as well to it as if he had

his amendment in his hand, and can, as he usually does, make as able a speech as if there were half-a-dozen amendments proposed to it. The whole scheme, in fact, is as much in the hands of the House, and as fully before it and open to discussion, as it was on the day I moved its adoption. All this motion will do is to prevent honorable gentlemen opposite playing the trick which I have spoken of—drawing the discussion away from the main question before the House, getting up debates upon the powers of the General Government and of the local governments, upon an elective or an appointed Legislative Council, and upon all sorts of side issues upon which the changes would be rung night after night and week after week, through the spring and summer, till the House became weary with the surfeit of talk, and the country disgusted. (Hear, hear.) That, sir, is the aim and object of honorable gentlemen opposite, but I hope this House will not be so foolish as to fall into the trap they have laid, and I know honorable members are fully aware of the designs of these honorable gentlemen. They cannot complain that they have not had an opportunity of moving amendments. They have had three weeks to do it, and they have not yet moved one or given notice of one. Then, sir, what will be the consequences, on the other hand, if the previous question is not carried? If it is rejected, and the main question is not put, Confederation is defeated. And I will at once inform the House that to vote that the main question be not put, will throw Confederation over forever, and forever destroy the last hopes of a friendly junction between the colonies of British North America. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—Why the last hopes?

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—Because if we reject now the agreement come to by all the governments of all the provinces, we can never expect to get them to meet again to make another.

HON. MR. HOLTON—But one of these Governments has ceased to exist.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that the governments of all the provinces are pledged to the scheme, but that the legislatures have not yet expressed themselves upon it. If any of them appear now to be hostile to it, that feeling may disappear when it is fully explained to them. Even the Hon. Attorney General PALMER, of Prince Edward Island, may himself become convinced of its desirability,

and vote for it. We cannot say how those legislatures will vote, but what we propose to do is to lay our action before the Imperial Government, and ask it to exercise its influence with the other colonies in securing the passage of the scheme. And I have no doubt that if the Mother Country gives friendly advice to the sister colonies in that kindly spirit in which she always gives it, if she points out that in her view this scheme is calculated to serve, not only our interests, but the general interests, welfare and prosperity of the Empire, I am quite satisfied that the people of those colonies, whatever may be their local feelings, will listen at all events with respect, and perhaps with conviction, to the advice so given by the Imperial Government. I have no doubt, indeed I am satisfied, that if the Imperial Government gives that advice, it will be in the spirit of kindness and maternal love and forbearance, and that if England points out what is due to ourselves as well as to the Empire, and shows what she, in her experience and wisdom, believes to be best for the future interests of British North America, her advice will be accepted in the spirit in which it is offered, and sooner or later with conviction. (Cheers.) For all these reasons I think the members of the Government would be wanting in their duty in this great strait, this great emergency in our affairs, if they did not press for the decision of this House as quickly as possible. (Hear, hear.) Why, there is the question of defence, which the honorable member for Cornwall admits to be of the most pressing importance, that requires immediate attention and demands that further delay in dealing with this scheme should not be allowed.

HON. MR. HOLTON—What has defence to do with this scheme of Confederation? The honorable gentleman has stated, over and over again, that it has nothing to do with it. (Hear, hear.)

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—The honorable gentleman is mistaken. The two questions are intimately connected.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Why, when we asked for information the other day as to what it is proposed to do in the matter of defence, the honorable gentleman said that that was a different subject from this altogether. (Hear, hear.)

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—The honorable member for Hochelaga certainly did move a series of resolutions asking for information upon this subject, which we refused, because they were offered for the purpose of

obstructing and delaying the debate on this scheme. (Hear, hear.) When I say that there is an intimate connection between these two questions of defence and Confederation, I mean this: that the progress of recent events—events which have occurred since the commencement of this debate—has increased the necessity of immediate action, both with regard to defence and to this scheme. Honorable gentlemen opposite have been in the Government—they have been behind the scenes—and they know that the question of the defence of British North America is of great and pressing importance, and they know that the question of the defence of Canada cannot be separated from it. And honorable gentlemen have been informed, and will find by the scheme itself, that the subject was considered by the Conference, and that it was arranged that there should be one organized system of defence for the whole of the provinces and at the cost of the whole. Well, it is now of the greatest importance that some members of the Government should go home immediately, in order that England may know what the opinion of Canada is upon this question of Confederation, as well as upon the question of defence. (Hear, hear.)

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—Is that what you want them to go for?

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—Yes. The season is fast approaching when it will be necessary to commence these works—the only season during which they can be carried out at all; and that man is not true to his country, that man is not a true patriot, who, for the sake of a petty parliamentary triumph, for the sake of a little party annoyance—for the conduct of the Opposition amounts to nothing more—would endeavor to postpone some definite arrangement on this important question of defence. (Hear, hear.) Yes, Mr. SPEAKER, this opposition is either one or the other of two things—it is either for the sake of party annoyance, or it is a deliberate desire to prevent anything being done to defend ourselves, in order that we may easily fall a prey to annexation. (Cheers.) I do not like to believe that honorable gentlemen opposite entertain any wish to become connected with the neighboring republic, and therefore I am forced to the conviction that they are actuated by the miserable motive of gaining a little parliamentary or party success. There are only two alternatives of belief, and one or the other of them must be correct. (Hear, hear.) I believe the honorable member for Chateaugay is in his heart strongly in favor of a

Federal union of these colonies; but because it is proposed by honorable gentlemen on this side of the House, he cannot and will not support it. (Hear, hear.) So long as my honorable friend the Hon. Finance Minister sits here on these benches, so long as MORDECAI sits at the King's gate—(laughter)—and so long as the honorable gentleman sits on the opposite instead of this side of the House, so long will he find fault and object. Hit high or hit low, like the flogged soldier, nothing will please him. (Renewed laughter.) But I believe the House will not sanction such pitiful conduct as honorable gentlemen opposite exhibit. I believe we will have a large, an overwhelming majority, to sustain us in the course we have adopted; and that we should be highly blameable were we to exhaust the patience not only of ourselves, but of our supporters, by allowing this conduct to be pursued much longer unchecked. These, sir, are my answers to the questions of the honorable member for Chateaugay. (Cheers.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—I have the satisfaction of having provoked from the hon. gentleman altogether the best speech he has delivered during this debate. So much I freely admit, and I think his own followers will confess that this is the first time he has spoken with anything like his usual spirit and force during the whole debate. This was perhaps inevitable, because in his other speech, and notably in his introductory speech, he labored under the consciousness that the scheme was at variance with his own antecedents, and was not approved of by anybody. We had, therefore, at that time none of that vivacity, none of that strength of declamation, none of that humor with which his brief speech this evening has overflowed. But, sir, to return to the point to which I called your attention when you resumed the chair. To that point the hon. gentleman has not been pleased to speak. He has gone off on all sorts of subjects. He has said he will not hold himself bound by the arrangements which he himself entered into at the opening of the debate. He says he does not consider himself so bound; and I must be allowed to say a word or two in reference to his excuse for his departure from that agreement. He says that I and other hon. gentlemen on this side have been instrumental in wasting the time of the House. Emphatically I deny that statement. (Hear, hear.) That we did resist the unfair attempts on the other side of the House to change the order of the debate

which was deliberately established, whereby the debate was to be resumed every evening at half-past seven, I do not deny. I frankly admit it, and claim that we were justified in so doing; at all events I am prepared to take the responsibility of having contributed my share to that result. But as to the debate on the main motion, I defy the Hon. Attorney General to indicate one hon. gentleman on this side who has wasted a single moment of the time of the House—who has spoken beside the question—and who has spoken in order to postpone the question and to protract the debate. And for proof of this assertion, I venture to say that when we get the extended reports of this debate, it will be found that the space occupied by the speeches of honorable gentlemen who support this measure is at least twice that which is occupied by the speeches of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. (Hear, hear.)

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—That's just the complaint made on this side, that you will not speak. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—Oh, we are wasting time by not speaking—that's the charge! (Laughter.) It is quite obvious that the honorable gentleman's leader would never have made a blunder of that kind. We have wasted the time of the House by not speaking! Well, sir, it is a very novel way of talking against time, by holding our tongues! (Laughter.) But, Mr. SPEAKER, I am not going into the general debate. I shall not proceed with this matter further. I rose for the purpose of appealing to the sense of justice and common fairness of hon. gentlemen. That appeal has been disregarded. They adhere to that unfair step of theirs, and of course we must meet it as we can. (Hear, hear.)

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—Mr. SPEAKER, the hon. gentleman found fault with what I stated just now. But what I said was quite correct; and that is, that we wanted to give as free scope to the debate as could be afforded on both sides of the House. When, however, hon. gentlemen on the other side had their opportunity to speak, they were never ready; and we all remember that on two occasions they actually moved the adjournment of the House, one night at nine o'clock, and again, when the hon. member for Brome (Mr. DUNKIN) was unable to continue his speech, at ten o'clock. Some hon. gentlemen on this side had promised to speak, and I well recollect that

the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. McGIVERN) had to come to their relief, and filled up the space in the debate, in order to give the opportunity to the Opposition of being ready on the following day. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. DORION—I cannot allow the Hon. Attorney General West to run away from the question by one of those "artful dodges," for which he is so well known in this House and the country. (Hear, hear.) The question put to him by my honorable friend the member for Chateaugay (Hon. Mr. HOLTON) was, whether he did not agree to the debate being continued on certain terms, and in such a way as that full opportunity should be given to hon. members to move their amendments. It is very well for the Attorney General West to say that that arrangement was made, not for the benefit of the House, not for the advantage of the public, not for the convenience of honorable members, but out of mere courtesy by the Government. Sir, the proposition was his own. The hon. gentleman himself came to the House and stated the manner in which the debate should be conducted, actually proposing that the rule which prevented honorable members speaking more than once on the same question, with the Speaker in the chair, should be suspended, in order that every member should have the same freedom of discussion as though we were in Committee of the Whole. That was the proposition of the Hon. Attorney General West himself, thinking it the most proper way to conduct the course of the debate. He went further, and stated it as his opinion that after the debate commenced, it should go on each day after half-past seven, leaving the afternoon sitting for the other business of the House. This was another of the hon. gentleman's voluntary statements. Then, going on, what do we find? We find the Hon. Attorney General West, immediately after, in answer to my hon. friend on my right (Hon. J. S. MACDONALD), saying:—

His idea was that after the debate commenced, it should go on each day after half-past seven, leaving the afternoon sitting for other business.

And again—

The suspension of the rules he proposed was for the protection of the minority, by allowing each member to speak and state his objections as often as he pleased.

He agreed that Mr. CAMERON's proposition was a reasonable one. The

Government would, in the first instance, lay their case before the House, and through the press before the country, and then allow a reasonable time for the country to judge of the case as presented by the Government.

The Hon. President of the Council also said :—

Although the Hon. Atty. Gen. had proposed that the discussion should continue day after day, he had not suggested for a moment that the vote should be hurried on; the debate at any period might be adjourned, if deemed necessary, to allow time for the expression of public opinion. There were 130 members, and almost every member would desire to speak on the question; and he thought clearly the proper course was to devote every day, after half-past seven, to the discussion, to allow all members on both sides to state their views, that they might go to the country and be fully considered.

This, then, was the manner in which the Government brought the proposition before the House—the matter was to be discussed without hurry, and the whole of the 130 members on the floor of the House were to be allowed to express their opinions fully, and their views were to go to the country to be fully weighed and considered. After that we heard the Hon. Atty. Gen. West saying :—

Of course it was competent to the House to vote against the Address as a whole, or to adopt amendments to it; but, if they did so, it would then be for the Government to consider whether they would press the scheme further on the attention of the House.

Still further, the Hon. Atty. Gen. West said :—

All amendments might be moved to that one resolution. It would be the same thing, in fact, as to move them upon each resolution separately.

This, Mr. SPEAKER, occurred during the preliminary discussion.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—That is right.

HON. MR. HOLTON—But you back out of it now.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—Why did you not move?

HON. MR. DORION—I was saying that this occurred in the preliminary discussion which took place on the floor of the House when the Hon. Atty. Gen. West himself brought in the resolution upon which the discussion of this measure should be based. We proposed that, as the best protection for the minority, we should go into Committee of the Whole; but the Hon.

Atty. Gen. West said that we should have all the advantages, and more, too, than if we went into committee. He promised that we should be allowed to express our views as often as we pleased, while we would have the benefit of greater order being kept, with the Speaker in the chair, than would be possible in Committee of the Whole. We relied upon this agreement being kept, and believed that not only would members be allowed to express their views without check, but that the public would have time to hold meetings and petition. We therefore consented at once to the eight days' adjournment, which was suggested by the honorable member for Peel (Hon. J. H. CAMERON), and which was considered by all a most reasonable proposition. Well, the Government took eight days to send their speeches to the country, and four days after the debate was resumed, we find the honorable member for Montreal Centre (Hon. Mr. ROSE) putting a notice on the paper to do away with the solemn agreement which was entered into on the floor of Parliament between the honorable members on the ministerial side and the minority in opposition. (Hear, hear.) The honorable gentlemen on the Treasury benches closed the exposition of their case on the 8th of February. On the 16th the debate was resumed, and on the 21st—Saturday and Sunday intervening—just two nights' debating having taken place in the meantime—the honorable member for Montreal Centre went to every member to get a round robin signed for the purpose of breaking a solemn agreement, which had been entered into in good faith, between the Government and the minority. (Hear, hear.) Having failed, after two nights' discussion, to carry the resolution of which he had given notice—after, I say, the honorable member for Montreal Centre had been foiled in his attempt to carry that motion—the Hon. Atty. Gen. West put a notice on the paper to the same effect, thereby assuming the responsibility of all that had been done in this respect by the honorable member for Montreal Centre. And in the absence of the Hon. Atty. Gen. West, the Hon. Atty. Gen. East moved that resolution for breaking the agreement which he and his colleagues had solemnly entered into. (Hear, hear.) And, sir, not only did they attempt to break this agreement, so as to prevent discussion on the part of the minority, and to stifle the expression of public opinion, which was

manifesting itself at public meetings, which were being held everywhere throughout the country, and making itself known to this House through the right of petition; but we now find the hon. gentlemen taking advantage of every rule and technicality known to parliamentary practice to accomplish the same object. (Hear, hear.) And, forsooth, the hon. gentleman rises in his place and attempts to justify himself by calling the Opposition a factious opposition, and by charging it with wasting the time of the House. They are anxious to strangle the discussion after five or six days' debate, when more time had been employed by hon. members on that side than by hon. members on our side, having already succeeded in forcing on the discussion at half-past three in the afternoon, instead of half-past seven, according to the agreement. And now, sir, we are witnessing the extraordinary spectacle of a Government moving the "previous question" to their own motion. (Cheers.) Well, indeed, might the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. POWELL) ask if there could be found a precedent for such a course! Hon. gentlemen who can accomplish such a thing as the "double shuffle" can never be much embarrassed for the want of a precedent. They who have so long, by means of parliamentary tricks, succeeded in maintaining their position, are now inventing a new dodge in order to choke off discussion on this question. Already, sir, have we seen, on one celebrated occasion—in the Corrigan case—the Hon. Attorney General West rising in his place and moving a resolution, and afterwards inviting his own followers to vote against it. (Cheers.) And now, following a similar course, he is proposing the "previous question," the object of which is, in ordinary parliamentary practice, to prevent a vote being taken on the main proposition. Whenever an hon. gentleman does not want to vote in favor of the question before the House, and dares not vote against it, he moves or gets a friend to move the "previous question," which is that the question be now put, and votes against it. (Hear, hear.) Such is the invariable practice in England, where parliamentary usage is better known than in this country, and we here find a government resorting to a similar dodge in reference to a measure of their own, and the most important measure that was ever brought before the country.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—And a strong government, too.

HON. MR. DORION—Yes, and a strong government, as my honorable friend says—a government which boasts of having an immense majority, and of having the power to carry such measures as it pleases. It is such a government as this, I say, which is dragging its supporters still deeper through the mire—which is saying to them: "You shall vote for the scheme without putting your views on record, and without giving the people an opportunity of expressing their opinion in the usual constitutional manner." (Hear, hear.) But what do they gain by such a course? They acknowledge it will not stop discussion. And thus they will not gain a single hour or a single minute in point of time. But this they will gain—if their supporters are blind enough to follow them—those who are pledged to their constituents not to vote for the scheme without first submitting it to the people, will be forced into eating up all the promises that they have made while in the presence of their constituents. It may be possible that they will find some who will thus, following the example shown them by the Government, give the denial to their solemn promises, and turn their backs on the pledges they have given—they may find, I say, a few of their followers doing this; but I shall be much mistaken if the majority of the members of this House who have gone to public meetings in the country—who have met their constituents face to face, and who have faithfully pledged themselves to vote for an appeal to the people, will be dragged, as the honorable gentlemen on the other side attempt to drag them, into doing that which their own consciences and their promises to their constituents alike forbid. (Hear, hear.) It will be discreditable to this House, should honorable members be found in such a position—if, by a mere dodge of this kind, Ministers themselves can not only break their own promises, but compel their supporters to break their promises as well. I hope, for the honor of this House and the country, there will not be found one of those who have promised to vote for an appeal to the people, recording his vote for the question now before the Chair. Let it be clearly understood, that every honorable member who votes for the previous question declares against any amendment being moved to the main motion,

against any expression of opinion on the part of the members of this House being placed on record. In voting, too, for the "previous question," he also votes to condone the breach of faith of which honorable gentlemen have been guilty towards this House. And, sir, honorable gentlemen must have sunk very low in the estimation of their own friends, when two or three of their warmest supporters have to rise, one after the other, to charge them, as was done this afternoon, with a breach of faith, and with not having kept their promises to this House and to the country. (Hear, hear.) In my opinion, the honorable gentlemen would have shown a little more dignity and self-respect had they not thus exposed themselves to the taunts of their own friends. But I cannot believe that the House will consent to be led away by the dexterous management of the Hon. Attorney General West—by the fictitious indignation which he is always ready to summon to his assistance, and with which he has burst upon the House to-day. In respect to the factiousness of the Opposition, I repeat that I never witnessed in this House such a spectacle as that which has just been displayed by hon. gentlemen on the other side. Never, in my life, did I hear a strong government rising in its place, and upon a question of this magnitude, involving the dearest interests of the country, exclaiming—"You shall accept the scheme as a whole; you shall not even have the opportunity of moving a single amendment." The honorable gentleman, sir, treated as an absurd proposition that of the honorable member for North Ontario—which is also the desire of the Lower Provinces—for a legislative union, with guarantees for the laws, language and religion of the inhabitants of Lower Canada, instead of a Federal union. But, sir, is it not the case that a great many members of this House, nay, some in the Administration, would prefer that to the proposed scheme of Federation? Is it not also the case that in Nova Scotia, Hon. Mr. HOWE has set his face against Federation, and is a strong advocate of legislative union, which the honorable gentlemen opposite treat as an absurdity. Well, sir, whether it is an absurdity or not, every honorable member of this House ought to have an opportunity to put his views on record, and of saying—"I want a legislative union, and not a Federation; I want an elective, and not a nominative Council."

(Hear, Hear.) Sir, the honorable gentlemen say that a legislative union is an absurdity, that an appeal to the people on this question is also an absurdity; but this is only in keeping with their whole course of conduct, which is to treat the people of this country with contempt, and altogether to disregard the wishes of their representatives in Parliament. (Hear, hear.) Not only do they treat this side with contempt, but they treat with even greater contempt their own friends, whom they are trying to coerce into approval of their unconstitutional course of conduct. (Cheers.)

HON. J. S. MACDONALD resumed his speech, which was interrupted at the dinner recess, by saying:—

His Grace proceeds to point out a course which, if followed, would most assuredly secure the accomplishment of the object he had in view. He says:—

Whatever other steps may be taken for the improved organization of the militia, it appears to Her Majesty's Government to be of essential importance that its administration and the supply of funds for its support, should be exempt from the disturbing action of ordinary politics. Unless this be done, there can be no confidence that in the appointment of officers and in other matters of a purely military character, no other object than the efficiency of the force is kept in view. Were it not that it might fairly be considered too great an interference with the privileges of the representatives of the people, I should be inclined to suggest that the charge for the militia, or a certain fixed portion of it, should be defrayed from the Consolidated Fund of Canada, or voted for a period of three or five years.

I trust the House will bear with me while I read the opinion of the Canadian Government on this extraordinary proposition:—

Another suggestion embraced in His Grace's despatch is well calculated to excite surprise. Your Excellency's advisers allude to that portion of the despatch in which His Grace proposes to remove the control of funds required for militia purposes from the domain of Parliament. His Grace is evidently aware that the proposition wears the aspect of "an interference with the privileges of the representatives of the people," and it is certain that any measure liable to this construction never will be, and ought not to be entertained by a people inheriting the freedom guaranteed by British institutions. The Imperial Parliament guards with jealous care the means of maintaining the military and naval forces of the Empire. Its appropriations are annually voted, and not the most powerful minister has dared to propose to the House of Commons the abandonment of its controlling power for a period of five

years. If the disturbing action "of ordinary politics" is a reason for removing the final direction of military preparations from Parliament, it is in every sense as applicable in England as in Canada. What the House of Commons would not under any circumstances of danger entertain, is not likely to be entertained by the Legislature of Canada. Whatever evils are incident to representative institutions, the people of a British province will not forget that they are trivial in comparison with those which are inseparable from arbitrary authority. Popular liberties are only safe when the action of the people retains and guides the policy of those who are invested with the power of directing the affairs of the country. They are safe against military despotism, wielded by a corrupt government, only when they have in their hands the means of controlling the supplies required for the maintenance of a military organization.

I will now quote one more extract from the same report, which will exhibit the opinion entertained at that time by us in relation to the political union of the provinces. What I am now about to read was written in answer to a proposition made from the Colonial Office that a fund should be raised by the British North American Colonies, and which should be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State for the common defence of the whole country. The extract here cited will place the House in a position to understand what was then intended to be done :—

A union for defence is proposed by His Grace the Secretary of State for the Colonies—a union of the British North American Provinces, for the formation and maintenance of one uniform system of military organization and training, having a common defensive fund, and approved by Her Majesty's Government—a union, whose details would emanate from the Secretary of State, and whose management would be entirely independent of the several local legislatures. Your Excellency's advisers have no hesitation in expressing the opinion that any alliance of this character cannot at present be entertained. An Intercolonial Railway seems to be the first step towards any more intimate relations between the British North American Provinces than those which now exist. The construction even of this work is by no means certain; although this Government, looking at it mainly as a means of defence, has entertained the preliminaries, in common with delegates from the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. It is premature, just now, to speculate upon the possible political consequences which may never be consummated. Certain it is, however, that there can be no closer intercolonial union of any kind until increased facilities for intercommunication are provided; and equally certain that the provinces, supposing them to be hereafter united, will never contribute to an expensive system of defence unless it be subject

to their own control. Speaking for Canada, Your Excellency's advisers are sure that this province will continue to claim the exclusive right of directing the expenditure of the public moneys.

Sir, these were the replies to the various propositions submitted by His Grace in relation to our contributions towards the defence of this country, and to the means for supplying the same. If different ground is now taken by honorable gentlemen on the Treasury benches, it seems to me that they abandon the rights which belong to a free people—the right of controlling the expenditure of our own money, the denial of which caused the revolt of the American colonies in 1776. In the observations I have made on the question of defence, and the willingness of the people of this country to contribute their share, I wish to be understood that the proportion asked of us shall be according to our ability. What I say is that in the condition in which the country is at this moment, it would be idle for us to undertake an outlay which would hopelessly embarrass our exchequer. To organize a large force in connection with the outlay for fortifications, would require a large number of men, who would be withdrawn from the industry of the country—and, that industry being heavily taxed, without any return being expected;—and the soil refusing perhaps to be as prolific as in other years, most serious embarrassments would overtake us in the attempt to defend ourselves in a war which we had done nothing to provoke. And, having no knowledge of the Imperial policy which might bring about such a war, I say it becomes the people of this country, before they undertake a large outlay for defence or military organisation, to consider what portion we can bear of the burdens sought to be imposed upon us. (Hear, hear.) I say nothing of the sensational style of speaking which the Attorney General West gets up about other topics, in order to get away from the point raised by my honorable friend from Chateaugay, who stated the case in a way that any one who desired might have met it fairly. When a plain answer is wanted to a pointed question, honorable gentlemen opposite invariably fly off to something else. I will not allude to the debate which incidentally followed after the recess this evening, and before I resumed my observations a little while ago, farther than to make a remark on the statement of the Attorney General West, that I sneered at the question

of defence. The honorable gentleman stopped there, and I do not know what he intended to add. I suppose it was to be the same courteous and elegant language which he addressed to my honorable friend the member for Chateauguay—language which, as regards its audacity and vituperative character, no other member of this House would condescend to use. Complaints from this side of the conduct of the Government generally, the honorable gentleman meets by getting up in a dreadful fury, and singling out honorable gentlemen on this side for personal attack. Such conduct, I think, is unworthy of the leader of this House. (Hear, hear.) I deny that I have ever sneered at the defence question. During my life, it has been more than a sentiment with me—it has been a principle that this country should be defended. I know it is a duty we owe to the Empire, as a self-governing colony, to contribute a fair proportion of our means for defence. And I am sure I speak the sentiments of every honorable member on this side, when I say that we are prepared, to the extent of our resources, to contribute all we can for that object. But it is not only that we are called upon to contribute means for our defence; we shall be called upon also, in the time of danger, to contribute men, to shed the best blood of the country, to see our fields devastated, our towns destroyed, our trade and commerce ruined. All these are consequences of a state of war, which must necessarily fall upon us, in the event of that calamity arising. We have all that to consider, and we have the consciousness also that, without a very large amount of Imperial aid, it would be impossible for us for a long time to resist an invasion of this country. But, while taking this ground, let us not be led away by this buncombe talk of loyalty—by the dragging in of the name of the Sovereign and the name of the Governor General by hon. gentlemen opposite. To over-awe and whip in their supporters, they say to them that they must do what they bid them, because the Queen has said this, and the Governor General has said that, and they constantly refer to “loyalty.” For my own part, I never invoke the aid of that term—for I always take it for granted that men are loyal, until they prove by word or deed that they are disloyal. (Hear, hear.) The imputations cast on our loyalty are a gratuitous insult offered to true Britons, who have proved in times past, and are ready to prove again,

their loyalty and their valour—men, whose attachment to the soil on which they were born makes them still more anxious to keep their hearths and firesides free from the pollution of the invader. Those who have come here only yesterday cannot feel the strength of the ties which bind us to our native land; and yet they have the audacity to charge us with being annexationists. So far from submitting to this imputation, I charge the gentlemen on the Treasury benches, by the course of legislation they have introduced—by the sudden manner in which they have changed their tactics, and proceeded to organise a Constitution which familiarises the people of this country more to American institutions than anything ever done here before—I charge them with having done much, to hasten annexation. I put it to honorable gentlemen whether the outside talk of annexation is not assuming a very alarming aspect. (Ironical cries of “Hear! hear” from the Ministerial benches.) Yes, and I charge honorable gentlemen with the fatal consequence of placing the issue before the English public, the people of this country, and the people of the United States—that either this self-made, unauthorised Constitution must be supported, or else the rejection of it will be tantamount to annexation, and consequently that we are annexationists at heart who do not approve of this measure. We, who raise our voices honestly against the scheme, being desirous really to perpetuate our connection with the Mother Country, and to defend this province with the means we have, are to be stigmatised as annexationists by the Minister of Agriculture, who sends it forth to the world, that there are annexationists not only here but down in the Lower Provinces. He, forsooth, is the man of all others to talk about loyalty! I have listened with disgust—(oh! oh!)—with disgust, at the assumption with which the honorable gentleman passes judgment on those who will be found standing by the British flag when he will be nowhere. (Hear, hear.) Yes; I can scarcely restrain my anger when I hear that honorable gentleman reading us a lecture on loyalty. It is “Satan reproving sin.” When he gets into a government with a number of super-loyal gentlemen, he forsooth must stigmatise as disloyal every one who will not go just his own way.

HON. MR. MCGEE—I had said all these things you refer to, before you took me into your government. (Laughter.)

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—Whilst the honorable gentleman was with us, we kept him as close as we could, and it was a hard task. (Laughter.) We managed, however, to keep him right, and he took his part in settling the principles which were laid down in the answer we gave to the Duke of NEWCASTLE.

HON. MR. MCGEE—Some of the views laid down in that document are very good.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—And no doubt, when he disagrees with the gentlemen with whom he is now associated, and leaves them as he left us, he will have different views again.

HON. MR. MCGEE—I will never go back to you.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—The honorable gentleman was glad to come to us. It was the first lift he got in Canada.

HON. MR. MCGEE—I never sought you.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—I was led into this digression in consequence of the taunts and imputations cast upon us this evening by the leader of the House. We were obliged to him for saying, in his speech at the opening of this debate, that we are all loyal in this country; and yet the Attorney General East in his speech made on the following day, said there were annexationists here—there were the JOHN DOUGALL party and the extreme democratic party. It is not for me to reconcile the statements of the two honorable gentlemen. One says there are no annexationists, the other says there are. The Hon. Attorney General East spoke of an annexation sentiment in Montreal. Whether he is right or not, we know that that city became notorious for its annexation proclivities at a former time. With regard to the prosperity of the country, and its condition at this present time, I have some observations to make, and will leave the House to deduce therefrom how far the Administration will be justifiable in asking from this House authority to make the outlay which they may propose for purposes of defence. I have said that the cry of annexation has arisen from the attempt made by honorable gentlemen opposite to shape our Constitution after the American model. And there is nothing more natural than, when the commerce of the country is at a stand-still, when indebtedness presses hard and heavy upon the farmers and mechanics as well as merchants, and all branches of trade are depressed—nothing is

more natural than that people should look somewhere for relief. This leads me to state that the desire for change—which it is said this proposed scheme is intended to meet—has not been produced so much by any sectional difficulties, as by the embarrassments which have overtaken the country. Make the institutions of this country analogous, except in some very trifling instances of difference, to those of the United States, and let us feel that our commerce is too limited, and embarrassments have overtaken us—and the result will be that the policy of honorable gentlemen opposite with regard to this question will make people look to the States, in spite of themselves. I wish to shew that the state of the country ten years ago was much more prosperous than it is now. The condition in which we found ourselves in 1852 and 1853 justified us to a great extent in going into a large indebtedness for the Grand Trunk. And probably the healthy condition of the farming interest and of every branch of trade at that time, justified to some extent the enactment of the Municipal Loan Fund Act, which enabled municipalities to borrow money for all sorts of improvements. Having referred to the state of prosperity which then prevailed, I shall next allude to the cause, which, in my judgment, more than anything else contributed to produce the disastrous difficulties which have since overtaken the country. I first quote from the despatch of Lord ELGIN in 1852, to show what was our condition about that period, when transmitting to the Colonial Office the Canadian *Blue Book* for the previous year:—

I had the honor, with my despatch, No. 2, on the 9th September, to transmit two copies of "Tables of the Trade and Navigation of the Province of Canada for 1851," and I now enclose the *Blue Book*, together with a printed copy of the "Accounts of the Province," and of a Report by the Commissioner of Public Works for the same year. These documents furnish much gratifying evidence of the progress and prosperity of the colony, and justify the anticipations on this head expressed in my despatch, No. 94, of the 1st August, 1851, which accompanied the *Blue Book* of 1850.

That is the official statement made by the then Governor General to the Mother Country. And what does he say in the following year? In 1853, after going over a number of facts, shewing the advancement of trade and commerce, and the general progress of the country, he says, in the last sentence but one of his despatch:—

I enclose the supplement of a local newspaper, which contains copies of the addresses that were presented to me at various points in my progress up the Ottawa. Your Grace will observe with satisfaction the uniform testimony which they bear to the prosperity of the country and the contentment of the inhabitants. Reports which reach me from other parts of the province speak on this point the same language. Canada has enjoyed seasons of prosperity before, but it is doubtful whether any previous period in the history of the colony can be cited at which there was so entire an absence of those bitter personal and party animosities which divert attention from material interests, and prevent co-operation for the public good.

I could quote also from the essays written at that time by the member for South Lanark (Mr. MORRIS), the Solicitor General East (Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN), and the late JOHN SHERIDAN HOGAN, to shew the unprecedented progress which was being made by Canada at that time. And what was the first thing to mar that prosperity? I wish to call the attention of honorable gentlemen to the fact, that the first step in bringing about the embarrassment we are now laboring under, was the repeal of the Usury laws. In the first place, the bill of the honorable member for South Oxford (Hon. Mr. BROWN) in 1853, took away the penalty attached to lending money at usurious rates. Money was then got freely—farmers and others borrowed heavily—and we commenced our downward career. Afterwards all restrictions on the lending of money were taken off. At first people could get money at six per cent., but afterwards capital came in from abroad, and the country was flooded with money, but at unlimited interest. I appeal to honorable gentlemen, who represent the farming portions of Upper Canada—I appeal to honorable members for Lower Canada, if they can rise in their places and say that the condition of this country at present is not deplorable; that there is not an amount of private indebtedness which is frightful to contemplate? And why is this? It is because so many are borrowing money on account of the facility of obtaining it at high rates; then, getting embarrassed, they borrow for three or four years more at 15 or 20 per cent; next they have to borrow at 30 or 40 per cent, and finally are stripped of their property and ruined.

Mr. A. MACKENZIE—Does the honorable gentleman want an answer to the appeal he made a moment ago?

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD—Certainly.

Mr. A. MACKENZIE—Well, I have to say for one, that while there is a considerable amount of money borrowed in the part of the country which I represent myself, there is an amount of accumulated wealth there tenfold what it was at the time the honorable gentleman has referred to; and there is not anything like that amount borrowed now that there was at that time. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. STIRTON.—I have no hesitation in endorsing that statement, as applicable also to the part of the country which I represent.

Mr. A. MACKENZIE—And I should have added that money can be borrowed at lower rates now than at the time referred to.

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD—Well, it appears that I have the testimony of two honorable gentlemen against me. As regards the statement of my honorable friend who comes from the Oil Springs, we can easily understand why money has flowed in there, where they sell a hundred acres for a million of dollars—and why, at the time his section of country has become rich, other parts of the country may remain poor. (Hear, hear.) At the time the usury laws were repealed, I had the honor, Mr. SPEAKER, to be in the seat which you now occupy, and I had therefore no opportunity of urging my opposition to the bill then brought before the House by the honorable member for South Oxford (Hon. Mr. BROWN) with all that energy and earnestness which characterises that honorable gentleman. But whenever the attempt was subsequently made to restore the usury laws, or to reimpose the restrictions on the rate of interest, my vote will always be found to have been with those who were opposed to what is called free trade in money, and to-day I feel more satisfied than ever that it is the repeal of the usury laws which has brought about a large amount of the depression and the difficulties under which the country now suffers. It is true that for two or three years after the repeal of the usury laws, the country was prosperous. Property was valued at enormous rates; large amounts were borrowed from the Municipal Loan Fund, and were spent on local improvements generally, yielding no return whatever. Then there were large sums borrowed from the different moneyed corporations that came into the country—such as the Canada Loan and Credit Company—the Trust and Loan Company—and the various insurance companies that are daily investing their surplus funds in valu-

able property in this country. Where does that money go? It does not remain here. It is drained off in the dividends of the banks, and of the various companies that are lending at usurious rates of interest. It is going out of the country. And what do we get in return? More facilities for borrowing. And I ask honorable gentlemen from Upper Canada—I do not know how far this is applicable to Lower Canada—whether it is not true that an immense number of our youth, now in the armies of the United States, have gone away because the properties held by their fathers are so heavily mortgaged that they had no hope of retrieving them. Speaking for my own section, I can say that there is scarcely a young man who can now look forward, as was the rule ten or twelve years ago, to succeeding his father in the family homestead. I say then that this generally depressed state of the country, without any prospect of relief, causes a large amount of uneasiness in the public mind. And there is no doubt that a good deal of the feeling in favor of the scheme which honorable gentleman take credit for, is influenced by the desire to look for some change, as a relief from the depression under which we labour. And I am not without authority for the statement I am now making. I shall read from an article published only a day or two ago by one, whose name I am sure is well known to the commercial community generally—who has contributed more than any one else to the statistics of our trade and commerce by his labors in Toronto, and subsequently in Montreal—I allude to the Editor of the *Trade Review*. I shall read from that article, and shall then ask the House to say whether I have been exaggerating. I am now speaking more of the condition of our farmers, and those who have been induced to borrow on account of the facilities afforded for getting money; I shall come presently to speak of the trade and commerce of the country, and shall prove from the same source that the statistics of our trade shew both to be in a deplorable condition. I do this to show that we should not blindly incur an immense liability in the matter of defence, when we have no means of meeting the outlay that may be imposed upon us. When the Hon. Solicitor General (Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN) and the member for St. John's (Mr. BOURASSA) had a race every year to see who would be foremost in bringing in his bill to reduce the rate of interest, the member for South Oxford (Hon. Mr. BROWN) of course insisted on the

maintenance of his pet scheme, which, in my opinion, has done more harm to the country than anything else. I regret that the House should have agreed so far with the honorable gentleman in maintaining that policy. As I said before, in a country like this, where our wealth is in our lands, where we own but little money—when our crops fail, how can we meet the extravagant demands made upon us by those from whom we borrow? But I will proceed to read what the *Trade Review* of February last says of our present laws on the subject of usury:—

The framers of these laws evidently intended them, we think, to protect the trader and the farmer from the extortions of money lenders, and, as such, they may have been suited for the time, when banking was solely in the hands of one or two corporations, which, of course, were monopolists. But competition has now fairly effaced all possibility of oppression from such a source. These laws, in fact, instead of guarding the interests they were intended to protect, only serve to drive their representatives into the enemy's quarters, and leave them at the mercy of the oppressor. Mercantile paper, which our banks are not willing to discount at seven per cent., is handed by the needy trader—who is in want of money to meet the pressing demands of some creditor, or to retire some notes falling due—to a broker, by whom, perhaps, after getting a bond over part of the trader's property, the paper is discounted at a rate more nearly assimilated to that at which respectable bankers are selling "current fund" drafts upon New York (say fifty per cent. discount) than a fair rate for commercial paper. This is the kind of protection our usury laws afford. Rather a rude nurse, we should call them, for our undeveloped "resources, and our infant manufactures."

That is the language of the reviewer, one whose business it is to review, not only the monetary condition and the commerce of the country, but every branch of our industry and trade, and he seals with his judgment the statements which have been made as to the deplorable condition into which the existing usury laws, in this and in former years, have brought the country. That is one of the consequences of free trade in money. The honorable member for South Oxford in answer to a remark from this side, said this afternoon that the commercial interests of Upper Canada were in a most prosperous condition.

HON. MR. BROWN—I did not say "a most prosperous condition." What I said was this—that the honorable member for Chateaugay had exaggerated the difficulties now existing in Upper Canada; that the

troubles in the United States, short crops and other causes had caused a depression in Upper Canada; but that this, I considered, was merely temporary, and that with one or two good crops all this would disappear.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—But these are hard truths which I have been reading. And I think it is better to tell frankly our condition, than to base our estimates on a condition which we do not really enjoy. Let us not send out extravagant statements about our situation which will not stand the test of an impartial scrutiny. Let us rather make known here and in the Mother Country our real resources, than make false representations of a state of prosperity which does not exist. Then this is our prospect, as stated by the editor of the *Trade Review*, and honorable gentlemen must remember that our present prospects have a great deal to do with the course they should take in legislating on the future constitution of our government:—

A very general degree of anxiety is apparent among mercantile men as to the prospects of a healthy trade during the coming season. There are so many unfavourable circumstances combining to affect our commerce, that this anxiety is by no means without a cause. Excessive importations last year, implying large internal and foreign indebtedness; decreased exports, equally implying inability to readily reduce this indebtedness, are facts that in themselves are sufficient to create a marked change in the immediate condition of trade. There can be no doubt but that the grain crop throughout Western Canada falls short of even diminished expectation, the fine sleighing of the past two months having failed to induce deliveries to any large extent by farmers. Taking into account, however, that throughout the autumn the deliveries were insignificant, it was generally anticipated that during the winter the amount of produce to be brought out would be very large. But unfortunately, notwithstanding a continuance of excellent roads, a very great pressure for money, and a fair demand at moderate rates, at no point in all the province have the receipts yet reached those of previous years. The only inference is, that the crop is not only a short one, but that the money being realised for it falls far short of general expectation. The result must be to materially lessen the debt-paying power of the people, and render them less likely to make new purchases. Not only will this be the internal effect, but when it is understood that one section of the province will require for consumption very nearly all the surplus produce of the other, the difficulty to discharge foreign indebtedness is intensified."

MR. SPEAKER, I again quote from the *Trade Review*. It tells us that the pro-

bable excess in Upper Canada will be more than swallowed up in Lower Canada. The article goes on to say:—

Another cause for anxiety is the general condition in which the retail trade of the country is found. The numerous failures that are daily occurring, and the wretched dividends which real estates are likely to pay, indicate a condition of things not at all desirable. Not only is there constantly apparent a manifest lack of capacity, but, as we remarked last week, a degree of rascality is being developed, which cannot fail to be highly injurious to general confidence. We do not now propose to enumerate the causes for these frequent casualties, or point out the policy of trade that has induced them: it is sufficient to say, that recent events make it more than usually incumbent upon importers to scan their credits very closely; to lessen large amounts in few hands; and to use every legitimate precaution for safety rather than profit. We need hardly another cause to account for the anxiety of merchants as to the future. But another cause we have in the restricted policy which the banks will of necessity be compelled to pursue. All that we have been attempting to describe will act with far greater force upon the banks than upon individuals. A small movement of produce implies an equally small circulation of bills; any lack of confidence in the retail trade will hasten the policy which has been for some time evident, viz., the contraction into large cities of the means of the leading institutions. Even in the ordinary condition of affairs, the banks would not do other than contract in a year of short crops and low prices. But another cause for contraction will be the contemplated withdrawal of Southern gold now in deposit. The passage of the Alien Bill may have one of two effects,—1st, it may cause the withdrawal of a considerable sum of gold held by the banks; or 2nd, it will certainly necessitate preparation for such a withdrawal, should it even never take place. Either consequence implies a conversion into bullion of some property not now in that shape. The banks now unitedly hold five and a-half millions of dollars in gold, against which there is a circulation of notes of over nine millions. This proportion will doubtless be maintained, and any considerable drafts for deposits will be met by bills of exchange on England, the banks either using their credit there, which they can do with interest at five per cent., or they can sell the securities in which their foreign deposits are invested.

Sir, there is the future, drawn only last month, of the condition of Upper Canada—short crops and nothing to export, and nothing staring us in the face but actual distress and actual want. Then, if that is imminent, does it not behove us to regard closely the conduct of the gentlemen on the Treasury benches? We ought to admonish them not to go heedlessly and needlessly

into extravagance which this country cannot bear. (Hear, hear.) The effect of this legislation, the unhinging of the public mind, and the high expectations formed of the advantages which are to result from the adoption of this scheme of a new Constitution—all these things have contributed to make the people unhappy and to drive the population out of the country. (Hear, hear.) I put it to the House, whether the honorable gentlemen on the Treasury benches have not given, as the main excuse for pressing the Confederation scheme, the imminent danger which surrounds us. Does the emigrant choose that country where he cannot profitably invest his capital; where he cannot find profitable employment on his arrival, nor lands in convenient situations, which he can convert to immediate use, where extravagance has been induced by the facilities afforded for borrowing and for wild speculations; and above all, where he expects to be called upon to perform military duties in the face of a powerful enemy immediately on the borders of his new home? I think that if, in the face of all these circumstances, the gentlemen on the Treasury benches pledge themselves to an excessive outlay, we ought to be told now what are the prospects in store for the people of Canada. (Hear, hear.) But, sir, they are silent on that point. We know this, however, from past experience—we know that it will be impossible for us to regulate the conduct of the honorable gentlemen on the Treasury benches, when they get to Downing-street, surrounded by the influences which will meet them there. Sir, we have occasion for alarm. We remember that when Hon. Mr. HINCKS went to England in 1854, notwithstanding we had voted one million eight hundred sterling in 1852 for the Grand Trunk, he returned to Canada just in time to call Parliament within a day of the prescribed period appointed for its meeting, and proposed, as the important measure for that session, £900,000 stg. additional; and this vote was forced through Parliament during the following session, when it transpired, for the first time, that the agreement to advance this sum out of the public exchequer had been entered into by Mr. HINCKS and Lord ELGIN whilst in London. We are now called upon to give these gentlemen a vote of credit; to give them the control of a large sum of money, to spend as they think

proper; to allow them to betake themselves to England to bind us to an agreement for all time to come. (Hear, hear.) We see, sir, day after day, as I have said before, how gentlemen come to this House and disregard the pledges they have made their constituents. Once in their places here, they forget the vows by which they obtained them. I could give a long list, in my experience of a quarter of a century in this House, of members who have betrayed the confidence reposed in them by the people who elected them. (Hear, hear.) Is it vain to appeal to members now to control the power the Government are asking from us, after we have protested against this sort of thing year after year; when we are refused those explanations which should be given to this House; when the country is deeply embarrassed, I fear, beyond redemption? (Hear, hear.) I have to apologise to the House for the length of time during which I have occupied its attention. But I hope the House will believe this, that I am not actuated by any factious motives in this matter. (Hear, hear.) I stand here as one who has no vote of his to recall; as one who has always maintained that, under our Constitution, as it is, prosperity and enjoyment might be secured, with all their concomitants, were we free from demagoguism, which has produced a very large proportion of the difficulties by which we are surrounded. (Hear, hear.) I think I have demonstrated that there is sufficient cause for alarm to make us anxious for the future. For all we know, we may find ourselves in a very awkward predicament when the question turns upon Confederation or annexation. I sincerely regret to notice the prevalence of this tone of annexation, and I say that, since the honorable gentlemen opposite got on the Treasury benches, this tone has been much more decided on this question than ever before. (Hear, hear.) Sir, I need only refer to the declaration of the honorable Premier in the other House, who stated the other day that we were on an inclined plane towards annexation, but which the Confederation scheme was calculated to arrest. I regret also, as much as any one, the position in which we are placed, and that, with such a large population, we are, like mendicants, knocking at the door of the Lower Provinces, imploring them against their will to step in to save us, forsooth, from destruction. (Hear.) It is no wonder that the

people there refuse to cast their lot with ours, after hearing the opinion the honorable gentlemen on the Treasury benches have so frequently expressed of each other. And what will be the consequence if an attempt is made to coerce them? Why, they will be like the damsel who is forced to marry against her will, and who will, in the end, be most likely to elope with some one else. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) With the tricks which the gentlemen on the Treasury benches know so well to play, we will only hasten the day when the Lower Provinces will perhaps endeavor to withdraw from the Mother Country and seek another alliance. I resume my seat, sir, regretting the manner in which the Government have tried to stifle the full and free discussion of this great question. (Cheers.)

MR. COWAN—I cannot agree altogether, Mr. SPEAKER, with the honorable member for Cornwall as to the causes which led to the prosperity of this country from 1854 to 1858, nor yet with the picture he draws of our present circumstances. That hon. gentleman attributes our prosperity to the repeal of the Usury laws. I do not doubt but that the repeal of the Usury laws had some effect, but there were other causes which had much more to do in producing that prosperity than the repeal of the Usury laws. In the first place we imported money by the million to build our railways, and in the second place, not only had we abundant harvests, but short crops in other countries gave us fabulous prices for everything we raised. Instead of eighty or ninety cents, wheat was worth two dollars a bushel and upwards, with millers scouring the country with teams to carry it from the barn to the mill. Such a tide of prosperity, Mr. SPEAKER, never set in on any country; the result was that it unhinged the sober calculation of almost everybody, and we ran into debt individually, municipally, and provincially, as if pay-day had never been to come. Well-to-do farmers, with perhaps a thousand dollars or two in their pocket, thought they might purchase an adjoining farm, but it was well if they escaped with the loss of the money paid down. In many instances the homestead was sacrificed ere the new farm was paid for, while houses planned and built then have not yet received their furniture. But, Mr. SPEAKER, if our prosperity was unprecedented, so were our reverses. The commercial crisis of 1858 came on us when we were

almost without a crop. The disastrous frost of the 11th of June destroyed the one-half, if not three-fourths, of the fall wheat.—Spring wheat—all except the Fife sort, then but sown—was so blighted as in many instances not to be worth the cutting. And many a farmer was not only destitute of potatoes to eat, but had even to purchase his next year's seed. The only article from which numerous farmers got any return was surplus stock, which that season brought fair prices—lean as well as fat—in the American markets. But these reverses were not without a salutary effect. All speculation was instantly stopped. Farmers began to practice anew frugality and economy, and turned their attention to rearing stock as well as cereals. The consequence is that the country has in a great measure recovered from the shock of 1858, and, notwithstanding rather short crops and comparatively low prices, I cannot help thinking that the hon. member for Cornwall takes altogether too gloomy a view of the state of the country. But though I cannot coincide with the gloomy views of the member for Cornwall, neither can I accept the bright prospect of the member for South Wellington, as being descriptive of the agricultural interest, generally, throughout the province. It is all very well for my hon. friend, who resides in one of the most fertile counties in Canada, and whose farmers devote their attention to rearing stock—stock second to none in the province—to talk of agricultural prosperity. But in less favored sections it cannot be denied that there is much individual suffering, caused by the midge and the unprecedented drought of last summer. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. LAFRAMBOISE said—Mr. SPEAKER, when, a few nights ago, I had the honor to assert in this House that the Government would adopt every means to cause their scheme of Confederation to be passed without amendment, and would have recourse to motions of the nature of that which is engaging our attention at the present time, I certainly did not expect that my prediction would be so soon accomplished, and I acknowledge that I did not believe that it was so well founded as it has proved to be. What do we see, Mr. SPEAKER? We see an example of the most deplorably restrictive action which can possibly be displayed by a government. After delivering, to satiety, speeches lasting several hours, speeches to

which we have listened with the greatest possible attention, the Administration, alarmed at the agitation which is arising everywhere throughout Lower Canada, and dreading reaction, takes every means to prevent discussion, and to cause the House to vote without allowing it an opportunity of proposing amendments to the informal scheme which it is desirous of imposing upon the country. (Hear, hear.) Among those who were witnesses of the unworthy behavior of some of the honorable Ministers, who now sit on the opposite side of the House, at the time of the celebrated "Double Shuffle" of 1858; among those who saw those men record an oath at ten o'clock at night which they violated the very next day—among those, I say, the breach of faith, of which the Hon. Attorney General West has just given so sad an example to this House, will excite no surprise, for those gentlemen have long accustomed us to such unworthy actions on the part of a Ministry which has lost all sense of honor and of the respect which they owe to the House. (Hear, hear.) It is evident, Mr. SPEAKER, that the Government is afraid of amendments which might be proposed by the Opposition to their scheme, and of the vote which would be taken on those amendments; discussion alarms them, and the Hon. Attorney General for Lower Canada dreads nothing so much as an appeal to the people, notwithstanding that he would appear to hold in contempt the protests which come to us in the shape of petitions from all the counties in the district of Montreal. (Hear, hear.) Yes, Mr. SPEAKER, these numerous petitions prove to us that several honorable members of this House do not represent here the opinion of their constituents in respect of the new Constitution which it is wished to impose upon us. There are representatives here who are ready to vote in favor of the scheme of Confederation in spite of earnest protestations from the counties for which they were elected. I shall content myself with mentioning a single one—I allude to the honorable member for St. Hyacinthe. Well, Mr. SPEAKER, that honorable member has declared that he will vote against the appeal to the people, and in favor of Confederation, notwithstanding that out of two thousand inhabitants whom he represents, or rather does not represent, in this House, seventeen hundred have formally enjoined him, by a petition signed with their names, to adopt the contrary course. (Hear, hear.)

A VOICE—How many of those are electors?

HON. MR. LAFRAMBOISE—They are all electors; and if you like, you may convince yourself of the truth of what I state by examining the signatures, which are those of duly qualified electors who voted at the election of the honorable member for St. Hyacinthe. I say then, Mr. SPEAKER, that the imposing and significant movement which is now going on in Lower Canada alarms the Ministry, and that if the Lower Canadian representatives obey the popular voice, and do not disregard it as some of them appear disposed to do, they will vote against the motion proposed by the Honorable Attorney General for Upper Canada; for if those honorable members support this motion, they will simply declare that they do not wish for amendments to the scheme, that they are opposed to an appeal to the people and to any alteration whatever of the scheme. The other night the honorable member for Montmorency declared in this House that this signified nothing; that a representative was not bound to respect the wishes of his constituents, and that we were at perfect liberty to vote as we might think fit on any measure whatsoever, and especially on the scheme of Confederation. At all events, Mr. SPEAKER, I shall venture to hold a different opinion from that of the honorable member, and I say that every man who shews a proper respect for his position in this House cannot vote contrary to the expressed wishes of his constituents; it is a doctrine which was never called in question until the honorable member for Montmorency considered that he might cast a doubt upon the correctness of it. Well, a fact that none will venture to deny is, that several members promised their constituents that they would vote in favor of an appeal to the people; and, by compelling them to-day to accept the motion of the Honorable Attorney General for Upper Canada, every chance of their doing so is taken away. Placed as they are in this dilemma, the members who made that promise, and who at the same time are in favor of the Government, ought not to hesitate as to the course to be pursued; they ought to throw out this motion, for, if it should be adopted, Confederation will at once become an accomplished fact, and the appeal to the people will have to be given up. (Hear, hear.) The Honorable Attorney General for Lower Canada has reproached the Opposition with pressing the adjournment of the House at ten, and half-past ten o'clock at night; but let him remember that he himself pressed an adjournment at the same hour, in order to give his colleague, the honorable

member for Dorchester, an opportunity of speaking on the following evening.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—I moved the adjournment at a later hour of the evening; the clock on your side marked a later hour than half-past ten.

HON. MR. LAFRAMBOISE—Well, I can say that the Ministerial clock shewed the hour which I have mentioned, and the two clocks generally agree, better than we agree ourselves. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) In conclusion, Mr. SPEAKER, I have no hesitation in saying that our parliamentary history shews no precedent for so unworthy a proceeding as the present. I say that it is the intention of the Government to send their measure to England to receive the Imperial sanction before the people of this country have had time to judge of it, and before their representatives have had an opportunity of amending it in any way whatever. This measure, or this new Constitution, after it shall have so received the sanction of the Imperial Government, will have to be accepted by Lower Canada, whether it suits her or not. (Hear, hear.) Mr. SPEAKER, I venture to hope that greater independence will be exhibited by our Lower Canadian representatives than our Ministers are willing to believe will be exhibited, and that our Lower Canadian members will not consent to allow themselves to be so led by the nose by their leaders. We were promised, at the commencement of this debate, that all the members should have an opportunity of expressing their views on the scheme, and of making amendments to it, should they think proper to do so; and now, treading all their promises under foot, the Ministry thus lays its ultimatum before us: you must adopt the scheme which we submit to you, without attempting to change a single iota. For my part, Mr. SPEAKER, I consider that I should be failing in the performance of my duty as a representative if I did not record my protest against such conduct, and such scandalous neglect of all the principles of responsible government. (Applause.)

MR. M. C. CAMERON—I very much regret that I find it necessary to detain the House, even for a few moments, for a second time on the same day, on the same subject; but I desire to repel, in the strongest manner, the insinuation that the Hon. Attorney General West has cast on those hon. gentlemen who are opposed to the Confederation scheme—the charge that we are either actuated by feelings tending towards the annexation of Canada to the neighboring republic, or else

that we desire to offer factious opposition, and that we have no good motive in seeking for delay with reference to the consideration of this question. Now, speaking for myself, I must say that I do not believe that there is an honorable gentleman on the floor of this House, or even within the length and breadth of British North America, who would less desire to see any change in the constitutional relations existing between these provinces and the Mother Country than myself. (Hear, hear.) In my opposition to the scheme I am actuated by a feeling, that adopting it in the manner in which it is now proposed to be done will tend more to drive us towards that annexation, which is held up as such a bugbear, than anything that could be done by honorable gentlemen on the Treasury benches in half a century, if our Constitution were allowed to remain as it is. (Hear, hear.) Then, as to our being called obstructionists, I would call your attention, Mr. SPEAKER, to the circumstances surrounding this debate. In the first instance, as has been represented by several honorable members, it was proposed that the matter should be considered as if in Committee of the Whole; but for purposes of preserving order and convenience for transacting other business, that the Speaker should remain in the chair. Though the Hon. Attorney General West does not consider that proposition in the same light as it was understood on this side of the House, and by myself, yet I am satisfied that the intention of hon. gentlemen in proposing it, was that the debate should go on in the same free and unrestrained manner, due order being preserved, as if the Speaker was not in the chair. (Hear, hear.) Hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches then proposed that they should have the opportunity of laying the scheme before the House and the country in as full and careful a manner as they pleased—that they were to take their own time to do this, and were to be allowed to speak without any interruption. That privilege was accorded to them most heartily and cordially by the Opposition. There was no interruption whatever from this side of the House during the whole of their five long speeches. (Hear, hear.) But the very moment they had accomplished their object, and we desired to have exactly the same opportunity—that of laying our views before the House and the country in the same manner, and letting them follow the speeches of the honorable gentlemen on the Treasury benches in proper order—they objected in the most arbitrary manner. The Hon. Attorney

General East claimed the right to reply at once to every speech delivered on this side of the House. (Hear, hear.) Then again a motion was made by the Hon. Attorney General West that until disposed of, the consideration of this question should be taken up every evening at half-past seven o'clock, and that was at once concurred in on our part. In a very short time afterwards it was proposed, and the proposition was endorsed and pressed by the Government, that this solemn agreement should be broken up, and the whole business of the country on the floor of this House suspended until the debate should be brought to a close. In reference to that, I did oppose the course pursued, because I did not think it was for the interest of the country, or that it would facilitate the business of this House. We find that several days were occupied in discussing whether that resolution should be adopted from day to day or not. Who is responsible for that discussion and delay? Was it hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, who desired to carry out the arrangement proposed by the Government themselves, or was it the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, who sought to break up the agreement that had been entered into, of which they themselves were the authors? (Hear, hear.) I have also, Mr. SPEAKER, in this connection, to make my acknowledgments to the Hon. Attorney General West for the very elegant compliment he paid the honorable member for Peel and myself, in characterising us as the "shanghais" from their, the Ministerial side of the House (hear, hear, and laughter)—but though he did give us the credit of being the only ones that had laid eggs that amounted to anything, the others being all addled, he might have reflected a little, and in doing so have found that the eggs that these "shanghais" had laid will produce birds that in all probability will cut the combs of honorable gentlemen on that side of the House. (Laughter.) The hot haste with which those honorable gentlemen are proceeding with this measure is fostering and providing that heat that will bring into vitality and life those very eggs that they referred to; and when the country understands the character of the brood which is produced by those eggs, honorable gentlemen will find that they have been counting without their host in hatching them. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. GALT—Counting their chickens before they are hatched. (Laughter.)

MR. M. C. CAMERON—Exactly; count-

ing the chickens before they are hatched. Honorable gentlemen parade before this House an indefinable something that they are careful to keep in the background, which they seem to intimate, if they were only to divulge, would bring almost every member of the House around to their view of the question at once. Mr. SPEAKER, if there is any information of that kind in their possession, we should know what it is. (Hear, hear.) If we have a herculean labor before us to meet some approaching difficulty, this House should know what that labor and that difficulty is, that we may prepare to meet it as speedily and as bravely as possible. (Hear, hear.) I do not find that the honorable gentlemen are making any preparations for meeting the lack of defence under which they say the country exists, between the present time and the assembling of this House in the summer. And yet they bring the matter up to frighten the House into submission to their views. They have a puppet from which, by keeping it sufficiently behind the screens, they throw a distorted shadow upon the wall and tell us to look at the giant; but when the shadow is traced to its origin, it will be found, I apprehend, to be nothing but a puppet after all. If they were to come out boldly and give this House all the information of which they boast the possession, I am very much mistaken if the mystery would not turn out to be a mere scarecrow. They make a great cackling about the hawk, and then when the whole brood of chickens is gathered under their wings, it turns out that the source of their pretended fright is nothing but a harmless dove after all. (Laughter.) Honorable gentlemen on the Treasury benches are constantly endeavoring to lead us to suppose that there is imminent danger of a war with the United States, and yet each honorable member, as he rises, declares that for himself he has no apprehension of anything of that kind. They ought to consider that if there is any ground for apprehension, if there is any danger of the United States attacking Canada and getting into a war with England, such a war will be upon us almost immediately. When the nation emerges from the strife in which it is at present engaged, they will have learned a costly lesson of the horrors of war and the financial burdens it imposes; and I am satisfied that so intelligent a people as they are universally admitted to be, will not rush into a contest with a power like that of England, unless they do so while smarting under wrongs they imagine they have suffered at the hands of Eng-

land in connection with the war in which they are now engaged. After they have had time to reflect and to sit down and count the cost of the strife through which they will have passed, in treasure and blood and intellect, and their national wounds have had time to stiffen, there will be little danger of their again rushing into another similarly disastrous contest. I heard a gentleman describing this matter a short time ago, by an illustration which I will here repeat. His position was that the respective probabilities of a war with the United States, at an early or a remote period, might be learned from what is often seen when two men have been engaged in a round of fisticuffs. They pummell and bruise each other in the most shocking manner; and while the wounds they have received at each other's hands are fresh, while their blood is up, and while they are smarting under their injuries, if a bystander interferes with either of them, even sometimes by a little wholesome, well-meant advice, the wounded man will be ready to pitch into him at once, almost without thought of the odds that may exist against him. But after such an individual cools off and his wounds become stiff and sore, and he gets time for reflection, he has no desire whatever to enter into a contest. And so, I apprehend, will it be with our neighbors on the other side of the line. When they get cooled down after the present contest, return to their almost desolated homes again, and see the vacancies that have been caused, and when their leaders count up the millions upon millions of dollars that their present war will have cost them, and the claims that will be made upon them for compensation, war losses, and numerous other matters, they will feel a very great aversion to entering upon hostilities which will bring down upon them the whole power of England. Therefore I hold that if we are going to expend money in defences, it ought to be done without a day's unnecessary delay. And yet hon. gentlemen propose to delay submitting a measure for the consideration of the House until another session. They will prorogue this session without making any appropriation for defence, and go home to England to push through a scheme which there is now no object in hurrying forward. (Hear, hear.) Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are not actuated in their opposition to the scheme by any desire to occupy the place of any one of the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, but their object is to protect the interests of the people, on whose behalf

they have been sent to this House, and on their behalf to see that we have a government carried on upon economical principles, so that the people may be led to respect and sustain it. (Hear, hear.) But if we have a government that is extravagant in their ideas, how can we expect the people to respect that government? And what is there so well calculated to place this country on the inclined plane to slide into the American Union—so graphically described by the head of the Government in the Upper House—as extravagance on the part of our Government? If we have to spend the sum that the commission has recommended in erecting works of defence, and then provide corresponding forces of men and equipments, the expense will be monstrous. And yet, forsooth, because we ask for information, and object to the coercion they have attempted, they charge us with being obstructionists. Do they mean to say that it is factious conduct for the representatives of the people to demand that they be consulted before their very Constitution is trampled upon and another forced upon them? Canada is by far the most numerously populated, most wealthy and most important of all the colonies to be affected by the change, and yet the people of this province are the only people that are to have no opportunity of saying whether the change is acceptable or not, nor are their representatives in Parliament to have even the opportunity of moving a single amendment to it. (Hear, hear.) If opposition to that kind of thing entitles me to the epithet of obstructionist, then I glory in the name of an obstructionist. (Applause.) I shall vote against the motion that has been made by my hon. friend the Hon. Atty. Gen. West, and I again express my sincere regret that he should have been induced to bring in such a motion, calculated, as it is, to stifle the proper and ordinary expression of this House. To tell us that we may discuss the question as much as we please is most gratuitous, and is nothing but a sham, alongside of the fact that the motion shuts us off from bringing forward any amendments, or placing our views upon the subject upon the records of the House. How often have hon. gentlemen on that side of the House told us that if we were not prepared to accept the measure, we ought to be prepared to propose a better one? But no sooner do we give notice of what we consider a better one, than we are virtually gagged, and told that we shall not have the opportunity of even proposing them to the House. If that is the way that a free

people is to be treated, hon. gentlemen will soon find out that they are on the wrong track; and when Parliament is again summoned, they will be met by a voice from the people that will show them that they have adopted a course that will consign names that have heretofore been honorable, to political oblivion, on account of this outrage upon the rights and liberties of a free people, and it will be an oblivion that will be richly merited. (Loud cheers.)

MR. SCATCHERD said:—The resolutions under debate, involving as they do an entire change in the Constitution of this country, I regard as of greater importance than any question that has been debated before this House since the union. So sweeping a change seldom takes place except after war or insurrection. (Hear, hear.) But we have had neither war nor insurrection—(hear)—we have enjoyed a very long season of peace and quietness, and at no time has there been an agitation among the people for such a change as that now proposed. I believe this scheme to have been undertaken mainly because the leaders of the two political parties saw that they had no hope left of continuing in office on the one hand, or getting into office on the other, while they fought against each other. I have heard it asserted in this House and out of this House, that so grave had become the position of public affairs, that all government had become impossible, and that the gravity of the occasion required that men of all parties should unite to find a solution of existing difficulties. I hope this was not a mere pretence, put forward by men in office to continue in office, and by men out of office to get into office. It is a fact well known, that so long as either party could govern without the assistance of the other, no advance was made toward a union between the leaders. The changing of two or three votes in this House would have indefinitely postponed the scheme now under consideration. That there was no necessity occasioned by a dead-lock in carrying on the Government must be apparent, when we consider that political parties, by a little forbearance, would have avoided the dead-lock. Surely, if parties could unite as they did in June last, they could have united to prevent the difficulty complained of, and have put off the evil day perhaps forever, without entering upon a scheme to subvert the Constitution. If a dead-lock existed, it ought

to be attributed rather to the contention of parties than to any defect in our form of government. (Hear, hear.) The union between the Canadas took place in 1840; for some time afterwards each section was represented in the united Legislature by forty-two members. Upper Canada at the time of the union had a population of 486,000, and Lower Canada 661,000. After the union took place, from 1844 to 1848, the majority of the Government was a very narrow one. The Government was kept in power by two or three votes; yet during these years there was not a suggestion in favor of a change of Constitution for the purpose of increasing the majority. (Hear, hear.) The same number of members continued to represent each section of the province until 1854, when the number from each section was increased to sixty-five, and has continued so to the present time. From the year 1854 until the present time, there has existed among the people of Upper Canada a strong agitation in favor of representation according to population. That principle was agitated by the Reform party at every election. It was the principal political topic, and members were required to pledge themselves to maintain it under all circumstances upon the floor of this House. And not only was the Reform party committed to that principle, but many Conservatives were forced to declare themselves in favor of it. In 1858 some of the members of the Government sent an official letter to England, in which the difficulties of the country were graphically referred to, and the agitation was characterized as being fraught with great danger to the peaceful and harmonious working of our constitutional system, and consequently detrimental to the progress of the province. This document was laid before Parliament in February, 1859, and in November of the same year the Toronto Convention met, where the Reform party was represented by about 570 prominent gentlemen from all parts of Upper Canada. At that meeting the grievances of which Upper Canada complained were discussed in an able manner by gentlemen fully acquainted with them, and capable of setting them forth. Although the project of a Federal union of the provinces had been brought before Parliament and the country in February, and the Convention met in November, and ample time was given for its agitation, we find that the Convention did

not consider that it afforded a proper remedy for the evils that existed in Upper Canada. The resolutions passed by that Convention with respect to the grievances of Canada, and the proper remedy for them, were as follow:—

No. 1.—Resolved, That the existing Legislative union of Upper and Lower Canada has failed to realize the anticipations of its promoters, has resulted in a heavy public debt, burdensome taxation, great political abuses, and universal dissatisfaction through Upper Canada, and it is the matured conviction of this assembly, from the antagonism developed, from difference of origin, local interests, and other causes, that the union in its present form can no longer be continued with advantage to the people.

So much for the grievances.

No. 5.—Resolved, That in the opinion of this assembly the best practical remedy for the evils now encountered in the government of Canada, is to be found in the formation of two or more local governments, to which shall be committed the control of all matters of a local and sectional character, and some joint authority charged with such matters as are necessary, common to both sections of the province.

Such was the remedy. The 4th resolution shows that the Federation of the provinces was not entertained as a remedy for the evils complained of by the Convention, for it resolved:—

That without entering on the discussion of other objections, this assembly is of opinion that the delay which must occur in obtaining the sanction of the Lower Provinces to a Federal union of all the British North American Colonies, places that measure beyond consideration as a remedy for present evils.

Now, if it had been the opinion of the people of Upper Canada, as represented in that Convention, that a Federal union with the Maritime Provinces would prove a remedy for the grievances they were laboring under, they would have taken it into consideration. Either it did not suit the leaders of the Reform party at that time to take up that plan as it was brought forward by men opposed to them, or else they did not believe it the true remedy. If they had believed it the proper remedy, there was nothing to prevent them uniting with the Government to carry it out, with the coöperation of the other provinces. The only drawback to the adoption of the scheme was the fact that its proposers were in office and likely to remain there. That to my mind is the only reason which can now be alleged for not taking it up at that time. One of the reasons assigned for calling that Convention together was, that although the population of Upper

Canada was much larger than that of Lower Canada, and was constantly increasing, yet Upper Canada found itself without power in the administration of the affairs of the province. (Hear, hear.) Another principal grievance under which Upper Canada labored was the unjust levying and distribution of the public moneys. It was contended that seventy per cent. of the annual taxation was collected from Upper Canada, and only thirty per cent. from Lower Canada; on the other hand, when the money came to be expended, for every dollar that was expended in Upper Canada, a dollar was also expended in Lower Canada. And that appears to have been the opinion of prominent members of both political parties; representation by population was demanded by the people of the western section as a cure for that state of things. They considered that if they were represented in this House according to numbers, they would be able to prevent the unjust distribution of the public revenues of the province. Now, the great measure before this House has been considered by some as designed to create a nation, by others as a means of increasing largely the material and commercial interests of the country. I cannot see that the Federation of the provinces has anything of a national phase in it. For those who are dissatisfied with remaining as colonists of Great Britain, it may be very well to look forward to the creation of a nationality or state of national existence. When you speak of national existence, you speak of independence; and so long as we are colonists of Great Britain we can have no national existence. (Hear, hear.) In New Brunswick this question has been treated purely as a question of material interest to the people. (Hear, hear.) In a work recently published by the Hon. Mr. CAUCHON, I find the following statement of the way in which the question is treated in New Brunswick. The honorable gentleman says, page 26:—

The only point for them to consider in making a selection would be the material question of profit or loss; more or less of trade, more or less of taxes. The truth of this is clearly shown by the project of Confederation itself, in which it will be seen that the exceptions affect only Lower Canada, and in the speeches made by Mr. TILLEY, in New Brunswick, in which he states frankly and unequivocally, that with that province there can be but one paramount question in the discussion of the scheme, namely, that of pecuniary interest. Will New Brunswick, under the union, pay more or less, receive more or less; will the taxes im-

posed, under the union, be more or less than they now are? The question has been thus received by the press and public men of that province, and they have so discussed it, with a view to accept or reject it.

To my mind, that is the way in which the question ought to be treated in this province. As a national matter it ought not to be considered at all. The true question is, whether the people of this province will be called upon to pay more or less taxes, and enjoy more or less prosperity. (Hear, hear.) The agitation in connection with representation by population has continued during the past ten years. Going back to the time of the defeat of the CARTIER-MACDONALD Administration, we find that that Administration had considered it an open question. The MACDONALD-SICOTTE Administration, which succeeded, resolved to treat it as a close question. They agreed to leave it in abeyance, but I never understood that their supporters from Upper Canada agreed to abandon it. It was stated distinctly at the time of the formation of that Government, that any abandonment of the question was a matter altogether with the Government, and was not binding upon their supporters. (Hear, hear.) That government adopted what was called the double-majority principle, but I never understood that a majority of their supporters from Upper Canada agreed to accept it as a basis, or a means of securing the settlement of the grievances of Upper Canada. What the Upper Canada Reform party agreed to was, that as there was great corruption and extravagance in the administration of the finances of this country, for the sake of securing administrative reform they would allow the question of representation by population to remain in abeyance for a time. However, the double-majority principle would not work. (Hear, hear.) The MACDONALD-SICOTTE Government were defeated, and the MACDONALD-DORTON Government was formed. They treated the question in the same way as the CARTIER-MACDONALD did—left it an open question. While that government continued in office, there was no special agitation for representation according to population, although in the House it was very generally supported by members from Upper Canada. That government resigned, a new government was formed, and, during the period of that new government's existence, the hon. member for South Oxford had his committee appointed to take into consid-

eration the representation question. That committee, it appears, had the matter under consideration for a long time. They made a report the same day the Government was defeated, but came to no conclusion whatever, except in the general statement that most of its members looked in the direction of a Federal Government. (Hear, hear.) This government was defeated on the question of the \$100,000 paid to the city of Montreal. That vote took place on the 14th of June, the latter part of the resolution being as follows:—

And in view of the facts above recited, this House would be failing in its duty if it did not express its disapprobation of an unauthorized advance of a large amount of public money, and of the subsequent departure from the conditions of the Order in Council under which the advance was made.

There was never a vote aimed more distinctly than that at the Honorable the Minister of Finance; it was declared by a majority of this House that he was the means of the loss of this \$100,000 to the country. The majority voted in that way, and affirmed that resolution. The moment it was passed a Ministerial crisis occurred, and it was understood that the Ministry had the sanction of the Governor General to dissolve the House; within a few days, some of the very men who condemned the Minister of Finance were willing to overlook his offence, to treat the vote of the House as of no consequence whatever, and to become colleagues of that honorable gentleman in the Government. (Hear.) Thus the present Coalition was formed with its policy of Confederation. I believe that the agitation for representation by population had been less active for three years preceding the formation of that government than at any time during the last ten years; but the mere fact of the Government being defeated seemed to be a sufficient excuse for these honorable gentlemen to join men to whom they had been opposed for years, and to come down to this House with a proposal for a Confederation of the provinces. For my own part, I am not opposed to a Confederation of these provinces, on a proper basis, although I would rather have seen a legislative union of them preferred. I have no sympathy with those members in their opposition to the scheme, who, while opposing it, are equally opposed to legislative union and representation by population. I think, from the increase of population in

Upper Canada, that some change is necessary; and I cannot understand how hon. members, who are opposed to this scheme and also to a legislative union, and to any change in representation, can expect sympathy from Upper Canadian members. It is not the principle of the scheme that I object to. My objections I will state. Part of the new Constitution proposes the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. Now, when that question was first brought up in 1862, I was opposed to it. When it was first announced as the intention of the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Government to undertake the building of that road, I expressed myself as decidedly in opposition to it, on the very first opportunity that offered, and I have never since seen any reason to change the position I then took. In connection with this subject, I beg leave to cite the opinions of the hon. member for South Oxford, as then expressed. I do not do so in order to show that he has changed his mind with regard to this road, for I believe he does not conceal the fact himself. I make this citation to show not only what his views were, but what were the views, I believe, of the majority of the people of Upper Canada at that time, views which in my opinion they still entertain. It is stated that the road ought to be built because it is necessary for the military defence of the country. It is stated that it ought to follow the longest route, because the shorter one will bring it too near the boundary line of the State of Maine. (Hear, hear.) When it is considered that this road will unite with the Grand Trunk at Rivière du Loup, and that the Grand Trunk is at places within twenty-six miles of the boundary of Maine, I think that the amount it will contribute to the military defence is of very little value. It is ridiculous to suppose that the Americans would not be able to cut a railway only twenty-six miles from their territory. If we are not strong enough to hold and protect the road which runs through Maine, the Intercolonial would be of very little importance or use. The opinion expressed in the *Globe* about this railway as a work of military defence was this—I quote from the issue of the 18th September, 1862:—

But as our opinion upon military matters may not be worth much, we are prepared to adduce corroborative testimony in its support.

And then he cites the following from *Blackwood's Magazine*:—

On the whole we are inclined to think that until our military frontier is rectified, the construction of a railway between St. John and the St. Lawrence would, as far as military operations are concerned, be money thrown away. If the Intercolonial Railway is to be built, let its friends justify it upon *bona fide* grounds, and not upon the bogus plea that it is necessary for the military defence of the province.

That was the opinion, I believe, of the majority of the people of Upper Canada at that time, that as a military defence this road would be completely useless. But we find that the proposition to build the road is inserted in one of these resolutions, the 68th, in the following terms:—

The General Government shall secure, without delay, the completion of the Intercolonial Railway from Rivière du Loup through New Brunswick to Truro, in Nova Scotia.

The next resolution refers to the North-Western Territory, and is as follows:—

69. The communication with the North-Western Territory and the improvements required for the development of the trade of the Great West with the seaboard are regarded by this Conference as subjects of the highest importance to the Federated Provinces, and shall be prosecuted at the earliest possible period that the state of the finances will permit.

According to these resolutions the construction of the Intercolonial Railway is made a part of the Constitution of the country, and the road will have to be built. On the other hand the enlargement of the canals and the opening up of the North-West will depend upon the contingency whether the finances of the country will permit of the performance of these works. Now, the opening up of the North-West is a subject that has engaged the serious attention of many people in Upper Canada. By a large majority of the population it is considered as most important for the interest of this country that that territory should be opened up to settlement. I find the Great North-West is thus referred to by the Hon. Mr. CAUCHON in his pamphlet on the Union of the Provinces of British North America, page 56:—

And what is Canada in extent compared to the Western prairies, the area and fertility of which can scarcely be appreciated or judged even with reports before us furnished by Mr. DALLAS, Governor of the Hudson's Bay Company, and Dr. RAE, an old factor, well known from his reputation as an astronomer, and as having discovered the remains of FRANKLIN and his unfortunate companions. The latter, instructed to attempt the discovery of

a passage through the Rocky Mountains for the Transcontinental Telegraph Company, states that the river Saskatchewan is a great public highway, flowing through immense fertile valleys, in which wheat and barley might be grown in abundance.

Mr. DALLAS alludes to it in the following words:—

The whole country is more or less adapted to colonization. Two years ago I rode on horseback in the month of August over the greater part of that country. We had to wade as it were knee deep through tares and fitch. I saw there horses and oxen as fat as any I ever found on the best pasturage grounds in England. Those animals had passed the winter in the open air, without a mouthful of hay; this will give a better idea of the climate here than if I were to furnish the variations of the thermometer.

I look upon this country as well adapted to settlement, and extraordinarily healthy. Everything seems to thrive here; the wheat crop is of course rather uncertain, but all other cereals and vegetables obtain the same perfection that they do in England. Towards the north we find an area of timber land, and undulating prairies, which extend over the whole country. The lakes and rivers abound in fish, and the prairies with every species of game, &c.

Now, sir, that is a description of the country held forth to the people of Upper Canada as a kind of set-off against the Intercolonial Railway, to be opened up whenever the state of the finances will permit. I object to the scheme, for the reason that it makes the opening up of such a country a mere contingency; and to show the interest taken by the people of Upper Canada generally, I will refer to an article that appeared in the *Globe* about the time the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Government proposed to build the Intercolonial Railway, on the 19th of September, 1862. It said:—

We observe that Mr. FOLEY has the good sense to reject the suggestion of Mr. HOWE that the Quebec and Halifax road is in fact an important link in the great Pacific Railway through British territory. Not a pound of freight nor a passenger which may come over the Pacific Railway, when it is built, will ever seek the port of Halifax. It is an absolute injury to the Pacific Railroad to represent that it is necessary to construct four hundred miles of an utterly unproductive line before commencing the greater work with one-fifth of the sum per annum which is to be devoted by the ministerial scheme to the Intercolonial Railroad. We can open a practicable communication across the continent and annex to Canada half a continent of the richest land yet unoccupied by civilized man. Not a penny are we to receive for this purpose, but £50,000 per annum thrown away upon the rocks of Rivière du Loup.

That, sir, was the opinion expressed by the *Globe* newspaper so late as September, 1862, and I call the attention of the House to the fact that as a very large proportion of the expense of building this railroad is to be borne by Upper Canada, would not the same sum, if so applied, open up this magnificent country? Are we not, in fact, deferring the opening of it up by spending a large sum of money in the opposite direction?

HON. MR. BROWN—Oh, no; quite incorrect.

MR. SCATCHERD—Then another complaint that has long been made in this country is, that we have a very large public debt; that the people are very highly taxed for the necessaries of life, and that in fact the chief articles consumed by the people can bear no more taxation. I think there can be no doubt that this complaint is true to quite as great an extent as has ever been urged. Let us look back and see what duties were paid upon the principal articles of consumption ten years ago, compared with the duties that they now bear. I hold in my hand a statement showing the rates of duty from 1855 to 1865, and also the values of the chief articles for consumption imported into this province for the half-year ended 30th June, 1864:—

ARTICLES.	1855.		1856.		1857.		1858.		1859.		1865.		Value.	Duty.
	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	\$	\$
Coffee.....	3½	8½	10	10	10	10	15	23½	39,016	21,118	23½	39,016	21,118	
Molasses.....	16	11	11	18	11	18	30	27½	118,285	33,007	27½	118,285	33,007	
Sugar.....	27½	20	17½	21	17½	21	30	47	779,907	373,963	47	779,907	373,963	
Tea.....	11½	11½	11½	12½	11½	12½	15	26	1,089,674	275,126	26	1,089,674	275,126	
Cotton Goods	13½	13½	15	15	15	15	20	20	3,277,985	664,381	20	3,277,985	664,381	
Iron "	12½	13½	15	16	15	16	20	20	776,225	151,422	20	776,225	151,422	
Silk "	12½	13½	15	17	15	17	20	20	430,773	85,345	20	430,773	85,345	
Woolen "	13½	14	15	18	15	18	20	20	2,517,669	499,084	20	2,517,669	499,084	

Well, sir, we find that some of these articles have been taxed to an amount equal to one-half their value. The person who buys and pays 50 per cent. duty, gets in fact in value only one-half of the money paid. With the duty derived from these articles it is proposed by this scheme to do, what? Why to spend \$20,000,000 on this railway, and that money will have to be raised some way or other out of the earnings of the people. I will cite another extract from the *Globe* with respect to the paying or supposed paying qualities of this road. On the 23rd of September, 1862, it said:—

The scheme of the Government for the construction of the Intercolonial Railway opens an account that never will be closed; every storm of snow in the inhospitable regions below Riviere du Loup will lay a new burden on the people of Upper Canada. The tax-payers will watch the passenger travel and freight traffic with the liveliest interest, as indicating the extent of the demands upon them for the year. The road will be run with a perfect consciousness that there is a prompt paymaster behind. With all the care that public companies can employ, the expenditures upon the small items connected with the running of a railroad is above all things difficult to control; but what sums will be spent when it is the Government that will manage and the people of the province that will pay? It was bad enough when they consented that Canada should pay five-twelfths of the expenditure, when in fact it will not receive one-twelfth of the benefit. Who can fail to see the hand of the Grand Trunk in this? It is the dream of many persons in Nova Scotia that this Halifax and Quebec Railway will draw to their harbor the trade of the West, but it is a dream and nothing more. No passenger, no shipper of freight, will ever think of going or sending to Halifax when he can find shipping at Quebec or Portland. He will not add the cost of seven hundred miles of railroad to the expenses of transit to benefit the people of Halifax. As to freight, the thing is not to be spoken of. Neither freight nor passengers would such a line draw from any point higher than Riviere du Loup. There is a refreshing coolness in the demand that Canada shall pay for the construction of a road which is professedly designed to draw away trade from its great estuary.

Is that not equally the case now as then? Who can fail to see the hand of the Grand Trunk in this Confederation scheme?—(Hear, hear, and laughter.) Again, with respect to this Intercolonial Railway, I find the following language used in the *Globe* on the 26th September, 1862:—

With Upper Canada decidedly opposed to the scheme, and Lower Canada divided, we are happy to say that we do not see any great danger of hasty action. We are only astonished that the

Ministry should have committed themselves to a scheme which finds so little support in any part of the province. The Lower Province delegates humbugged them beautifully. It is evident that Blue Nose is a sharp fellow. He is rubbed bright on his rocks. We shall have to be careful in our dealings with him. If Lower Canada is afraid of him because he is British, we must learn to watch him because he is not very rich but very keen and shrewd.

Well, it was supposed when the members of the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Government were dealing with these men in 1862, that they were humbugged beautifully, but when we got the best men in the country, the ablest and most talented men, to deal with them, what kind of bargain did they make with these shrewd blue noses? (Hear, hear.) Why, instead of Canada paying what was proposed by the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Government, the Lower Provinces made a much more favorable bargain with the cleverest men we have. (Hear, hear.) I contend, sir, that this scheme, at one jump, proposes to increase the public debt twenty millions of dollars. And another thing stated is, that a sum necessary for the purpose will be expended for the defence of the country; and if we are to place any reliance upon the report of Col. JERVOIS, the sum of about six millions of dollars will have to be expended upon the defences. From the reports which reached us to-day by telegraph, it appears that the Imperial Government will expend for our defence only the sum of £50,000.

HON. MR. BROWN—The hon. gentleman is mistaken. The Hon. Attorney General West distinctly stated to-day that there was an error in the telegraphic report of the debate in the Imperial Parliament, and it is highly indecorous for the hon. gentleman to repeat these statements after they have been shown to be erroneous. And I am now in a position to state, that we have had an answer to a telegram sent specially to New York to ascertain the fact from the London papers, that the sum asked for by the Imperial Government for the defences of Quebec was £200,000, not £50,000 as stated by the hon. member.

MR. SCATCHERD—Before the hon. member makes charges, he ought to have ascertained that this telegram had been brought to my notice. I took the statement as it appeared in the published telegraphic reports. He has no right to charge me with repeating an incorrect statement. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. BROWN—It was not to that that I particularly referred; but the hon. gentleman all through his speech has repeated things which my colleagues as well as myself have repeatedly declared, from personal knowledge, to be incorrect.

HON. MR. HOLTON—If the papers were brought down there would be no misapprehension.

MR. SCATCHERD—What is the amount to be contributed by the Imperial Government altogether for our defence? Is it only £200,000?

HON. MR. BROWN—The hon. gentleman will see from the reports that that amount is intended simply for works at Quebec. The proportion to be contributed for the defences at Montreal and westward is not stated, nor yet settled.

MR. SCATCHERD—I have been told for the first time that the Imperial Government will contribute anything towards the western defences; for the telegraphic reports say that, if they undertake to fortify Quebec, the Canadian Government will have to undertake the works at Montreal and westward. Now, we are told that this scheme has reference both to local government and local defence, and as the cost of defensive works is stated by Col. JERVOIS to be six millions, I suppose we will have to pay that too.

HON. MR. BROWN—The cost may be a great deal more than six millions, possibly. We can say nothing at present as to the cost.

MR. SCATCHERD—A great deal more. Then immense sums of money are to melt away like snow upon these works, and, in fact, there will be no limit to the expenditure. (Hear, hear.) However, passing on from this point, I would like to ask, if Confederation is carried, in what position will the country stand in respect to the public debt? It appears that the population of the various provinces, in 1861, was as follows:—

Upper Canada.....	1,396,091
Lower Canada.....	1,110,664
New Brunswick.....	252,447
Nova Scotia.....	330,857
Newfoundland.....	130,000
Prince Edward Island.....	80,757

If Confederation takes place, these provinces will be indebted as follows: the public debt of Canada, according to the Public Accounts, amounts to \$67,263,000; Nova Scotia is to be allowed to increase its debt to \$8,000,000; New Brunswick will be

allowed to increase its debt to \$7,000,000; the debt of Prince Edward Island is \$240,000; and the debt of Newfoundland, \$946,000, making, if the provinces are united, a grand total of \$83,000,000 as the debt of the Federal Government. It may be said with respect to Canada, that she is going into the Confederation with a debt of only \$62,500,000; although that may be true, she will nevertheless owe the whole amount I have stated, which, if not paid by the Federal Government, will have to be paid by the Governments of Upper and Lower Canada.

HON. MR. BROWN—My hon. friend will see that the debt of \$5,000,000 that make up the \$67,263,000 is due to ourselves, and that there are assets to meet it, which assets will be made over to the local governments. The reason it was taken from the \$67,263,000 was because it was due upon local account, and because there were local funds to meet its payment. It was altogether apart and distinct from the general debt of the province.

MR. SCATCHERD—What are the assets? Are they sufficient to pay the interest upon the amount?

HON. MR. BROWN—Yes, quite enough.

MR. SCATCHERD—This \$5,000,000 is part of the debt of the province, which I have put down at \$67,263,000.

HON. MR. BROWN—Yes; but my hon. friend must see that there are local funds to meet it, just in the same way as we deduct the Sinking Fund from the amount of the general debt.

MR. TYMAL—Two years ago the hon. gentleman taught us to believe, and I heard him say that the debt of the country was \$78,000,000. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—Was the amount of the Sinking Fund always deducted by the hon. member?

HON. MR. BROWN—Yes; I always deducted it from the debt; but I did not deduct these local funds that are now placed against the sum of \$5,000,000 to be borne by the local governments.

MR. SCATCHERD—At the time Confederation takes place, there will be a debt weighing upon the provinces of \$83,000,000, upon which interest will have to be paid, and the following additional debts, so far as we know, will be immediately contracted by the new Government: Intercolonial Railway, \$20,000,000.

HON. MR. BROWN—No! no! My hon. friend must surely see how wrong it is to make such a statement. It is quite uncertain what amount will be thrown upon the Federal Government for the construction of that road; but, if it is built in the way which has been suggested by the Lower Provinces, it will cost no such sum, nor anything like the sum, mentioned by the hon. member for West Middlesex. Of course, no one can at present tell in what way the Federal Government may decide that it shall be done; but if it is done in the way of a bonus to be paid on the completion of the road, and on security being given that the road shall be kept open for a certain term of years, it will cost nothing like the sum mentioned by my hon. friend.

HON. MR. HOLTON—We have no such proposition before us.

HON. MR. BROWN—But I believe the Lower Provinces have such a proposition before them for a large section of the road—a proposition for a bonus of \$10,000 per mile, which would complete the whole road for a sum infinitely less than my hon. friend has mentioned. Therefore, my hon. friend leads the House quite astray when he dogmatically puts down the cost of the Intercolonial Railway at \$20,000,000.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Hon. Mr. TILLEY says it will cost \$12,000,000.

HON. MR. BROWN—Perhaps Hon. Mr. TILLEY thinks that it may cost that sum, but there are other hon. gentlemen who are quite as well able to judge of the matter as my hon. friend, Mr. TILLEY, who place it at \$8,000,000; and the money that will be necessary for the purpose will be borrowed under the Imperial guarantee, at a rate, I presume, not exceeding 3½ per cent.

MR. SCATCHERD—I would ask my hon. friend the President of the Council if he has not stated that the Intercolonial Railway would cost \$16,000,000 or \$18,000,000? (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. BROWN—It is quite probable; my impression at one time was that it would cost \$15,000,000; but then this was always based on the idea of its being built by the Government, and it was one of my strongest objections to the scheme that the honorable gentlemen who now constitute the Opposition intended to build it at the public cost, and run it at the public cost.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Hon. gentlemen who now form the Opposition?

HON. MR. BROWN—I am not speaking

of the hon. member for Chateaugay, but of his leaders.

HON. MR. BOLTON—Will the honorable gentleman please refer to those he means more specifically?

HON. MR. BROWN—The hon. gentleman who sits at his side is one of them.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Surely the hon. gentleman does not refer to my hon. friend the member for Hochelaga (Hon. Mr. DORION)?

HON. MR. BROWN—The hon. member for Bagot (Hon. Mr. LAFRAMBOISE).

HON. MR. HOLTON—No; the hon. member for Bagot only joined the Government in 1863.

HON. MR. BROWN—The hon. member for Cornwall (Hon. J. S. MACDONALD), is at any rate fully responsible.

HON. MR. DORION—The government of my honorable friend (Hon. J. S. MACDONALD) had a proposition before it somewhat similar to this, and which was to build a railway; but it was not said by what means. You, however, have bound yourself to build a railway, and if you do not find a company to construct it, you will have to build it and keep it open at your own cost.

HON. MR. BROWN—Not exactly; and there is already a proposal to build a large portion of the line.

MR. SCATCHERD—I think the course which the debate has taken shows the absolute necessity that the Government should have brought down a statement of the expense of this road, so that members might have been able to form some opinion in regard to its cost. They might have called upon the engineer who surveyed the route to make some approximation of the probable outlay. When, in the absence of such information, I rise in my place and say that according to the best data at my command, it will cost \$20,000,000, I am met by the Hon. President of the Council protesting against my making such a statement. But when I ask my honorable friend if he has not stated that it will cost \$16,000,000 or \$18,000,000, he replies that he might have said it would cost \$15,000,000. So that, according to my hon. friend himself, it is safe to assume that for the Intercolonial Railway, the debt will be increased by \$15,000,000. This, then, is one of the new debts the new Government will be called upon immediately to contract. Then another debt will be required for the defences of the country. I put this sum down at \$6,000,000.

But the Hon. President of the Council says it is impossible to say what the defences will cost, and they may cost a great deal more.

HON. MR. BROWN—The hon. gentleman should state more carefully what I said. I did not speak of his country simply, but of the whole defences—those to be undertaken by the Imperial Government as well.

MR. SCATCHERD—I refer to the fortifications required for Quebec, Montreal, Kingston, Toronto and Hamilton. It is impossible for us to form any estimate of what defences may be required in St. John and Halifax, and other portions of the Lower Provinces. But certainly the sum which will be required for the defences and for the armament of those defences in Canada will not be less than \$6,000,000. Add this and the sum required for the Intercolonial Railway to the debt already existing, and it will be found that, almost at the outset of its career, the Federation would labor under pressure of a debt amounting to about \$110,000,000.

HON. MR. BROWN—Oh! no, no.

MR. SCATCHERD—The fact is undeniable. Almost from the first day of its existence, the new Government will be called upon to pay interest, on account of public debt, to the amount of \$3,809,668 for Canada; \$750,000 for Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and \$59,333 for Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island; then there is, over and above the subsidy of eighty cents per head, the sum of \$115,200 to be paid yearly to Newfoundland, and \$88,900 to be paid annually to Prince Edward Island. To this must be added the interest on the outlay for the Intercolonial Railway. It has been stated that money for this purpose can be borrowed at three and a half per cent., but there is nothing to show that the arrangement proposed to be entered into by the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Government, some two or three years ago, in reference to the borrowing of money at three and a half per cent., can now be carried out. We have no reason to believe that the proposed Federal Government will be able to borrow money on the same favorable terms; and, if the interest charged is at the rate of five per cent., there will be nearly \$1,000,000 to be paid annually as interest on the Intercolonial Railway debt alone.

HON. MR. BROWN—A million of dollars! Five per cent. interest on money borrowed on the credit of the Imperial Government!

MR. SCATCHERD—What has been shown us to the contrary?

HON. MR. BROWN—My hon. friend must have heard the statement of an arrangement being made with the Imperial Government for borrowing the necessary funds.

MR. SCATCHERD—I read in the pamphlet recently published by the hon. member for Montmorency (Hon. Mr. CAUCHON), who is a warm supporter of the Government, and is supposed to be an authority on this subject, that:—

The population of Newfoundland being 130,000; \$25 per head would establish its debt at \$3,250,000, and it would thus be placed on a level with the population of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick with regard to their respective figures of population.

But as that province owes \$946,000, we must deduct this amount from the \$3,250,000; this would give a result of \$2,304,000, on which the Federal Government will have to pay to Newfoundland an annual interest of five per centum, viz: \$115,200.

But if the money can be obtained at three and a half per cent., why is it proposed that the Federal Government shall pay interest at the rate of five per cent. to the Provinces of Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island?

HON. MR. BROWN—Does not my hon. friend see how this is, and how unfair his conclusions are? The reason why we are to pay these provinces five per cent. is, that we are about to throw upon them a large share of the burden of our public debt, upon which five per cent. interest is paid; if the people of Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island, who have little or no debt, assume debts of the other provinces, for which they have to pay five per cent. interest, it is only fair and just that they should get their five per cent. back again.

MR. SCATCHERD—The Hon. President of the Council says that at present we pay five per cent. on our indebtedness, but that in future we shall not pay so high a rate.

HON. MR. BROWN—No one said so. What I said was that the Imperial Government would guarantee the interest on the money to build the Intercolonial Railway, and that we should have to pay interest according to the terms on which the Imperial Government would be able to borrow, which will be about 3½ per cent.

MR. SCATCHERD—And supposing the money is obtained on these favorable terms,

the interest for the Intercolonial Railway debt will be half a million of dollars.

HON. MR. BROWN—\$350,000.

MR. SCATCHERD—At the reduced rate of interest, the Federal Government will start with an annual burden, in the shape of interest, of at least \$5,000,000. I had put the sum down at \$6,158,851.

HON. MR. BROWN—How much does my hon. friend make the difference in the interest—\$1,158,851?

MR. SCATCHERD—Yes.

HON. MR. BROWN—My hon. friend is entirely wrong in his calculations. But will my hon. friend answer this question: How much additional money shall we receive into the treasury in the shape of customs duties from the Lower Provinces?

MR. SCATCHERD—But we are given to understand that the customs duties, instead of being increased, will be decreased. If, however, the Lower Provinces, which now pay on an average, we will say 5 per cent., shall be called upon to pay at least 20 per cent., and up to 40 per cent., they will never agree to Confederation.

HON. MR. BROWN—My hon. friend is all wrong in his figures, but that is really not the point. When he says that the interest will be increased, he should also state what we are to get back in the shape of customs duties from the Lower Provinces. What is the use of giving one side and not the other?

MR. SCATCHERD—I think that any person who will seriously contemplate this proposition of the Government, must come to the conclusion that this Confederation scheme is nothing more or less than a scheme to construct the Intercolonial Railway. (Hear, hear.) If it was not necessary for some parties that that road should be constructed, we should have had no Confederation scheme. Another objection, to my mind, on the face of these resolutions, has reference to the subsidy of 80 cents per head. The 64th resolution provides that the General Government shall pay 80 cents per head of the population of 1861 to the several provinces for local purposes:—

Upper Canada.....	\$1,116,872
Lower Canada.....	888,531
Nova Scotia.....	264,685
New Brunswick.....	201,637
Newfoundland.....	104,000
Prince Edward Island.....	64,505

I think it will be admitted by every member

from Upper Canada, that if the people of Upper Canada had representation by population, they would have no desire to change the present system of government. (Hear, hear.) We in Upper Canada contend that we pay seventy per cent. of the taxation, while Lower Canada pays only thirty per cent. Now, what will be the effect of the 64th resolution? Under that resolution, Upper Canada will receive a subsidy of \$1,116,000, and on the principle which has always been contended for in Upper Canada, the proportion of that sum which Lower Canada will pay, as a member of the Confederation, will be thirty per cent., or say \$335,000, while Upper Canada will pay seventy per cent., or \$781,000. We have been paying the larger proportion of the taxation, and Lower Canada the smaller proportion, and the object of going into this Confederation is, that the local governments should have the management of their own local affairs, and that we should raise the money necessary for our own local purposes, while Lower Canada should raise the money necessary for her local purposes. But in this instance, the General Government will collect that money in Upper Canada in the large proportion which I have just stated; on the other hand, Lower Canada will get a subsidy of \$888,000. Upper Canada, as a member of the Confederation, will pay \$621,000 of that sum, according to the admitted ratio in which she contributes to the public exchequer, and Lower Canada will pay 30 per cent., or \$267,000.

MR. HOPE MACKENZIE—The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken in his argument.

MR. SCATCHERD—By this arrangement, then, Upper Canada, in comparison with Lower Canada, will pay to the General Government yearly, for all time to come, in excess of Lower Canada, \$286,000 more than she would pay were these subsidies collected direct from each province.

HON. MR. BROWN—The calculation of my hon. friend is entirely incorrect. But I do not wish to interrupt him, unless he desires it.

MR. SCATCHERD—I have no objection. Is not the principle on which I have made the calculation correct?

HON. MR. BROWN—No, it is not correct. The hon. gentleman should remember that the relations between Upper and Lower Canada will be entirely changed when all these provinces are brought together.

MR. SCATCHERD—If there is no change, the principle is correct.

HON. MR. BROWN—Of course, so far as Upper Canada and Lower Canada are concerned. But the hon. gentleman must see that by the introduction of the Maritime Provinces into the union, an entire change is made in the relations between Upper and Lower Canada. There will not only be a change in the way in which the taxes contributed by the people reach the treasury, but an immense change also in the way in which those moneys will be distributed, and by both Upper Canada will profit.

MR. SCATCHERD—The hon. gentleman admits that the principle is correct, and, unless as affected by altered circumstances, it will bring out the result I have stated.

HON. MR. BROWN—But we know what the circumstances will be. The honorable gentleman should take up the whole of the financial arrangements of the scheme. It is not fair to take up a mere portion of them. If he had looked at the commercial tables of all the provinces, he would have seen that his calculations were entirely erroneous.

MR. SCATCHERD—What I say is this, that if, instead of paying all the local governments this subsidy of 80 cents per head, Upper Canada had been left to collect from her own people her \$1,116,000, and Lower Canada to collect from her people the \$888,000 which she is to receive, that would have been what we have been contending for in Upper Canada.

HON. MR. BROWN—No doubt.

MR. SCATCHERD—Well, we have always contended that we were willing to collect the moneys required for our own local purposes in Upper Canada, and that Lower Canada should do the same. We are entitled, according to that principle, to \$286,000 more than we shall receive; and the proposed arrangement, therefore, I say is unjust; otherwise we have been contending for what was incorrect for the last ten years. It should have been made part of the scheme, that whatever Upper Canada required for her local expenditure should be obtained by taxes levied on her people, and that whatever Lower Canada required for the like purposes should be levied in the same way. But that is not the scheme, so that we gain nothing with regard to our paying more than we receive, which has been our complaint hitherto.

HON. MR. BROWN—I am surprised that my honorable friend should go so far. I agree with him so far as my own judgment is

concerned, that it would have been a desirable arrangement if we could have got each province to collect, by direct taxation, the moneys it required to meet its own local expenditure. But the honorable gentleman must not say that because we have not got that length, we leave the matter exactly as it was. There is a very great change, and the proposed system is much more just than that existing hitherto. (Hear, hear.)

MR. SCATCHERD—But will the hon. gentleman not say that it would have been desirable that these sums, instead of being collected by the General Government, should have been collected by each province?

HON. MR. BROWN—Certainly; that was what I contended for. But we had not the making of the whole of the bargain; and surely the honorable gentleman cannot contend that because we did not get everything our own way, we should therefore give up the whole scheme. I apprehend, however, it will be found, if this scheme goes into operation, that the burdens on the people of Upper Canada will be very different from what they have been in times past.

MR. SCATCHERD—Well, the honorable gentleman admits that Upper Canada will not get in this scheme all he contended for, and I say that if this scheme goes into operation, the position of Upper Canada will be no better than it was before. I give this as a glaring instance—there are others which cannot so readily be detected—of the way in which the just claims and interests of Upper Canada have been overlooked. I do not see how honorable gentlemen will be able to answer the charges brought against them by their constituents, that they have deliberately agreed, that for all time to come there shall be that advantage of one section over the other. If Upper Canada is to get no more benefit from the Confederation than I can find in these resolutions, I am at a loss to see how she is benefited by them. The expense of an Intercolonial Railway is to be saddled on her farmers and her people generally—they are to pay the larger portion of that expense, and that, so far as I can see, is to be the grand effect of this scheme. (Hear, hear.) Another objection I have to the project relates to the proposition with reference to the Constitution of the Legislative Council. I say it is a retrograde step to do away with the elective principle in the Legislative Council—(hear, hear)—and a step that will be very unpalatable to the people of Upper Canada. I do not see why the large province

of Canada, containing a population of two and a half millions, should have been obliged at the Conference to give up a point involving so important a principle, to the small provinces containing a population of only 800,000. (Hear, hear.) I say take those resolutions from first to last—there are seventy-two of them—let any man read them, and he cannot fail to come to the conclusion that from the first to the seventy-second, it is concession after concession on the part of Upper Canada to those Lower Provinces.

COL. HAULTAIN—What does New Brunswick say?

MR. SCATCHERD—What I say is, that I cannot see why this large province should have been overruled at that Conference with reference to this question of the Legislative Council. What did it matter to New Brunswick if the people of Upper Canada desire to have their legislative councillors elected? If New Brunswick desires to have hers nominated by the Crown, let it be so; but why prevent Upper Canada from having hers elected by the people? (Hear, hear.) Then the 43rd resolution I consider objectionable. The first clause of that resolution authorizes New Brunswick to impose duties on the export of timber, logs, masts, spars, deals, and sawed lumber. If this Intercolonial Railway is constructed, it will have very little passenger traffic during a large portion of the year, and I suppose it will do a large business in freight. Like other railways, it will be the means of conveying a large quantity of timber to the seaboard. It appears to me that any one interested in the timber business of this country must see that every stick of timber that will go on the Intercolonial Railway from Canada into New Brunswick will be liable to this export duty. I ask the Honorable President of the Council if that will not be the fact?

HON. MR. BROWN—I think the honorable gentleman could not have been present when the Honorable Finance Minister explained this matter. This export duty is the same as is paid on timber in this country in the shape of stumpage.

MR. SCATCHERD—That is not the point; no timber can go out of New Brunswick without paying an export duty. Is not that the law at the present time?

HON. MR. BROWN—No timber can go from our forests without paying a duty of exactly the same kind.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Exactly the same?

HON. MR. BROWN—What is the difference?

HON. MR. HOLTON—Does the honorable gentleman say that this export duty and stumpage are exactly the same in their nature?

HON. MR. BROWN—I say exactly the same, with reference to the lumber from which the Government of New Brunswick now derives a revenue. There will be some instances in which it will not work in exactly the same way.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Such as timber cut on private lands?

HON. MR. BROWN—There will be a difference as regards that. This was the way in which this arrangement arose. For myself, I regret it should be put in that shape, for I am opposed to all export duties. (Hear, hear.) Of course it was arranged that the Local Governments should have the lands, mines, minerals and Crown timber of their respective provinces. From our Crown timber here we receive a large revenue in the shape of stumpage, which is to go to Upper and Lower Canada respectively for their local purposes. But the New Brunswick delegates said—"We do not levy a stumpage duty on our Crown timber as you do; we find it better to levy it in the shape of an export duty"—and we complied with their desire that they should have their local revenue in that shape as an offset to our stumpage duty.

MR. MCKELLAR—I think the question raised on this point by the honorable member for West Middlesex is hardly worth discussing, because timber from Canada will never be carried over the Intercolonial road. It does not pay to carry it over our own roads, and it would certainly never be carried by railway all that distance. (Hear, hear.)

MR. T. C. WALLBRIDGE—It is carried from Canada to Portland over the Grand Trunk for shipbuilding purposes. (Cries of "No, no.")

MR. SCATCHERD—My honorable friend from South Oxford has not come to the point, which is this, that it is not right for the people of New Brunswick to charge this duty on timber. What right have they to levy an export duty on our timber? Yet this resolution, it appears to me, would give them that right.

HON. MR. BROWN—My honorable friend will recollect that these resolutions are to be embodied in a statute, and the intention will be much more clearly stated in it. It was not by any means the intention that one pro-

vince should have the right to impose an export duty on the products of another.

MR. SCATCHERD—It seems to me, however, that the meaning of that resolution is clearly as I have stated it. This scheme is objectionable on the face of it, because it will largely increase the public debt for the erection of defences and the construction of the Intercolonial Railway.

HON. MR. BROWN—What return will we get for that?

MR. SCATCHERD—Why, according to the extracts I have just read, we will get nothing at all.

HON. MR. BROWN—The hon. gentleman says that the construction of this railway to the Maritime Provinces will involve us in increased debt. Now, should he not let us, in all candor, know how much we are to get in the shape of revenue from those provinces, as an offset.

MR. SCATCHERD—It is generally admitted that we will receive no advantage from the construction of the Intercolonial Railway.

HON. MR. BROWN—Who admits it?

MR. SCATCHERD—I say that this road will have to be run at the expense of this province, and not only that, but it will be a piece of corruption from the time of the turning of the first shovelful of earth. All the officers of the road will be appointed by the Government, and it will be an everlasting expense. It could not have been better expressed than it was by the hon. member for South Oxford in his own paper, that every storm of snow would be watched with the liveliest anxiety by the people of Upper Canada. (Hear, hear.) I know it is said that the Government will open up the North-West when the state of the finances permit; but how much better would it be to have the money taken, which is to be appropriated for this unprofitable railway, and expended at once in opening up that territory? It is doubtful whether there is any land in that part of the country through which the railway is to pass, fit for cultivation. Then, according to the view taken by my honorable friend from South Oxford, the only products shipped on it will be those grown east of Rivière du Loup. (Hear, hear.) The payment of subsidies from the General to the Local Governments, the doing away with the elective principle in the Legislative Council, and the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, are to my mind grave objections to the Confederation. I consider that such a measure ought not to become law until it has

been submitted to and pronounced upon by the people. (Hear, hear.) Yet it is the declared intention of the Government not to submit it to the people for their opinion. Now, I think the Government are not keeping faith with the people in this respect. At a dinner in Toronto, in November last, the honorable member for South Oxford is reported, by the *Globe* of Nov. 4th, to have said:—

HON. MR. BROWN—A friend asks if the scheme is to go into operation without being submitted to the people. That is a matter for the different Parliaments to consider—whether it shall be done, or whether it shall not be done. It is not, I apprehend, for the Administration of this province, or any other province, to say that this measure shall or shall not be sent especially to the people. We are in the hands of the representatives of the people, and by their decision we are ready to abide.

How different is that declaration from the conduct of the Government now, when they come down and say they are going to use every means to carry the scheme through without submitting it to the people! (Hear, hear.) At the same dinner there was another honorable member of the Government present, the Hon. Minister of Finance, and I will read to the House what he said on the question of appealing to the people:—

They would have desired to see a Central Government, extending its arms over all interests. But there were difficulties which rendered this impossible, and in meeting these difficulties he trusted that the measure which would be submitted to the people, to the Imperial Parliament, and to the Provincial Parliaments, would be found to be one which protected local interests, while national interests had been reserved for the central power, which he hoped would manage them in a way to do honor to the race from which we had sprung. (Cheers.)

There is the express declaration of two Ministers of the Crown that this measure, before it would become law, should be submitted to the people. (Hear, hear.) Now, is the course indicated that which has been adopted? Is the scheme to be submitted to the people? No; they bring down the scheme and say that it must be passed in its entirety, and so far from submitting it to the people, they move the previous question to prevent the possibility of an amendment to that effect being put. Some members who have preceded me contended that it would be unconstitutional to submit it to the people, and they cited cases in support of their argument. But in those cases, Parliament had full power to dispose of the question then before

it; this Parliament has no power to dispose finally of this question. The British Parliament can act with or without the consent of this Parliament; therefore, it appears to me that the cases cited are not applicable to our case, and I maintain that submitting the resolutions to the people would prevent irritation hereafter. (Hear, hear.) How can it be pretended that if the measure is not passed now, the time will never occur again? So far as Upper Canada is concerned, I think she might hope to obtain such a scheme as this at any time—(hear, hear)—and I am willing to take the responsibility of voting against this Confederation scheme. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. JOHN MACDONALD (Toronto) said—MR. SPEAKER, before recording my vote on this question, I desire plainly to state the position which I occupy in regard to it. I desire to say that I am in favor of Confederation. (Hear, hear.) The first resolution which was proposed at the Quebec Conference and agreed upon, namely, that a Confederation of all the British North America Provinces, on principles just to all, was desirable, I have no hesitation in saying, meets with my entire approval. We have been told that the Conference at Quebec exhibited one of the grandest spectacles which the world ever beheld. (Hear, hear.) I may be wrong, but I fail to see it in that light. I am prepared to award to honorable gentlemen all the sincerity in meeting together to settle the sectional difficulties of this country to which they can possibly lay claim, and it is a matter of great regret to me that I find myself to-night compelled to record my vote against hon. gentlemen with whom it has been my pleasure to be associated ever since I entered political life. But, sir, it is with me a matter of conscientious conviction, and I am bound, whatever the consequences may be, to follow those convictions. (Hear, hear.) Now, Mr. SPEAKER, I think that hon. gentlemen, in bringing this scheme down and saying that we must take it just as it is without making any amendment to it whatever, are asking too much. (Hear, hear.) That is assuming the document is perfect in every particular, or as nearly so as possible. If we are to undertake the discussion of this question, and yet not be allowed to alter it in any single particular so as to adapt it to the circumstances of the province, I really cannot conceive for what purpose this House has been called together. (Hear, hear.) We

have heard a good deal said about the leading Opposition members in all the provinces having received invitations to enter the Conference for the free discussion of the question, but I would ask, sir, on what occasion the Opposition of Lower Canada were invited by the Government to take part in that Conference? (Hear, hear.) I understood the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Hon. Mr. ROSE) to say, that although he did not agree with some of the minute details, yet rather than jeopardise the adoption of the whole scheme, he was prepared to vote for it just as it stands. Now, I would ask if the question of our School law is a minute detail? I would ask if the appropriation of the debt between Upper and Lower Canada is a minute detail? I would ask if the question of the defences of the country is a minute detail? And yet we are asked to vote for this measure without having these particulars laid before us for our consideration. (Hear, hear.) It is better, the hon. gentleman says, that we should vote upon it in ignorance of these things, and leave the result, if wrong, to be righted by future legislators. Well, the member may vote in ignorance if he prefers to do things in that way, but as I am constituted (it may be a fault of mine), I cannot do that. I will never record a vote in this House unless I know, or have tried my utmost to know what I am doing. (Hear, hear.) The Hon. Minister of Finance, in the very able speech which he delivered at Sherbrooke, alluded to the great difficulties which surrounded the School question. He intimated that the question was one of such magnitude, that a great deal of time was required for its consideration, and then invited the coöperation of all intelligent men to the solution of that difficulty. If then the smaller question is of so much importance, why should the larger one be forced upon this House with such haste? Does it require less time for consideration than the smaller one to which I have alluded? It seems to me very much like building a house first, and after it is built proceeding to examine the foundations. The hon. gentleman spoke of the improvement which this scheme had already secured in the value of our securities in England. Now, it does not require much thought to discover that it is an easy matter to affect the stock exchange either favorably or unfavorably. Securities go up to-day and down to-morrow. A man in business may get an

endorser which may for a short time improve his credit; so we seek to improve our credit by an alliance with the Maritime Provinces. Mr. SPEAKER, there are other and far better ways of improving our credit, the very best of which is living within our means, bringing our expenditure within our income, and establishing our financial operations on a sound and healthy basis. Rest assured, the monied men of England will attach much greater importance to such a course than any alliance we can possibly make with other provinces, for the purpose of improving our credit. (Hear, hear.) Well, sir, we are told that this great scheme is to settle all our sectional difficulties. I may perhaps be very dull of comprehension, but I must confess that I cannot see that. We have difficulties among ourselves, as scenes that have transpired on the floor of this House have fully proved, and we seek to settle those difficulties by forming a union with provinces that are at loggerheads among themselves. (Hear, hear.) Now, sir, we have long contended in Upper Canada for a just representation in Parliament, and we are told that, because we are going to get seventeen more members than Lower Canada in the Federal Legislature, all the difficulties for the settlement of which representation according to population was sought, are to be thereby remedied. I cannot see that that result will follow, because in the Upper House there is still to be an equality of votes, and I quote now from the pamphlet written by the Hon. Mr. CAUCHON to show that he is of opinion that any advantage which we gain in the Lower House will be completely paralyzed in the Upper Chamber. He says:—

The Constitution of 1840 only stipulated for equality in the Lower House. Let us suppose that the majority of the Legislative Council had chosen to adopt a project of law which would have been hostile to the interests of Lower Canada; as Upper and Lower Canada were equally represented in the Lower House, the bill adopted by the Upper House would have been certainly thrown out, and it is by the Lower House alone that we have, up to this time, been able to protect and save our institutions, taking into account also the good-will shown to us by Lower Canadian representatives of English descent. Why has the Legislative Assembly always been the battlefield with respect to the struggle that has been going on for the last fourteen years between Upper and Lower Canada on the question of representation by population? It is because there alone equality has existed, and there alone could be found the means of solving

the constitutional problem. If then, instead of the present Constitution, we substitute local legislatures, and over them the Federal Parliament, we shall see in that case precisely the inverse of that which we have always observed in our present legislature, that is to say, that on the occurrence of any local misunderstanding, the struggle will be carried from the Lower House to the Legislative Council, and precisely to the reasons that we have adduced.

Mr. SPEAKER, we have here, in the language of one of the most determined opponents of the principle of representation according to population, very good reasons given for coming to the conclusion that the granting of increased representation in the Lower Legislature will amount to nothing, while the same just principle is denied in the constitution of the Legislative Council. I hope I may be incorrect, but I am of opinion that if this scheme goes into operation, we shall witness the difficulty alluded to on the floor of the Confederate Legislature in less than six months after its organization. (Hear, hear.) And the unfair representation which Upper Canada will have in the Upper Chamber must exist throughout all time. Nor will she be able to add even one member, no matter how great may be the preponderance of her population over other parts of the Confederacy. And this equality of votes between Upper Canada and Lower Canada will act, as Mr. CAUCHON tells his Lower Canadian friends, as a perfect counterpoise to the legislation of the Lower House. In connection with this subject, there is another feature of the scheme which is painful to contemplate, in which we are, I think, about to advance backwards. The qualification of a Legislative Councillor is now \$8,000; but it is proposed to reduce it to \$4,000, which I regard as retrogressive. And in the case of Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland, the qualification may be personal property as well as real estate—in other words, the legislative councillors from those provinces may be peddlers of jewelry or any other commodity, whose stock in trade may be burned up while they are attending a session, rendering them unable longer to qualify. (Hear, hear.) But there is a much worse feature than that: it will have the effect of introducing into the Upper Chamber a class of needy adventurers who in a crisis may be approached without very much difficulty, and who might plead their own circumstances as an ample apology in quieting their consciences for the votes they

might give. Now, Mr. SPEAKER, I object further to this scheme on the ground of the onerous and expensive machinery of the local governments. I know it has been asserted that it will not cost the country any more than under the present system, and I will entirely give up my position if any hon. gentleman can prove to me that a man will not go behind who doubles or even increases the number of his employes without at the same time increasing the capital and extent of his business. I see in this scheme the introduction and increase—the rapid increase—of a large number of consumers, without correspondingly increasing the producers of the country. If I err in this I err in good company, for I quote the words of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. CARDWELL, who says on this point:—

A very important part of this subject is the expense which may attend the working of the Central and the Local Governments. Her Majesty's Government cannot but express the earnest hope that the arrangements which may be adopted in this respect may not be of such a nature as to increase, at least in any considerable degree, the whole expenditure, or to make any material addition to the taxation and thereby retard the internal industry or tend to impose new burdens on the commerce of the country.

Now, sir, I object as a western man (and I will be pardoned if I allude to the sectional question) to the great injustice which will be done to the people of Upper Canada in the heavy burdens which she will have to bear in the carrying on of the General Government. In the able speech delivered by the Hon. the Minister of Finance at Sherbrooke, he said that when the population of Canada should reach five millions (a larger population than that of the proposed Confederation at present), the revenue which would be derived for public purposes would not be a farthing more than now. One hon. gentleman has said in this House that it is as cheap to govern three millions as five millions of people. That may be true, but one million of money will not go as far as five millions in making those local improvements which Upper Canada would require, and to which the people of Upper Canada would be justly and fairly entitled. Then I object further to the scheme, because while Upper Canada will contribute the largest amount to the general revenue, she will also have to bear the heavy share of defensive and other public works in the Maritime Provinces and Lower Canada.

(Hear, hear.) I object further to the indefinite postponement of the opening up of the North-West, the settlement of the valleys of the Saskatchewan and the improvement of our canal system. (Hear, hear.) There is a very marked difference in the phraseology of two of the clauses of this scheme which must strike any one reading them as extraordinary. The one declares that the Intercolonial Railway *shall* be built. There can be no mistake about that, nor is there any possibility of doubt. The language is definite—it is to be built immediately. (Hear, hear.) The other clause (69) reads thus:—

The communication with the North-Western territory and the improvements required for the development of the trade of the Great West with the seaboard are regarded by this Conference as subjects of the highest importance to the Federated Provinces, and shall be prosecuted at the earliest possible period that the state of the finances will permit.

(Hear, hear.) This certainly is the most ambiguous language that could well be employed in reference to this great and desirable work. However, we are told that this is a mistake, and that the opening up of the North-West will go on simultaneously with the construction of the Intercolonial Railway; but we find Hon. Mr. TILLEY asserting in the Lower Provinces that there was no serious intention of going on with this work at present, and that a large sum was to be spent at once in New Brunswick in improving its defences. If I may be allowed to give an illustration of the uncertain and evasive character of this provision of the scheme, I will quote from a cartoon in *Punch*, which I have here before me. It refers to a Russian State paper on Polish affairs. England, France and Austria examining it, thus explain it:—

England, "It seems to mean—Eh? H'm!"
 France, "I think it means—Eh? Ha!"
 Austria, "I suspect it means—Eh? Ho!"
 Chorus, "And we don't know what it means."

HON. MR. MCGEE—That appears to be quite correct in your case.

MR. JOHN MACDONALD—Well, my ignorance is pardonable when there is so much ignorance of the scheme even among members of the Ministry. (Hear, hear.) I can fancy the question of the opening up of the North-West coming up in the first session of the Federal Legislature and the manner in which it will be received.

New-Brunswick will say: "Oh we cannot go on with this work until the Intercolonial Railway is completed, and New Brunswick is put in a complete state of defence." Nova Scotia will say: "When the finances permit we will proceed with it;" and all the provinces will unite in saying, when this provision of the Constitution is pointed out to them, "Oh, we don't know what it means." (Laughter.) I object to this scheme, sir, on account of the burdens it proposes to place on this country in the shape of defence. (Hear, hear.) We have had glowing accounts from the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and others about the territory that will belong to this Confederation. We are told that it will extend for four thousand miles from ocean to ocean; and will it be believed that we in Upper and Lower Canada, with a population less than that of the city of London, will be called upon to defend such a frontier—a territory, we are told, as great as the continent of Europe? (Hear, hear.) The thing is an anomaly that no country in the world presents except our own. I regard this addition of territory by Confederation as a source of weakness instead of strength; and to my mind the casting of the burden of defence upon this country is like investing a sovereign with all the outward semblance of royalty, and giving him a dollar per day to keep up the dignity of his court, or like expecting the engine of one of the small ferry steamers which ply on the river here to Point Lévis, to propel the *Great Eastern* across the Atlantic. (Hear, hear.) Sir, I am not unmindful of the fostering care of the British Island over all its colonies. I am not unmindful of all that England has done to guard and protect her colonies throughout the world, and to develop their resources. But when we see by the telegraphic reports of to-day that the Imperial Government is about to expend £50,000—or if you accept the correction of the Government, as stated this evening, £200,000—upon the defences of this country, I ask in all seriousness what is that amount for the protection of an exposed frontier such as our's?

HON. MR. BROWN—I do not wish to interrupt my hon. friend; but I must say that when he has heard it stated that this £200,000 is to be granted by the Imperial Government simply for the defence of the city of Quebec, I am amazed how he can get up here and charge the Imperial Government with the intention of giving only that

amount for the defence of the whole country.

HON. MR. DORION—It is distinctly stated in the report of the debate in the House of Lords that that is all the Imperial Government intend to appropriate.

HON. MR. BROWN—I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, but it is not so stated. I think the hon. gentleman will find that there are now large works going on at Halifax and St. John; and that besides the appropriation for works at Quebec, the question of the amount to be contributed for the defence of Canada elsewhere is still under the consideration of the Imperial Government.

HON. MR. DORION—Oh, no; only the question of the naval defence.

HON. MR. BROWN—Well, the hon. gentleman may not accept the statement I make, but I am quite sure the hon. member for Toronto will, that the question of the defence of this province at Montreal and westward is still under the consideration of the Imperial Government, and at this moment is undecided.

MR. JOHN MACDONALD—Of course, I was aware that the £200,000 proposed to be appropriated were for works at Quebec.

HON. MR. BROWN—The hon. gentleman should not have stated, then, that they were for the defence of the whole of the province.

MR. JOHN MACDONALD—I am free to admit that this was a mistake, and that the amount was for the defences of Quebec.

HON. MR. BROWN—Well, it was very wrong to repeat it.

MR. JOHN MACDONALD—Well, I ask that if the Imperial Government will appropriate only this sum, where, at such a period of imminent danger as the present is said to be, and with every point of the frontier perfectly defenceless, is the money to come from to place all parts of the province in a position to resist aggression, and who is to provide it? The hon. member for Lambton, the other night, in alluding to the ability of this country to raise and maintain a standing army for our protection, instanced the case of Denmark, which he said was able to support an army of 20,000 men. I certainly thought the allusion a most unhappy one, and one would have imagined that the recent history of that country would have prevented its being made. (Hear, hear.) But in regard to all the features in this scheme objectionable to Upper Canada, and adverse to

its interest, Upper Canadian members in this House say, "Oh, let us have Confederation, and we will make all these things right by subsequent legislation." Well, I say to every Upper Canadian that if he goes into this treaty with a view of violating its letter and spirit subsequently, he is unfaithful to the duty he owes to Upper Canada as well as to Lower Canada and the sister provinces. (Hear, hear.) I do not desire to enter into a treaty with the object of escaping its obligations at some future time; and it is because I wish to do what is right, that I point out those things in the scheme that I believe to be wrong, and which, unless they are modified, I cannot support by my vote. (Hear, hear.) It would be a breach of faith on the part of Upper Canada in a few years after this to say, "We want an increased representation; we want a larger amount for our local purposes," when with their eyes open, her representatives accepted the document now before the House, and with a clear apprehension of what they were doing, made themselves parties to this treaty. Why, Mr. SPEAKER, is it that Lower Canada has so long resisted the cry for an increased representation to the western section of the province? Simply because the treaty of 1840 granted to both sections equality on the floor of this House. (Hear, hear.) I regret exceedingly that the Government intend to force this measure upon the people without appealing to them on the question, and knowing whether it meets with their approval or not. (Hear, hear.) In that same speech of the Hon. Minister of Finance to which I have already made allusion, one of his strongest points was this, that the Union Act of 1840 was forced on the people of Lower Canada without their consent. (Hear.) Yet, Mr. SPEAKER, what do we find? We find the intelligent and enterprising people of New Brunswick have rejected this measure, and that it is not favored either by the people of Prince Edward Island or Nova Scotia. We find, further, petitions coming in every day against the measure from all parts of Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) And yet, in the face of all this opposition, the Government presume to force the measure upon the country. But then we are told that the rejection of the scheme by New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island will make no difference, although they were treated with here on equal terms, Prince Edward Island having the same vote in the

Conference as Upper or Lower Canada; they assisted in framing these articles, and it was to conciliate them that all these concessions were made. We are told that this is a document of concessions; but I declare that I have failed to see any concessions whatever that have been made to Upper Canada; they were all made to the Maritime Provinces. I repeat that the delegates who met in Quebec as the representatives of provinces, and who had equal weight in the Conference with Canada, are now to be treated as if they were of no account; that if the people of Canada, representing three-fourths of the whole population, decide upon it, it will be carried through. (Hear, hear.) Then we are told that the danger of war is very imminent. I fail to see that. The Government brought in an Alien Bill, and a large majority in the House voted for it, because they believed it necessary, at the time, to secure the peace of the country; and in like manner they will be supported by this House in any measure which may be required for the purpose of adding to our security. But I ask, sir, if these resolutions were carried to-night, how much they would add to our peace and security? What increased facilities of communication would they give us with the Lower Provinces, until it was possible to build the Intercolonial Railway? Very many years must necessarily elapse before that work could be completed; meanwhile, the whole question of union could be discussed; objections could be considered, and the people could be consulted. Thus, without hastily pressing on a measure which might eventuate in disappointment and misery, a sound and judicious measure might be devised, which would meet with the approval of the country, and whose principles might be perpetuated with the happiest results.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—That's a fact! (Laughter.)

MR. JOHN MACDONALD—Perhaps I differ with many in regard to the subject of the Intercolonial Railway. I am willing that the Intercolonial Railway should be built, and I am willing that it should be built at once. I will go farther than that, and say I am willing that this Parliament should grant as the share of this country an amount sufficient to justify sound commercial men in taking up that work, which I look upon in the light of a great commercial undertaking. That is the idea that I hold

in regard to the Intercolonial Railway. We should then know how much the road would cost, and how much money we had to spend, and by placing it under the management of sound, judicious commercial men, the best possible guarantee would be afforded us of its being properly worked. (Hear, hear.) I do not, for my part, underrate the difficulties which beset the hon. gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches. However much others may be ready to charge hon. gentlemen with having lost confidence in them, I am free to admit that my confidence in hon. gentlemen with whom I have hitherto worked, is as strong as ever it was. But sir, no matter whether that confidence were strong or feeble, I must vote on this question as I conscientiously believe it is my duty to vote. That course I have ever followed since I have had the honor of a seat in this House, and that course I intend to pursue so long as I continue in public life. Far be it from me to withhold from honorable gentlemen that full measure of credit to which they are justly entitled. I believe that they were perfectly sincere in thus coming together to endeavour to bring about a solution of our constitutional difficulties, and I hope they may be successful in their efforts in that direction. And if in the end they shall accomplish that great object—if they shall succeed in banishing strife and discord from the floor of this House, and in bringing to our shores an increased measure of commercial prosperity, no man will be more willing to acknowledge his error than I shall, and no one will be more ready to join in giving them that full measure of a nation's gratitude to which under those circumstances they will be so fully and fairly entitled. (Cheers.)

MR. McKELLAR—It is very late in the evening, and I do not intend to speak at any great length. However, I think it is proper, in the interests of a considerable portion of the people of Upper Canada, that I should call the attention of the House to this fact, that a few weeks ago a very large and influential meeting of the citizens of Toronto was held in that city, most of them, I believe, being the constituents of the honorable gentleman who has just addressed us, and to which meeting that honorable gentleman was invited for the purpose of discussing that very measure. He did not, however, think proper to attend; but I myself was there; and I think he has treated his constituents not with that courtesy and attention which they had a right

to expect at his hands. (Hear, hear.) Why, sir, did he not attend that meeting, and throw on it that flood of light which he has shed abroad amongst us this evening? (Laughter.) Well, in the metropolis of Upper Canada, where many of the most influential men of that section of the province were assembled, on a motion being made for what the honorable gentleman now contends, an appeal to the people—that this measure should be submitted to the popular vote before being disposed of by this House—at a public meeting, I say, in the metropolis of Upper Canada, where there were hundreds of the leading men assembled, not a seconder could be found. (Hear, hear.) I say we must hold that honorable gentleman responsible for not going to that meeting and enlightening his constituents upon this very important subject.

AN HON. MEMBER—Did you do so with your constituents?

MR. McKELLAR—Yes, the question was fully discussed by them. The honorable gentleman who sits in the Upper House as the representative of the two counties of Essex and Kent was elected by acclamation. And why? Because this Coalition had taken place, and this scheme of Federation was in progress, and that honorable gentleman came out, openly and above board, and declared in his speeches and in his address that he was prepared to do what he did the other day in the Upper House, vote for every paragraph of these resolutions. (Hear, hear.) The honorable member for Toronto (MR. JOHN MACDONALD), however, did not venture to go near his constituents, although they were assembled within some two hundred yards of where he resides; and in the face of that he comes here and tells us we must have an appeal to the people. If ever a subject was brought under the attention of this House, which met the almost unanimous approval of the people of the country, it is the scheme now under discussion. (Cheers and counter cheers.) We have been told that because the press of the country support the scheme nearly without exception, the press has been subsidized, and yet, up to this moment, they have not been able to point to a single case in proof of their assertion. It is paying the conductors of the press of Canada a very poor compliment to say that they could be bought, even were such a thing to be attempted. (Hear, hear.) The press of this country—the unbought press of the country—from one end to the other, are in favor of the scheme. We have

had, too, elections for thirty or forty constituencies in both sections since the scheme was brought forward.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—Does the honorable gentleman speak of municipal elections?

MR. McKELLAR—The honorable member alludes to those elections as being municipal elections, but I spoke not of the little municipality of Cornwall, and the hon. gentleman need not therefore be in any way alarmed. (Laughter.) Almost without exception, the elections which have since taken place have been in favor of this scheme of Federation. (Hear, hear.) It was my intention to have spoken at some length on the merits of this scheme.

DR. PARKER—Move the adjournment.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—No, no, no.

MR. McKELLAR—I am quite willing to drop the subject in the meantime. I may state that if it is thought desirable to proceed to a vote without discussion, for my part—

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—I must beg the honorable gentleman to understand what is our position on this subject. He stated just now that he had merely risen to answer some objections which were made by the honorable member for Toronto, and he appears indisposed to speak this evening.—Well, the honorable gentleman may speak at another time. It is only half-past twelve, and we may very well sit till two—(oh, oh)—so there is plenty of time. And as we know very well that the honorable gentlemen belonging to the Opposition are desirous of discussing this question at greater length, we are willing to listen to what they have to say.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—I am willing to stand as much night work as any honorable member of this House, but it is a little too much to ask us to sit here after twelve, night after night. At no time have I ever seen any success attending legislation after midnight.

MR. McKELLAR—I simply rose at the present time to point out the extraordinary conduct of the honorable member for Toronto. I may or may not desire to trespass upon the attention of the House to-morrow. But if I do not then speak, it is because of the imminent danger which I believe we are in, that the debate should be brought to a speedy close. In case I do not address the House again, I desire to take this opportunity of saying that I am entirely in favor of the resolutions, and that I shall support them cor-

dially, and oppose any amendments which may be offered to them; and, in taking that course, I am confident that I am doing that which will be endorsed almost unanimously by my constituents, and which will commend itself to at least three-fourths of the people of Upper Canada. If I believed that this measure was opposed to the wishes of the people of Canada, I would be the last man to press for a vote upon it until it had been submitted to them; but believing, from the clearest evidence, that the scheme meets with the almost unanimous approval of the country, I think the sooner we bring it into operation the better. (Hear, hear.)

MR. JOHN MACDONALD—I may perhaps be allowed to state in explanation that the good people of Kent are doubtless favored with a representative of much clearer views and sounder judgment than he who represents the unfortunate people of Toronto. But I would just say to that hon. gentleman, that if he will only look after the interests of his own constituents, I will try to look after the interests of mine. There is this difference between the hon. gentleman and myself, that when the scheme was first announced, he took the whole thing down at once, whilst I thought it too weighty to be thus hastily disposed of, and required time for reflection. And the debates which have taken place in this House—the diversity of opinion amongst Ministers themselves as to several points of the scheme—convince me that so far from its being understood by every man, woman and child in Upper Canada, as the hon. member for Kent stated, and as he would fain have us believe, it is far from being understood in the country. I am persuaded that the course I took was right. I can only say that, if the honorable gentleman leaves this House with skirts as clean as I intend mine shall be when I retire from Parliament, he will have no cause to reproach himself for anything he has done during his political career. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. HOWLAND—I desire to say a few words in reply to what fell from my honorable friend the member for Cornwall (Hon. J. S. MACDONALD), so that no misconception should exist on the part of the members of this House in regard to the course I thought proper to pursue when I went before my constituents, after having accepted the office which I have now the honor to hold in the Government. From the honorable gentleman's remarks, I think it would be inferred that I had accepted office

subject to conditions, and had left it to be understood that amendments would be made to the scheme now before the House. At least such is my impression from what fell from my honorable friend. I feel extremely obliged to the honorable gentleman for the kind manner in which he has spoken of me, and I can assure him in return that I value his opinion and friendship most highly; at the same time, it is proper that I should say a word or two in reference to what he has stated, in order that no misconception may possibly exist on the subject. I placed before my constituents, fairly and fully, my views on this important question. I indicated to them that there were some parts of the scheme which, if I had been a delegate to the Convention, I should have opposed and endeavored to modify. At the same time, I stated that we had to accept it as it was, it being in the nature of a treaty, or reject it.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—I am sure my honorable friend will not accuse me of a desire wilfully to misrepresent his position in reference to this matter. What I meant to say, if I did not say it, was this, that the scheme, as a whole, is not such as the Hon. Postmaster General desires—that he himself told his constituents that he entertained objections to it; and on that I argued that if the scheme was so bad as to be unsatisfactory to the members of the Government themselves, it was not fair to deny to the Opposition, to whom it was still more distasteful, the opportunity of placing on record their objections to it. (Hear, hear.)

MR. GEOFFRION moved the adjournment of the debate.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER moved in amendment that the debate be resumed at the next sitting of the House to-morrow, as the first Order of the Day after routine business.

HON. MR. HOLTON moved in amendment:—

That the debate be adjourned till Monday next, and that an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that he will cause to be laid before this House, in the meantime, all information submitted to the Conference, as well as any that may have since come into the possession of the Government, relating to the various important subjects referred to in the resolutions of the Conference; and particularly all information respecting the route and cost of the proposed Intercolonial Railway, the proposed distribution of the public property and liabilities among the several governments which are intended to replace the present Government of this Pro-

vince, the nature, extent and cost of the contemplated improvements of our inland water communications, the rights of Canada in the North-West Territory, and the cost of opening up that territory for settlement, the amount required to be contributed by the provinces towards the public defence, and the extent and value of the public lands of Newfoundland, in order that this House may be better enabled to consider the effect of the proposed constitutional changes on the material interests and the future political condition of the country.

The honorable gentleman said—MR. SPEAKER, I shall simply say, with respect to this motion, that we are asked to adopt conclusions come to by the Conference of delegates which met in Quebec in October last. It is only right and proper—it is only fair and reasonable—that we should be placed in possession of the data upon which these conclusions are founded. If we are a free British Parliament, worthy of our position as the representatives of British freemen, we will insist on being placed in possession of all the information upon which these resolutions were founded. I think there can be no reasonable answer to oppose to this request, and I feel that I should be doing injustice to the House if I detained it for one moment longer with any argument upon the subject. (Hear, hear.)

MR. A. MACKENZIE—The time mentioned is too short. It would be necessary to adjourn the debate for two months at least, in order to get the information here sought. But there are serious omissions in the resolution. The honorable gentleman ought to have asked for the number of engines and cars proposed to be employed on the railway, and the amount of traffic which is expected to be carried backwards and forwards in the course of a year. (Laughter.) The whole thing to my mind is ridiculous. (Hear, hear.)

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—I am surprised, sir, that the honorable member for Chateauguay should have proposed such a motion in amendment as this—a motion which has no affinity whatever to the question under consideration. In my opinion things should be called by their right names, and I have not the least hesitation in saying that this motion, from the irrelevant matter it contains, is entirely irregular—that it is, in fact, an absurdity. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. DORION—This is the only way in which we can make a motion for getting information from the Government. The amendment proposes that the debate shall be adjourned until Monday next, for the purpose of affording an opportunity to the Government

to bring down the information which they had before them during the Conference at which the resolutions in favor of Confederation were originated. It cannot be denied that when the Hon. Finance Minister and his colleagues agreed that \$150,000 should be paid for the unoccupied lands in Newfoundland, they must have had some information before them as to the value of those lands, and whether they consisted of one acre or a million. There is no doubt that when they agreed upon what part of the public debt of Canada should form part of the debt of the Confederation, they had a statement laid before them upon which that agreement was based. If I recollect aright, I saw in the newspapers a statement that the Conference had adjourned for a day or two in order to allow the Finance Ministers of the several provinces to make up and bring before the Conference a statement respecting the debts and financial positions of the several provinces. Well, this is all we want to obtain. We want the same information that the honorable gentlemen had before them when they agreed to those resolutions in conference. We do not suppose that they went into the consideration of these matters without any information before them. We do not suppose that they merely guessed that the debt of Canada was \$62,500,000, and guessed in the same way at the debts of the other provinces. We want the same opportunity of understanding these resolutions and of coming to a correct decision upon them, that the honorable gentlemen themselves enjoyed. We do not want an hour's delay more than is absolutely necessary to bring down the information and enable us to apply it in judging of the merits of the scheme. (Hear.) Honorable gentlemen say it will require months to get the information. The honorable member for Lambton (Mr. A. MACKENZIE) seems to be very much afraid to have the information brought down, lest it would result in the scheme not being carried. He ought to remember that we have not the confidence in the Honorable Attorney General East, nor yet in the Honorable Finance Minister, that he has. (Laughter.) He has known those gentlemen for a long time, and the House has had frequent opportunities, during past sessions, of observing the amount of confidence he has always reposed in them. He had a wonderful amount of confidence in the Honorable Finance Minister at the close of last session, when he voted for the motion respecting the \$100,000 handed over to the city of Montreal for

the payment of a Grand Trunk railway liability. But he will pardon us and exercise a little patience with us if we, who have never had that confidence in the honorable member for Sherbrooke since he has been Finance Minister, desire to have a little information before we vote for the extravagant scheme which he has brought before us. We want information mainly respecting the finances, the Intercolonial Railway, and the Crown lands of Newfoundland, and we have no other way of placing our demand in a shape to be recorded, since the previous question has been moved, than by moving for it in amendment to the motion for adjourning the debate.

HON. MR. GALT—The honorable gentleman is going into the merits of a resolution about which a point of order has been raised.

HON. MR. DORION—I was not aware that a point of order had been raised. What is the point of order? I understood the Honorable Attorney General East to have been arguing against bringing down the information called for.

HON. MR. CARTIER—No, no, not at all. The Speaker will decide whether the resolution is in order or not.

THE SPEAKER—It is a well understood rule that no amendment to a motion for an adjournment can be proposed, unless it relates to the time to which the adjournment is proposed to be made. The first portion of the motion is in order, or would be in order if it were separated from what follows, and proposed by itself; but I cannot compel the honorable mover of it to alter it. According to the best of my judgment, the motion is out of order.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Then, Mr. SPEAKER, I desire to have an opportunity of placing an appeal from the decision of the Chair on the resolution I have offered, upon the *Journals* of the House.

The members having been called in, the decision of the Honorable Speaker was sustained on the following division:—

YEAS.—Messrs. Alley, Ault, Beaubien, Belle-rose, Biggar, Blanchet, Bowman, Bown, Brouseau, Brown, Carling, Atty. Gen. Cartier, Cartwright, Cauchon, Chapais, Cockburn, Cornellier, Cowan, Currier, De Boucherville, De Niverville, Dickson, Dufresne (Montcalm), Dunsford, Evan-turel, Galt, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gibbs, Haultain, Higginson, Howland, Jones (South Leeds), Langevin, LeBoutillier, Mackenzie (Lambton), Mackenzie (North Oxford), Magill, McConkey, McDougall, McGee, McKellar, Morris, Morrison, Pinsonneault, Poulin, Powell, Robitaille, Ross (Prince Edward), Scoble, Smith (Toronto East),

Stirton, Street, Sylvain, Thompson, Walsh, Wells, Willson, and Wright (East York).—59.

NAVS.—Messieurs Cameron (North Ontario), Coupal, Dorion (Drummond and Arthabaska), Dorion (Hochelaga), Dufresne (Iberville), Fortier, Geoffrion, Holton, Houde, Labreche-Viger, Laframboise, Lajoie, Macdonald (Cornwall), O'Halloran, Paquet, Parker, Perrault, Rymal, Scatcherd, and Thibaudeau.—20.

The question being again put on Hon. Mr. Attorney General CARTIER's motion,

HON. MR. DORION said—**MR. SPEAKER**, I hold in my hand an amendment which will exactly suit the ruling of the Chair, as it relates only to the time to which the debate shall be adjourned. The very unfair and arbitrary course which the Government has unfortunately seen fit to pursue, has prevented the honorable members of this House from moving any amendments to the scheme proposed for its adoption; but I for one am most desirous, in accordance with the almost universal wish of the people of the district of Montreal, to have the question tested whether the opinion of the people shall be allowed to be heard before a final decision is come to by this House. I find that in nineteen French-Canadian counties in that district, resolutions have been passed in favor of that course, and petitions have been signed by from fifteen to twenty thousand inhabitants, asking that no such scheme be adopted without submitting it to a vote of the people. (Hear, hear.) Sir, I think it would have been far more dignified on the part of the Government, and more respectful towards the country, to have allowed the scheme—which, in their opinion, will create such prosperity that everybody will be in ecstasies over it, but which, in our opinion, will bring on this country such a state of dissatisfaction as will perhaps engender some other feeling than that of union with the Lower Provinces—to be voted upon by those who are most deeply interested in it, the people of Canada. But they have chosen to gag us, inasmuch that we have no other course left but to move amendments to the motion for adjourning the debate, and that we are determined to avail ourselves of. My motion in amendment is:—

That the debate on this resolution, involving as it does fundamental changes in the political institutions and in the political relations of this province, changes which were not in the contemplation of the people at the last general election, ought, in the opinion of this House, to be adjourned for one month, or until such time as the people of this province shall have an opportunity of con-

stitutionally pronouncing their opinions thereon, by an appeal to them.

I do not fix the time arbitrarily in which the appeal to the people shall be made. If honorable gentlemen are anxious to have the scheme carried at an early day, they can bring on an election at once, or they may take their own time. Let them dissolve the House to-morrow. We are ready for it at any time. The conduct of the Government in reference to the procedure of the House upon the great question they submitted to it, is as disgraceful as it is derogatory to the dignity of this House. After coming to a solemn agreement with the House that the discussion should go on as if in Committee of the Whole, and that consequently amendments might be moved, they now distrust the favorable feeling which they told us at the outset existed among the people, and now they will not allow us to place amendments to the scheme in the Speaker's hands. They fear to have the question discussed and understood among the people. They are wise in their generation. They have just beheld the Hon. Mr. TILLEY—for ten years past at the head of the Government of New Brunswick, and a most deservedly popular gentleman—though uniting with his own strength that of the leaders of the Opposition, swept away by the people. (Hear, hear.) Well may they tremble for the fate of their scheme among the people of Canada. But they do not content themselves with simply refusing an appeal to the people. They go further and refuse the members of this House the opportunity of placing their views before the House and country. We are ready to go to our constituents at once upon the question, and if they say that the scheme is a desirable one, I for one am prepared to bow to the will of the majority. But, sir, to bow to a self-constituted delegation—an association of honorable gentlemen who were never authorized, either by the Parliament or people of this province, to meet together along with gentlemen from other provinces, and concoct a new Constitution for the government of the people, and then to come to this House and say to it, "You must accept this new Constitution in all its details, making no change or amendment, nor even having the privilege of proposing any amendments so as to have them placed on the *Journals* of this House"—I say the demand that we should bow in meek and humble submission to that sort of treatment at the hands of

the gentlemen on the Treasury benches, is most monstrous. (Hear, hear.) I cannot say that under other circumstances, such an appeal as has just been made from the decision of the Chair would have been taken, but in this instance there was no other course left to the minority to show that they had demanded most important information in reference to the scheme under discussion. Whether it be until a direct appeal can be had to the people by a general election, or by petitions, I say the gravity of the question calls for delay. Never has such extraordinary action been taken by any government, whether weak or strong, as has been taken by honorable gentlemen opposite.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—The Government having endeavored to checkmate the Opposition to their scheme in the tyrannical way in which they have done, I think it is only fair to defeat their object and to stalemate them, because in point of fact it will amount to that if we succeed in this motion. I think honorable gentlemen will admit that in this great and momentous change which is going to take place, the people who sent us here are as deeply interested as we are. They sent us here to make laws under the Constitution as established, not to overturn the Constitution; and before such a violent change of Constitution is made as will, undoubtedly, plunge us into most serious expenses, there ought to be given them an opportunity of saying whether or not they concur in the change proposed. It is for this reason I second the resolution in amendment, and I hope we shall have for it the support of those honorable gentlemen who, though supporters of the Government, have expressed such marked dissent from the policy of shutting off amendments by moving the previous question.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER said—With reference to this motion, I have to raise the same point of order that I brought against the other one. I beg to say at the outset that the statement that there is to be no other opportunity of bringing forward a motion in favor of submitting the scheme to the people, is all clap-trap. The honorable member for Peel has given a notice of a motion on that subject, as a substantial proposition on which every honorable gentleman will have an opportunity of recording his vote in a regular way.

[The honorable gentleman then went on to discuss the point of order, giving several reasons for considering it irregular. The dis-

cussion of the points raised was also taken part in by Hon. Messrs. GALT, HOLTON, DORION, J. S. MACDONALD, and Mr. MORRIS.]

THE SPEAKER ruled the motion out of order. He said that the practice in such cases appeared to be for the Speaker to eliminate from such motions all that was irregular, and if the honorable member who prepared the motion consented to that, to put it to the House as it then stood. If the honorable member would not consent, why the motion fell to the ground. If the honorable member for Hochelaga would consent, therefore, to his eliminating from the motion all but that which referred to the adjournment, he (the Speaker) would put it to the House. If not, he would be obliged to rule it out of order.

HON. MR. DORION having declined to allow his motion to be interfered with, it was accordingly ruled out of order, the amendment of the Honorable Attorney General **CARTIER** was agreed to, and the debate was adjourned until three o'clock the next day.

—o—

WEDNESDAY, March 8, 1865.

MR. CHAMBERS said—The position of the speaker who comes towards the last in a debate is, if disadvantageous in some respects, at least advantageous in others. If from the ability of gentlemen who have preceded him, and from their logical and argumentative powers, most that could have been said has been said—if, from the ample store of knowledge they possess, numerous ideas have been advanced, and logical conclusions drawn therefrom, there is at least this advantage to their successors in the debate, that they have the benefit of those conclusions, the advantage of those ideas and of that knowledge. And although a subsequent speaker may be unable to advance new theories, or even add new arguments, he can at least compare the opinions and the views of those who have preceded him. I may state in the outset that I had hoped, at the commencement of this debate, to have heard it announced that this Legislature would be allowed the privilege of amending such of the resolutions submitted as they might, upon earnest and careful examination, have deemed necessary. I had hoped, Mr. **SPEAKER**, that some latitude would be allowed to this Legislature in suggesting improvements and

amendments to the resolutions, which do appear to me to have been resolved upon with some degree of haste for matters fraught with such vital interest and importance to these provinces. If indeed, sir, the hon. gentlemen who so recently held their deliberations in this city had been composed of men perfect in intellect, and possessing intelligence unalloyed by the baser ingredient of ordinary humanity—liability to err, then it would, I say, have seemed more consistent to ask this or any other legislature to adopt the Constitution which they had framed for us and for posterity without amendments, to ask us to receive, as we would or as we do, the articles of our religious faith—to ask us to have faith, and to believe that these delegates had embodied in these resolutions all the requisites and necessities for a perfect Constitution. I had hoped, sir, we should be able to apply ourselves to the calm, deliberate, impartial consideration of these important resolutions, and, being divested of all party spirit, endeavor to arrive at such conclusions as would be advantageous to all the provinces. But, sir, notwithstanding all this; however much it may have been desired, and whatever alterations we may have wished for; whatever further benefits and advantages Upper Canada may have desired to secure in this great national co-partnership; and although I should myself have preferred alterations in some of the resolutions, as well as in some of the details, yet I am not, after having listened patiently and anxiously to the able arguments in favor of Confederation, as well as against it—I am not, I repeat, prepared to state that I will take upon myself to say that Confederation, as a scheme, should be rejected—that I will state that I shall vote against the creation of a new nationality. (Hear, hear.) I will state some reasons why I am not prepared to do so. In the first place, when I look abroad and see the neighboring American Republic engaged in one of the most terrible and disastrous wars that has ever racked this continent; when I read in almost every journal issuing from the press of that country anathemas against the British Empire; when I see that press teeming with threats against this country; when I know that that nation has by sea a navy prepared to cope with the strong powers of the old world, and a force on land, in point of numbers at least, astonishing the generals of the most advanced of warlike nations—when, I say, I see that nation in a warlike, and not only in a war-

like, but in a threatening attitude towards us, I am led to consider, as paramount to every other consideration, what ought to be done for the safety of this country. To preserve its territory from invasion, to protect the lives and property of its subjects, is, I conceive, the first important duty towards which the attention of every government should be directed. (Hear.) Then, sir, upon the well-understood maxim that union is strength, I am inclined to believe that the union of the British North American Provinces would give strength to us all. (Hear, hear.) I confess I fail to see a source of weakness in this union, as is very ingeniously argued by some hon. gentlemen opposed to this scheme *in toto*. It does appear to me that the very political and national status given to these provinces by a union, would become immediately a source of strength; that the very new name to be given to the new nationality would be an immense fortification of defence in itself. (Hear, hear.) When, sir, I consider the interest evinced by the people of England, the people of France, and, I may say, of all Europe, the very apprehension that seems to exist with regard to this Confederation of the British North American Provinces, it appears to me that the very announcement of the creation of this new nationality has given us already a position and a strength which in the palmiest days of the old *régime* we might never have hoped for. (Hear, hear.) When I remember, sir, that great Constitutions in the old world have been founded in the blood of contending nations; that in the Mother Country the heirs of contending houses, at times through various centuries, struggled for supremacy; and that authority, power and good government have been established only after being wrenched from opposing factions by the sword—when I remember, sir, that history records the revolution which terminated the long struggle between the sovereigns in England and their parliaments—how, from union, order and freedom, established only by the sword, sprung a prosperity hitherto unknown in the annals of human affairs; when I trace their history from the days of feudalism down to the present, I am led to believe that if we have the opportunity of securing greatness, prosperity, and an established and well-regulated freedom, comparing favorably with all that is enjoyed by the Mother Country, and without the cost of a single drop of blood, and, if the financial

statements are correct, with little loss, if any, of treasure, we would not act wisely in letting pass the opportunity. (Hear, hear.) I think, on the first proposition, that our defensive position would be strengthened by this union. First, because were we to remain as we at present stand, separate provinces, there would be greater temptation to the adjoining republic to acquire possession of our territory, believing, as they undoubtedly would, that this could be done with advantage and little cost to themselves; whereas the magnitude of our national position, under the Confederation, would be the means, I am satisfied, of deterring them from such an enterprise. And I am satisfied, too, that the people of England would be more alive to our interests, more willing to spend their lives and their treasure in assisting in our defence, composing a strong, united, new nationality on this continent, than they would if we were to remain isolated colonial dependencies. (Hear, hear.) I believe the very intimation of this Confederation has awakened the world to the greatness, the vastness of the resources of this country. (Hear, hear.) That these views are shared in by eminent statesmen in Europe is also a significant fact. Lord HOUGHTON, on seconding the Address on the late Speech from the Throne, very emphatically declared, in regard to that portion in which allusion is made to Confederation, "that he was glad of this movement, because he confessed that he believed the future of the world rested not in isolated municipalities, but in great empires." And the Earl of DERBY, too, in his remarks on that occasion, also said:—

Under the circumstances, I view with the utmost satisfaction that most important step to which Her Majesty's Speech refers—the Confederation of the Canadian Provinces. I hope to see in that Confederation of the Canadian Provinces a determination to constitute themselves a power strong enough, with the aid of this country (which I am sure will never be withheld from them), to defend themselves against all aggression.

(Hear, hear.) Now, I ask, what would have been the consequences if the political combination that has taken place, for purposes well understood and declared, had not been made? We have seen the political party strifes that agitated this country; we have seen the bitterness with which opposing parties contended for office; we have seen the business of the country neglected, and

its legislation brought to a stand-still, while parties assailed each other in our legislative halls on some personal, individual ground of malice; we have seen Lower Canada refusing to Upper Canada her fair representation in Parliament; we have seen sectional and religious difficulties and dissensions growing more and more complicated, and portending strongly a dissolution of the union, because we of Upper Canada could not have much longer submitted to waive our fair and equitable right to be represented according to our population upon the floor of this House. (Hear, hear.) Looking, then, at the matter from this point of view, I deem the circumstances opportune that have opened a way for a solution of the difficulties that surrounded us, and at the same time afford a wider and more extended and ample scope to the people for their defence, for their commercial, manufacturing and mining interests, and for their social intercourse. Believing, then, that in respect to the solution of the political differences so recently existing, the Confederation of the provinces is exceedingly desirable; believing that in order to maintain an honorable existence, the union has become expedient, as affording a means of defence against aggression, I have, I think, at least two exceedingly strong grounds upon which I may favor the scheme in a general point of view. (Hear, hear.) Admitting that Confederation on general principles is a proposition that admits of being strongly entertained; that I feel convinced in my own mind that something requires to be done; that necessity demands strong and vigorous action on the part of the Government to relieve us from the difficulties into which political differences have thrown us, to guard and defend us against difficulties not only political at home, but warlike abroad—I am, nevertheless, not one of those who are willing to accept, without investigation and careful enquiry, a Constitution out and manufactured without the measure of the people it is proposed to fit having been taken. (Hear, hear.) I desire that the garment of the Constitution should be made to fit the people and at their request. (Hear, hear.) If I had any apprehension that this scheme was distasteful—was not acquiesced in—was not endorsed by the people, I should be the last man in this House to endorse these resolutions; and I should like every information afforded to this House that can be possibly given. I will not, however, pretend to dic-

tute to the Government of the day what amount of information they shall furnish and lay before us. I shall not charge them with dereliction of duty in not giving more information. I do not pretend to say that they should at this stage give further intimation of the line of policy proposed to be pursued and adopted by them with regard to the local governments. They, in their wisdom, no doubt, have laid down a course they deem judicious and advisable to pursue, and which may be so. But at the same time I reserve to myself the right to be satisfied or dissatisfied with the reasons given, and with the information laid before us, and I conceive no blame can be attached to the man from Upper Canada who is anxious to know, before he votes for Confederation, what the results will be to that section of the country. (Hear, hear.) Gentlemen will, I hope, take it in no wrong spirit when I say that upon others than themselves—upon the young men of this House and this country—will fall the consequences of this scheme, if carried into effect, whether beneficial or disastrous; and upon us who now cast our votes in its favor will fall the responsibility, if, after its adoption, the working of its machinery shall prove disastrous and injurious to Upper Canada. I maintain that the merit for the time being of framing a new nationality will attach to the few who have conceived and accomplished it; and they will no doubt be removed to places of honor, trust and emolument beyond the reach of the people, while we shall be left to see that the cog-wheels and straps and appurtenances of this gigantic invention are made to adhere to their respective and destined positions. (Hear, hear.) And woe to us if a wheel becomes displaced, or a single accident happens in its future working. Is it then, sir, improper to desire to see the fullest programme before we enter upon the play? Though favorable to Confederation, we might be unwilling to swallow some of its indigestible ingredients, if any such it should, upon examination, be found to contain. (Hear, hear.) Now, upon examination of these resolutions, I find the first one contain I think nothing but that which would be acceptable and be gladly received by every truly loyal British subject—a Federal union under the Crown of Great Britain. No one has attempted to address this House but has given the fullest expression of his desire to see the connection with the Mother

Country maintained and preserved—to see the great arm of the British Empire, which we all so much esteem, respect, and admire, strengthened. (Hear, hear.) It has been argued here that the British connection will be endangered by this scheme, that growing in strength, we shall by and by become independent, throw off our allegiance, become coveted, and finally swallowed up by the neighboring republic. I believe the interest now exhibited in England in our welfare, in our prosperity, in the formation of our new nationality—the affection shown for us in the hearts of many English statesmen, exhibited in their declarations of their belief in our loyalty, is sincere. (Hear.) I cannot believe that as we grow great, prosperous, and valuable, their interest in us will grow less or be in the slightest degree diminished. The contrary is the reasonable deduction. If that nation has been in times past so solicitous with regard to us; if when poor, small, and unknown comparatively, she has sent her best blood and her richest treasures for our defence and support, it is unjust to her now and unreasonable to assume that she will ever, unless at our own request, abandon, neglect or forget us. (Hear, hear.) The recollections of our childhood and of the anxious care extended toward us will be ever fresh, I trust, in the mind and heart and memory of our Island Parent, and when maturity overtakes us, I am sure she will not forget the child she has so loved. I trust not. I see no occasion for apprehension on this account in this direction. (Hear, hear.) I see, Mr. SPEAKER, embodied in this second resolution—if we are to have a union of the provinces—the only method which I think could be at all satisfactory to the various sections. It is alleged by some that a legislative union would be desirable. For my own part, I see many difficulties that would inevitably arise out of a legislative union, which it appears to me would be insurmountable. I do not believe that a general government would be as capable, even if it were as willing—which I doubt if it would be—to deal with the local affairs of the different sections as the local governments would be. I believe a general government, charged with matters of common interest to the whole country, and local governments for the provinces, as proposed by this resolution, is best adapted to secure efficiency, harmony and permanency in the working of

this union. The second resolution, too, opens up a mighty page on our historic future. It points a significant finger to the day when millions of inhabitants shall people the verdant valley of the Saskatchewan, when railways and telegraphs shall thread the almost boundless territory of the North-West, where the war-hoop of the savage alone is heard. It points to the vast commercial enterprises yet to be engaged in upon the Pacific shores, to the rich gold fields of Columbia and the fertile shores of Vancouver. (Hear, hear.) We rise, Mr. SPEAKER, in this resolution, from the simplicity of small colonial dependencies to a vastness in extent of territory to which the little islands that compose the mighty Empire to which we belong are insignificant. We may look forward, even with hope and pride, without, I think, too great a stretch of imagination, to some distant day, when in the rocking of European thrones, perhaps, we shall be able to send out our fleets and our armies, gathered from the Atlantic to the Pacific, to afford aid and assistance to that very Empire to which we now, in our weakness, appeal for support and strength and aid. (Applause.) Who will say that the conception of this scheme has not a grandeur about it commending itself to the minds of those who rise superior to the cries of party strife—commending itself to the favorable consideration of those who desire to move onward with gigantic strides to greatness, to wealth, to a more perfect civilization—to break out from the narrow grooves of prejudice, and selfishness, and bigotry, and desire to take to the broad gauge of an enlightened and expansive policy? (Hear, hear.) Resolutions three, four and five I may pass over. They all have for their tendency the planting of the roots of the Constitution of this new nationality in the firm soil of the British model; of coupling to the firm car of British freedom this new nationality, the wisdom, and expediency and policy of which course is not attempted to be denied by a single voice in this House. I pass to the consideration of the eleventh resolution, which has been the subject of much discussion among the people outside of this House, and has been referred to as one very strong ground for the rejection of the scheme. Those of the old Reform party who contended—and I am sure conscientiously contended—for the elective principle in the Upper House, ever jealous as they have a right to be of those

rights and privileges, for which they have long and ardently contended, see in this resolution a retrograde rather than a progressive principle—a backward rather than a forward movement—instead of a salutary reform, a return to the old-fogyism of the past, if I may be allowed the expression. (Hear, hear.) Well, sir, I in some measure agree with those who entertain these opinions. I would, for my own part, very much prefer to see the elective principle retained in the Legislative Council, and I very much desire, if this scheme is to be adopted at all, that in pursuance of the intimation given in the despatch of the 3rd December, 1864, from the Imperial Government, acknowledging the despatch of this Government of the 7th of November, 1864, the provinces should enter again upon the consideration of the resolution respecting the appointment by the Crown of the members of the Legislative Council. As this suggestion is one that comes not from either of the provinces—arises from no sectional nor provincial prejudices—none of the provinces can well refuse to entertain it if they are really actuated by a desire to arrive at a form of Constitutional Government based upon principles just to the several provinces, as is declared to be their desire in the very first of these resolutions. (Hear.) I will not, sir, enter into further details upon this subject; I will not discuss the advantages of an intercolonial road, or its disadvantages; but I will simply say, that in the hour of emergency, when our position is such that we cannot, we must not stand still—when we are hurried along by the resistless power of circumstances—when dangers threaten, on the one hand, and bright prospects of greatness lie in immediate unity of action on the other, we should not descend to the penurious position of being unwilling to spend a dollar to accomplish a great and mighty project that will live in the memory of all future ages—of founding a nationality that will, it may be, exist, as the learned historian quoted by my hon. friend from Quebec has said: “When some traveller from New Zealand shall stand upon a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Pauls.” (Hear.) I would not, sir, on the other hand, be willing to adopt a scheme which would, in a financial point of view, endanger the best interests of Upper Canada; but I am assured by the facts and figures intro-

duced. by my honorable friends from South Oxford and from Sherbrooke, who, I am sure, do not wish to be taken in in respect to this scheme any more than I do, or than any other man from Upper Canada—I am assured, I say, by them, that our financial position will be benefited by the Confederation. I have compared those facts and those figures, and I must confess I have confidence in their conclusions. (Hear, hear.) I have heard it urged, sir, that because some counties in New Brunswick have rejected the men who have adopted Confederation as a policy, we ought therefore to abandon the scheme. Well, sir, we are either bound in good faith to carry out the engagement entered into at Quebec or not, and I say with my friend the Honorable Attorney General West, we are bound in all conscience and honor, and in every principle of law or equity, to adhere to the agreement entered into. (Hear, hear.) The *tu quoque* argument is not a good defence to such a breach of good faith. What a sorry figure should we out, sir, before the Imperial Government with this argument in our mouths:—"The Provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island broke faith, violated their pledges, were untrue to their engagements, and we followed their example." I think, sir, such a position would be pitiable, and would tend to lower us in the eyes of the Imperial Government. (Hear, hear.) I maintain that the principle enunciated by my friend the Honorable Attorney General West is correct; we must adopt these resolutions, and we must take them before the Imperial Government, in order to maintain the respect of that Government, in order to maintain the respect of the Empire, in order to maintain even our own self-respect. (Hear, hear.) When that is accomplished, our duty will be ended. If the Maritime Provinces will not adhere to the arrangement, we shall have done our duty, and shall have secured the good-will and respect of the Mother Country. (Hear, hear.) Before taking my seat, I will say, sir, with regard to the putting of the previous question, I am sorry that has been done. I am one who is desirous of giving to every man, of every party, of every shade of political opinion, the most extensive scope for the expression of his opinions, the fairest opportunity of giving them utterance and of recording his votes, so that they may appear upon the *Journals*, ready to be referred

to, in order both to protect himself and to benefit others. This, sir, is, however, a technicality; and however much I may regret that the question has been put in that form, I cannot on that account reject the whole scheme of Confederation. (Hear, hear.)

MR. GEOFFRION said—MR. SPEAKER, when I moved the adjournment last night, it was not my intention to offer to-day a general review of the scheme which is under discussion; for I am of opinion that it has been sufficiently discussed to enable the country to judge of its merits and of its disadvantages. My intention was rather to confine myself to certain points in the plan which, in my opinion, have not been held up in a sufficiently salient point of view, and to make a few remarks on what has been said, both in this House and in the Legislative Council, in relation to the protection of the institutions of Lower Canada. In the Upper House the Hon. the Prime Minister (Hon. Sir ETIENNE PASCAL TACHÉ), in his speech of the 3rd February last, said:—

If we obtain a Federal union, it will be equivalent to a disunion of the provinces, and thereby Lower Canada will preserve her autonomy, together with all the institutions which are so dear to her; and over which she may exercise all the surveillance which is necessary to preserve them from danger.

And the Hon. Solicitor General (Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN), after having explained, in his way, the resolutions respecting marriage and divorce, expressed himself as follows, in his speech of the 21st February last:—

This is an important point, and the French-Canadian members ought to congratulate themselves on observing that their fellow-countrymen did not fail in the performance of their duty in relation to a question of such importance. It is needless to say that on many other points some of them will not admit that we performed our duty well; but on the point in question, there can be no difference of opinion, for we have all a common rule, and, I repeat, they should be satisfied that their co-religionists in the Conference were not forgetful of their duty on that occasion.

It then behoves this honorable House, MR. SPEAKER, to see that our national institutions are really protected by the resolutions which are submitted to us. In order that this end may be fully attained, it is necessary to define the peculiar features of our position as a people. I can say, with the utmost sincerity, that for my part I have

never found any other points of difference between the English and the French-Canadians who inhabit this country, but those arising from their religion, their language, and their laws; for we have the same attachment that they have to the British Empire, and I am convinced that no hon. member of this House will express a contrary opinion. (Hear, hear.) This being admitted, Mr. SPEAKER, I beg to call the attention of the House to the twenty-ninth resolution. It reads as follows:—

The General Parliament shall have power to make laws for the peace, welfare and good government of the Federated Provinces (saving the Sovereignty of England), and especially laws respecting the following subjects:—

Then, after a long enumeration of subjects on which the General Government is to have power to legislate, we come to the 31st paragraph, which relates to marriage and divorce. On the 2nd July, 1864, the Prime Minister, (Hon. Sir ETIENNE PASCAL TACHÉ), in the course of an eloquent speech delivered on the second reading of the Benning Divorce Bill, spoke as follows in the Legislative Council:—

I oppose the second reading of the bill, and I do so on the principle that divorce is antichristian and antinational. [And after having cited various passages from the Bible, he continued:] Divorce is immoral in its consequences, and, worse still, it destroys society by destroying the family. [And again:] I should be sorry to wound the feelings of any one, but we have to protect society in general, and we have certain duties to discharge. For my part, I should be acting against my conscience, my religion and my country, if I did not oppose the bill. Death alone can dissolve marriage—that is the teaching of the Apostles, and it is also the doctrine of all the Fathers and Councils.

On the 9th July of the same year, the Hon. Solicitor General for Lower Canada, in his speech delivered in this House on the same subject, expressed himself as follows:—

If I oppose the bill now before the House, it is not because I do not believe that the person petitioning for it has just grounds of complaint, but because we are asked to do that which is diametrically opposed to my principles in this matter; and because, moreover, I consider that the House has not the right to dissolve the marriage contracted between the parties interested, and to permit them to marry again.

This opinion of the Hon. Solicitor General for Lower Canada was supported by the whole of the French-Canadian and Catholic members, who declared, on that occasion, by voting even against the first reading of the

bill, that they were opposed to the principle of divorce; and their opinion was concurred in and supported by the greater part of the newspapers in Lower Canada. The *Canadian* said, on that occasion:—

The Divorce Bill was, we regret to say, read a first time yesterday evening. The division was 61 votes against 42. There is, therefore, no hope of this antisocial measure being defeated. The duty of reflecting men, nevertheless, is to warn society of the danger in which it is placed; to protest strongly against the deadly assaults made upon it. Messrs. LANGEVIN, McGER and CARTIER discharged, yesterday evening, that high and important duty, and, as representatives of Lower Canada society, they addressed in eloquent terms warnings to society in Upper Canada.

The *Courrier du Canada*, with reference to the same question, said:—

If any one says that the Church is in error when, for various reasons, she decides that a separation between married persons, in so far as regards the marriage bed or cohabitation, may take place for a definite or an indefinite period, let him be anathema. That is the doctrine of the Catholic Church as to marriage, and in this instance, as in every other, it is in accordance with the laws of nature, which themselves repel divorce as something monstrous.

The *Journal de Québec* of the 9th June, 1864, says:—

The question of divorce recurs periodically to occupy the attention of the House and afflict the consciences of Catholics. Divorce is the most powerful agent for effecting the dissolution of society, for marriage is the social formula; once you open the flood-gates of divorce, no matter under what pretext, how are you to dam up the tide and prevent it from submerging the whole of society?

Now, Mr. SPEAKER, as I said a moment ago, these were the opinions of all French-Canadians, and, with reference to this question, I cannot imagine anything to justify the change of opinion which has manifested itself amongst a certain number of French-Canadian members and our Catholic ministers. If it be true that a Catholic cannot adopt the principle of divorce, and if we are in conscience bound to oppose it in our capacity as legislators, by voting against every measure tending to sanction it, I ask how we can vote for a resolution purporting to vest in the Federal Legislature the power of legislating on the subject? The hon. member for Montmorency, in the course of his speech in this House the day before yesterday, told us that if it had not been recorded in the resolutions

that the Federal Parliament would have the right of legislating on divorce, that power would have been exercised not only by the latter, but by the local legislatures also. The 43rd resolution, article 15, tells us that property and civil rights, excepting those portions thereof assigned to the General Parliament, are to be left to the local governments. It is evident, therefore, that if it had not been stated in the resolutions that the Federal Government was to have the right of legislating on marriage and divorce, that power would have remained vested in the local legislatures.

HON. M. CAUCHON—And if that resolution had not been inserted in the scheme, what would have been the effect?

MR. GEOFFRION—The insertion of that clause places us precisely in the position we should have occupied under a legislative union. By one section of that clause, the Federal Legislature is vested with the power of legislating, not only on the question of marriage and divorce, but also on the civil rights of the French-Canadians. It can, whenever it chooses, attack our civil laws. The hon. member for Montmorency admits that the 43rd clause, and paragraph 15, assure the protection of our civil rights, and says that if that portion of the resolutions had not been inserted, the local legislatures would alone have had the right to deal with the matter. MR. SPEAKER, a single glance at our civil code is sufficient to convince any one of this. Under article 74 of title 5, I find the following:—"Marriage is dissolved solely by the natural death of one of the parties; so long as they both live, it is indissoluble." If it be true that our French civil law declares that marriage cannot be dissolved by any means whatsoever, nor by any authority; if the right of legislating on marriage and divorce had not been left to the General Legislature, no person could have obtained a divorce and leave to marry again.

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—What happens at the present moment?

MR. GEOFFRION—What happens? It is true that the Legislature furnishes us with precedents, but every time that a divorce has been asked from the Legislature, the Catholic members have voted against it. As the resolutions stand, the Federal Legislature may grant bills of divorce, thanks to the insertion of this clause in the scheme. We are told that this has been done in

order to remove a danger which already existed in the local legislatures; but a great error has been committed; for, under the new system, any one can make application to the General Legislature and obtain a bill of divorce. And if that right had not been given to the Federal Legislature, it would have been impossible to obtain a divorce in Lower Canada, inasmuch as the majority in the Local Legislature will be French-Canadian and Catholic, and marriage and divorce would be under the control of that legislature. (Hear, hear.) The Honorable Solicitor General LANGEVIN said in his speech—and I fancied that he had much difficulty in explaining the article relative to divorce, that the Catholic members of the Conference were not opposed to that article, and that, though they were opposed to the principle of divorce, he admitted that there were cases in which Catholics were allowed to separate. I cannot help saying, MR. SPEAKER, that this was a very poor argument for granting to the General Government the power of legislating in the matter of divorce. The same resolution says that the Federal Government is to have the right of legislating on marriage, and the Honorable Solicitor General, in his speech, explains that article as follows:—

The word "marriage" has been placed in the draft of the proposed Constitution to invest the Federal Legislature with the right of declaring what marriages shall be held and deemed to be valid throughout the whole extent of the Confederacy, without, however, interfering in any particular with the doctrines or rites of the religious creeds to which the parties may belong.

I must acknowledge that the statement is very skilfully made, and to persons who accept it without close examination, I admit that it is calculated to convey the idea that the Government hold that the Federal Legislature cannot decree that a civil marriage is obligatory, and that a marriage must be celebrated under the Catholic or the Protestant Church in order to be valid. But any one who closely examines that portion of the clause will easily see that it cannot possibly be interpreted in any such sense, and that the existence of that clause in the Constitution will enable the Federal Government to enact that civil marriage alone shall be valid, so that children the issue of marriages contracted in the Church and not ratified by a civil magistrate, will be illegitimate. I maintain that the clause is susceptible of no other interpretation, and I defy the Honorable Solicitor General for

Lower Canada (Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN) to interpret it correctly in any other sense. (Hear, hear.) He has really given us a magnificent explanation of the clause, but it seems to me that as the House is called upon to deal with written resolutions, we must interpret them as they are laid before us; the House cannot scrutinise the hidden intentions of the Government in the matter. If the resolutions have any other meaning than that expressed on the face of them, the House is entitled to call upon the Government to explain and correct them. The motion now before the House is as follows:—

That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She may be graciously pleased to cause a measure to be submitted to the Imperial Parliament, for uniting the Colonies of Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, and Prince Edward Island in one government, with provisions based on certain resolutions which were adopted at a Conference of Delegates from the said Colonies, held at the city of Quebec, on the 10th October, 1864.

I assert, then, that if we vote this Address, we cannot complain if the Imperial Government should declare that the Federal Legislature shall have the right to legislate on all matters relating to marriage and divorce.

HON. MR. CAUCHON—Who is to draw up the Constitution?

MR. GEOFFRION—The Imperial Government.

HON. MR. CAUCHON—Not at all. It will be drawn up here and submitted to the Imperial Government.

MR. GEOFFRION—If I am not mistaken as to the meaning of the motion, the Address asks Her Majesty to cause a measure to be submitted to the Imperial Parliament for the purpose of uniting the Colonies of Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, and Prince Edward Island in one government, with provisions based on certain resolutions which were adopted at a Conference of delegates from the said colonies. Now, if the Imperial Government is to adopt the measure, they can do as was done in 1856, with reference to the Legislative Council, and we cannot complain if they should amend it in a sense distasteful to us, since our resolutions declare that the Local Government shall have the right to legislate on property and civil rights, except such portions thereof as shall be vested in the Federal Government—and amongst the subjects left to the latter are marriage and

divorce. (Hear, hear.) I know the answer that will be made to me on this point. It will be said that it is through party spirit I am standing up to defend religion, and that I desire to lead this Honorable House to believe that by voting for these resolutions we endanger our religious institutions. But it appears to me, Mr. SPEAKER, that for all of us Catholics, the indissolubility of marriage is an article of religion, and that if the resolutions do not admit that doctrine of the Church, they must be rejected by every one of us. But it will perhaps be asked—"How does it happen that our Catholic clergy remain passive whilst one of the dogmas of our religion is thus being undermined?" I deny, Mr. SPEAKER, that the Canadian clergy are in favor of the Ministerial scheme, and I am supported in this by the fact that the petitions sent here against the scheme were signed by several priests.

HON. MR. CAUCHON—By how many?

MR. GEOFFRION—Several of them have signed the petitions; I can fancy that some members of the clergy are in favor of the project, but I deny that the clergy in general profess the same sentiments. We have not received a single petition in favor of Confederation, and every day large numbers of them reach us, praying for the abandonment of the scheme.

HON. MR. CAUCHON—Do not drag the clergy into the debate: we have not done so.

MR. GEOFFRION—Yes, you have done it. The Honorable Attorney General for Lower Canada said in this House that the clergy were in favor of the scheme. Now, I maintain that a great many priests are opposed to Confederation. (Hear, hear.) I find in the *Canadien* of this day a letter written by a member of the clergy, who expresses himself in the following terms on the subject of Confederation—

MR. ROBITAILLE—Is the letter really written by a priest?

MR. GEOFFRION—If the honorable member has any doubt on that point, he can solve it by applying to the honorable member for the county of Quebec, who is the proprietor of the paper. This is what the reverend gentleman says:—"The clergy are not in favor of your Confederation as it is proposed; a great many of them, it is true, have faith in it, and trust in our public men, but a good many of them also dread it, and would like to see it amended." It is quite easy for any one who takes the trouble to reflect on this matter,

to understand that among the clergy, as among the people, there may be a great many persons who, having always had confidence in the Lower Canada Ministers, and having been accustomed to look upon them as the natural protectors of religion and of our national institutions—are ready to accept the declarations and explanations made in this House by our Ministers. Now, these explanations simply stated that the legislation of the Federal Government would merely go the length of declaring the validity of marriages contracted in any one of the provinces of the Confederation when the parties entered Lower Canada; but it is evident that if they accept such explanations, those members of the clergy who have always had confidence in the present Ministers are not easily susceptible of alarm. But if we take the trouble of interpreting that clause of the resolution in its true sense, it must be admitted that the legislation of the Federal Government on marriage and divorce may in many ways run counter to our sentiments as Catholics, since it may declare that marriage is nothing more than a civil contract, and that religious marriages contracted either by Protestants or Catholics, and not ratified by a magistrate, shall not be valid. Let us now see what will be the effect of these provisions as regards our laws. The Honorable Attorney General for Lower Canada gave us a pompous eulogy of our civil code; he went so far as to state that it was infinitely superior to the French code, and to any code he was acquainted with. We are told that our institutions and our civil laws will be fully protected, and that the Federal Legislature can only legislate on the laws of the other provinces, our civil laws being placed beyond its reach. If this provision relating to marriage and divorce be adopted, what will be the effect on our civil laws? The Hon. Solicitor General for Lower Canada told us that the object of that resolution was to render valid throughout the Confederation a marriage contracted in any one of the provinces. It seems to me very extraordinary, Mr. SPEAKER, that a gentleman in the position of the hon. member for Dorchester, and who, in virtue of that position, may aspire to a seat on the bench, and who already enjoys precedence over the majority of the Bar of Lower Canada, should evince such deplorable ignorance of our civil law. In article 19, title 5 of the *Civil Code*, relative to marriage, I find the following:—"A marriage celebrated out of Lower Canada between two persons, either or both of whom are subject to its laws, is valid, if celebrated

according to the formalities of the place of celebration, provided that the parties did not go there with the intention of evading the law." Thus, Mr. SPEAKER, since the marriage of a Lower Canadian contracted in another country in accordance with its laws, is valid in this country, the explanation and interpretation given by the Honorable the Solicitor General, of the clause relating to marriage and divorce, has no force whatsoever, and the clause may as well be struck out of the resolutions. (Hear, hear.) If I rightly understand that clause, the legislature will have power to deal with a host of matters relating to marriage; thus it may change that part of the civil code which defines the age at which a child may marry without the consent of parents; it may alter the mode of contracting marriage, change the mutual rights and duties of married persons; it will also have power to modify our civil code in the matter of our obligations arising from marriage, in the matter of tutorship, paternal authority, &c., &c., in fact in a multitude of its provisions. If that be the great protection afforded by the new Constitution to our laws, to our religious and civil institutions, there is every reason to fear that they may one day receive a fatal blow. I will now call the attention of the House, and particularly of the French-Canadian members, to the forty-sixth resolution, which relates to the use of the French language in the Federal Legislature. It is as follows:—"The English and French languages may be used simultaneously in the proceedings of the Federal Legislature as well as in the Legislature of Lower Canada, and also in the Federal courts and in the courts of Lower Canada." A close examination of this resolution shews at once that it does not declare that the French language is to be on the same footing as the English language in the Federal and Local Legislatures; in place of the word "shall," which ought to have been inserted in the resolution, the word used is "may," so that if the British majority decide that the *Votes and Proceedings* and Bills of the House shall be printed only in English, nothing can prevent the enactment taking effect. Of course we shall be allowed to use the French language in debate, but on the other hand, it is evident that the majority may, whenever they choose, enact that the bills and proceedings of the House shall not be printed in French, and consequently the clause affords no security whatever to us French-Canadians. I take it for granted that as regards all the bills or resolutions of this House, the meaning to

be given to words is that given to them by the law of the country, and I am therefore justified, when explaining the resolutions before us, in holding to the very letter of their resolutions, and it needs no effort of the imagination to discover the intention of those who prepared them. The provincial statute 22 Victoria, chap. 29, relative to the interpretation of the statutes, says:—"Whenever by any act it is provided that a thing shall be done, the obligation to do it is to be inferred; but when it is said that a thing may be done, the power of doing it is permissive." In the resolutions submitted us, the word used in the English version is "may," which is translated into French by the word "*pourront*," and it is said that the English and French languages may be used simultaneously in the proceedings of the Federal Parliament as well as in the Legislature of Lower Canada, and also in the Federal courts and the courts of Lower Canada. It is easy to see, then, that the use of the French language is rendered extremely precarious, and that the majority may proscribe it in our *Votes and Proceedings*, and in our Legislature. The Lower Canada members who have always supported the Ministry ought to urge them to insert a clause in the resolutions declaring that the French language shall be on the same footing as the English language; the guarantee afforded us by the resolutions, as they now stand, amounts to nothing. I am not the first to point out the danger to our institutions and our laws; the *Canadien* of this city has enumerated them over and over again, and the honorable member for Montmorency himself, who quite recently admitted in this House that he was the editor in chief of the *Journal de Québec*, wrote as follows in that paper on the 18th January, 1865. After having spoken of the past conduct of the Upper Canadians, and more particularly of the Honorable President of the Council (Hon. Mr. BROWN), he says:—

For Lower Canada there are other questions still besides the question of money; there are the religious, social, and national questions. Here it is that the greatest difficulties exist in the way of the success of the scheme, for a few slight changes in the letter of the scheme—changes which will in no way affect the interests of the other provinces—will cause the project to be accepted by the immense majority of the population of the country. We do not hesitate to say that it is astounding that the Conference should have approximated so closely to equity, after a few days only of work, and in the midst of innumerable obstacles.

It seems to me, Mr. SPEAKER, that if the honorable member for Montmorency was right in telling the Ministry that our nationality and our institutions were in danger, and that changes were required, we French-Canadian members are bound to see that the resolutions submitted to us afford sufficient protection to those institutions, and that the resolutions are not written in such a way as to be susceptible of two interpretations. How has the discussion of the scheme of Confederation been conducted in Lower Canada? In this way: in the first place, all the Ministerial journals begged and prayed the people not to condemn the scheme before being made acquainted with it; they proclaimed stoutly that the Government must be allowed to elaborate its measures in peace, and then, when the scheme was made public, the same journals declared that certainly the scheme must be amended in certain particulars before being adopted by the country, and that they would be the first to call for these changes, which, moreover, could be obtained without difficulty from the Administration; if not, they would oppose the scheme as dangerous to Lower Canada. Even the *Mercury* made that statement. It was also said: "The Government will not make a Ministerial question of the adoption of the scheme as it is; the project may be discussed, and if it is found to involve anything dangerous for our religious and national institutions, that danger can be obviated by amending the resolutions." More than that, at the opening of the discussion of the scheme, the Hon. Attorney General for Upper Canada himself declared in this House that members might propose amendments, and that the House would dispose of them. Now what have we seen since? We have seen the same Hon. Minister declare that the scheme must be accepted as it was, and that the Government would not tolerate any amendment. Is such conduct calculated to inspire confidence in the scheme, and in the Administration who bring it forward? I appeal to honorable members from Lower Canada, and I ask them if they are prepared to ratify by their verdict the unjustifiable course adopted by the Government, and whether it is not their duty to insist on the Government affording us better security for our religious and national institutions? (Hear. hear.) I trust that the Lower Canada members will not shirk their duty, and that they will insist on the Government declaring, in their resolutions, that all these things we hold so dear shall be pro-

ected from the attacks of our adversaries. Every danger of false interpretation ought to be removed from these resolutions. If, as it is stated, our language is to be fully protected under the new system, I do not see why it is not so stated clearly in the Constitution. The explanations of the Honorable Solicitor General for Lower Canada (Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN) are all very well, but they are not sufficient, and I should much prefer a written statement in the Constitution itself, formally setting forth that these matters shall not be affected by any legislation of the Federal Government. (Hear, hear.) I trust the English members of this House will not take offence at my insisting on more ample guarantees for our religious and national institutions, and that they will see that it is not through a spirit of hostility to their institutions, and that the same motives that induce them to demand more ample guarantees for their national minority in Lower Canada—guarantees which were claimed the other evening by the honorable member for Montreal Centre (Hon. Mr. ROSE)—make me ask for the same guarantees for my fellow-countrymen.

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—Will my honorable friend allow me to say a few words in explanation? He said he hoped the Government and members on this side of the House would admit that his desire was to defend the religious and national interests of Lower Canada. The honorable member for Verchères need not be uneasy on that point. For it must always be taken for granted—and every member on this side of the House will agree with me in this—that every sentiment expressed on the floor of this House by honorable gentlemen opposite, relative to those questions touching our nationality and our religion, is frank and sincere, and we, therefore, feel that in expressing himself as he has done, the honorable member for Verchères is perfectly frank and sincere. However, I take the liberty of answering him on two points. The first question is that of marriage. The honorable member did not quote the whole of that portion of my speech which relates to marriage; he simply quoted the first part, but he ought to have given the second, which is as follows:—

The fact is that the whole matter amounts to this—the Central Government may decide that any marriage contracted in Upper Canada or in any of the Confederated provinces, in accordance with the laws of the country in which it was contracted, although that law might be different from ours, should be deemed valid in Lower Canada,

in case the parties should come to reside there, and *vice versa*.

This was merely a development of what I said. I stated before that the interpretation I had given of the word "marriage" was that of the Government and of the Conference of Quebec, and that we wished the Constitution to be drafted in that sense. The honorable member for Verchères quoted that part of the draft of the civil code which states that one of the articles provides that a marriage contracted in any country whatever, according to the laws of the country in which it shall have been contracted, shall be valid, and he argues from that, that since it was declared by the civil code, there was no necessity for inserting it in the resolutions. But the honorable member must be aware that that part of the code may be repealed at any time, and that if this occurred, parties married under the circumstances referred to would no longer enjoy the protection they now have and which we desire to secure for them under the Constitution. I maintain, then, that it was absolutely necessary to insert the word "marriage" as it has been inserted, in the resolutions, and that it has no other meaning than the meaning I attributed to it in the name of the Government and of the Conference. Thus the honorable member for Verchères had no grounds for asserting that the Federal Legislature might change that part of the civil code which determines the age at which marriage can be contracted without the consent of parents. Another point on which the honorable member for Verchères insisted, no doubt with the view of obtaining information, which I shall be delighted to afford if it should induce him to vote for the resolutions—and I am perfectly certain it ought to be sufficient—is the point as to the use of the French language under Confederation. The forty-sixth resolution is as follows:—

The English and French languages may be used simultaneously in the proceedings of the Federal Parliament as well as in the Legislature of Lower Canada and in the Federal courts and in the courts of Lower Canada.

The honorable member for Verchères says—
"It is true that the French language may be used in the Federal Parliament and in the Legislature of Lower Canada, as well as in the courts of justice of the Confederation, but the resolutions do not affirm that that language may be used in the drafting of laws and in the *Votes and Proceedings* of the Federal and Local Legislatures." Well,

Mr. SPEAKER, I am quite sure the honorable member for Verchères will be delighted to learn that it was perfectly well understood at the Conference of Quebec that the French language should not only be spoken in the courts of justice, in the Federal Parliament and in the Legislature of Lower Canada, but that, precisely as is now the case, the *Votes and Proceedings* of the Legislature, as well as all the Federal laws and those of the Legislature of Lower Canada, should be printed in both languages. And what is still more, under Confederation the French language will be spoken before the Federal tribunals, an advantage which we do not possess at present when we apply to the Court of Appeals of Great Britain. So that the honorable member for Verchères and this honorable House will gladly admit that its representatives at the Conference of Quebec did not fail in their duty on that point. These are the principles upon which the new Constitution will be based, and I feel justified in going so far as to say that it was impossible to secure more effectually this essential privilege of our nationality, and at the same time our civil and religious institutions. I was anxious to offer these explanations to the honorable member for Verchères and to the House, and I trust they will completely satisfy the country.

MR. GEOFFRION—The honorable member for Dorchester (Hon. Sol. Gen. LANGEVIN) has explained to us that the intention of the members of the Conference of Quebec was, not only that the French language should be used in the Federal Legislature and the Local Government of Lower Canada, as well as before the tribunals of the country, but that it was to be a right guaranteed to the French population by the Constitution under Confederation. The honorable gentleman has also told us that the word "marriage" inserted in the resolutions does not signify anything else but what he explained to the House in his speech, and that we ought to be happy to see that the representatives of the French population at the Conference had thus secured the safety of their civil and religious institutions. For my part, Mr. SPEAKER, I must say that I cannot bring myself, like the honorable member, to see the splendid protection he vaunts so highly. If the resolutions now before this House have any meaning, that meaning is only to be derived from the strict letter of the resolutions themselves. It will always be optional with the British majority to avail themselves of the letter of the Constitution,

and they may at any time say to us: "You cannot have it, we oppose it, and the Constitution does not confer on you the rights you claim under it." And it will be the more easy for them to do so from the fact that the resolution does not affirm that these matters cannot be disturbed. If the Conference had any other intention than what appears in the resolutions, the House should be made aware of it before being called upon to vote on these resolutions. For if the intention of the Conference was as stated by the Honorable Solicitor General for Lower Canada, and if that intention be carried into effect, the House will run the risk of discovering that on all the other resolutions the intention is different from the letter, and will be in like manner carried out, for the resolutions must be interpreted as they stand, without reference to the intention of the members of the Conference. And for that reason I cannot help declaring that we French-Canadians would be guilty of an act of unpardonable imprudence in adopting a resolution which declares that the Federal Legislature is to have the right of legislating on marriage and divorce, and which merely declares that the French language may be used in the Federal Legislature. We French-Canadian members, I repeat it, ought to insist that the word "shall" be substituted for the word "may" in the resolution relating to this matter, with reference to the publication of the proceedings of the Legislature. If this is not done, and if we do not take every possible precaution, sooner or later the English speaking majority in the Federal Legislature will unite against us on this point, and enact that the laws shall be printed in the English language only. And if we rest satisfied with the understanding referred to by the Honorable Solicitor General for Lower Canada, we shall be told when we exclaim against that injustice: "You should have obtained more full and complete guarantees, and you should have seen that the Constitution was made more explicit and more precise on this point." And we shall have no answer to make. We must perforce be resigned, and put up with all the restrictions the majority may impose upon us. I maintain, therefore, that it is the duty of the French-Canadian members of this House to induce the Government to embody the understanding arrived at amongst the members of the Conference in the Constitution, and to require that the guarantees said to be afforded to us by the Constitution shall be more clearly expressed than they are in the resolutions. If we vote

these resolutions as they are, we shall vote without knowing exactly the nature of the guarantees they afford us. (Cheers.)

MR. RÉMILLARD said—MR. SPEAKER, the question of a Federal union of the British North American Provinces is one of such importance, that at the present time it is engaging the attention, not only of this honorable House, but also of the whole political world. I consider, therefore, that it is the duty of those to whom it is submitted to express, each in his own way, the reasons which induce them to adopt or reject the union in question. When for the first time, in the year 1861, the county of Bellechasse did me the honor to send me here as its representative, I had not the slightest idea that I should be called upon, in the beginning of 1865, to take part in the discussion of such a measure, upon which, in my opinion, our whole future depends. So rapid, however, is the growth of events in this age of progress of every kind, that there is no reason to be surprised that we are to-day called upon to grapple with the subject of the political position of our youthful country. I am prepared at once to acknowledge, MR. SPEAKER, that that position has not for several years past appeared to me to be an enviable one; and in fact what has the political aspect been? Within the precincts of this House we have looked upon scenes that are to be regretted and that were of frequent occurrence. We have looked upon bitter and incessant strife between our public men on the subject of certain sectional difficulties, which should be settled in a friendly way, if it is our wish at a later period to avoid serious troubles. We have seen Ministries succeed each other at intervals of hardly six months—Ministries which were daily accused, and in many cases with good reason, of having been guilty of acts of corruption in order to prolong their feeble existence. Without these precincts we have seen public journals filled with personal attacks and insults of every kind, general elections every year, carried in many counties by means of fraud, and the fomenting of wretched prejudices. (Hear, hear.) To such a degree had this been carried, that the people had come to consider it a highly meritorious action to calumniate a member or a candidate, and to deprive him of that good character which he had, in some cases, acquired by many and great sacrifices. (Hear, hear.) Honest men can experience

no feeling other than disgust at such a political course, which is inimical to every feeling of patriotism, and is fraught with danger to our institutions. The Canadian people, by nature brave, intelligent and courageous, are called upon to play a more noble and a more worthy part than that. Upon our statesmen, let them belong to what party they may, it devolves to provide them with a career which is suitable to them, without taking into consideration either prejudices or opinions expressed at another period and under other circumstances. (Hear, hear.) We French-Canadians especially, if we are desirous of continuing to enjoy, in the midst of the various races who inhabit this vast continent of America, the institutions which have been so carefully preserved for us, and which are more precious to us than life itself, require to seek an alliance with the inhabitants of the other British American Provinces, with which we have interests in common, which will have, in case of invasion, the same enemies as ourselves to repulse, and which, like ourselves, enjoy the advantage of living under the protection of Great Britain. At a time when we are, so to speak, threatened by the United States, ought we to be so foolish as to disregard the advice which comes to us from Great Britain, without whom we could do nothing for our defence, and to pretend seriously that we can without danger overthrow the Federal union which we are discussing, in the preparation of which our statesmen themselves prescribed the conditions which they considered to be most equitable and the best calculated to preserve the interests which are most dear to all? Should we act in this way, we should be forming a very incorrect estimate of our position in relation to England, and our formidable neighbours the United States. The distinguished men who took part in the Conference held at Quebec in the month of October last, unanimously declared that "the best interests and present and future prosperity of British North America will be promoted by a Federal union under the Crown of Great Britain, provided such union can be effected on principles just to the several provinces." The most eminent men in England have repeated the same thing, and have approved of the scheme of the Conference. I do not propose, MR. SPEAKER, to discuss the several articles contained in the plan of union; the honorable members who have preceded me

in this debate have, in my opinion, said all that can be said on each of the articles. Moreover, the erudite and carefully-weighed papers on the subject which have been published in this city in the *Journal de Québec* and the *Courrier du Canada* have contributed to diffusing a knowledge of the scheme in no less degree than the numerous speeches which have been delivered in this House. Despite the good opinion which I have of some of the honorable members who have endeavored to prove to this House and to the country that the proposed union would be more disastrous than advantageous in its results to the several provinces affected by it, I must acknowledge that their arguments have not convinced me—I will even say did not appear to me to be convincing. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member for Lotbinière for example, in whom, as he is aware, I have confidence, and from whom I greatly regret to differ in opinion on a measure of such importance, is opposed to any alteration in our present Constitution. He finds that everything has been for the best. The following is what he said in his eloquent speech :—

Let us not be dazzled by the ambition of becoming, all at once, a great people. The United States are a great people, but what people, however small it may be, is there which now envies their greatness? Let us be satisfied with our lot; few people have a better.

I agree with my honorable friend to a certain extent. Like him, I do not envy the lot of the United States, but I disagree with him as to the means to be taken to protect us against our adversaries, even against the United States, and to preserve our nationality. The honorable member, to prove that the union proposed would be an evil, quoted to us the following extract from Lord BROUGHAM's work on *Political Philosophy* :

The Federal union, by keeping up a line of separation between its members, gives the freest scope to these pernicious prejudices, feelings which it is the highest duty of all governments to eradicate, because they lead directly to confusion and war.

I may mistake, but it appears to me that this extract from Lord BROUGHAM's work is not so much opposed to a Federal union, such as that which is proposed to us, as it is to the existing situation of the French-Canadians. In fact there is a strong line of demarcation in this province between the inhabitants of Upper Canada and those of Lower Canada; it is that very line of

demarcation which has given rise to the sectional difficulties which our statesmen have undertaken to settle in a friendly way. The leaders of the Opposition themselves undertook to settle these difficulties in a manner much less advantageous to Lower Canada. If then the opinion of Lord BROUGHAM is to be an authority in this case, it would be the duty of the Government of this province to remove the line of demarcation to which I have alluded as existing between the inhabitants of Upper Canada and those of Lower Canada. This, I am satisfied, is not what my honorable friend desires. (Hear, hear.) When speaking of the seven United Provinces (now Holland and Belgium), the hon. member for Lotbinière read the following extract from the first volume of Lord MACAULAY's *History of England* :—

The union of Utrecht, rudely formed amidst the agonies of a revolution, for the purpose of meeting immediate exigencies, had never been deliberately revised and perfected in a time of tranquillity. Every one of the seven commonwealths which that union had bound together retained almost all the rights of sovereignty, and asserted those rights punctiliously against the Central Government.

This is all that the honorable member quoted from Lord MACAULAY. As may be seen, Mr. SPEAKER, this author is not opposed to a Federal union; he simply points out the defects of the union of Utrecht. That union had been rudely formed, in the midst of a revolution, for the purpose of meeting immediate exigencies. But our plan of union was weighed with deliberation, in a time of tranquillity, and this tranquillity is certainly the result of the formation of the present Coalition Government. Therefore, the author who has been quoted merely demonstrates one thing, and that is, that we should be wrong to await the convulsions of a revolution, or of an invasion, in order to discuss the bases of a Federal union. (Hear, hear.) The honorable member for Lotbinière gave us to understand that the most certain method of obtaining the friendship of the Maritime Provinces, and of securing their sympathy and zeal in case of attack, was, so to speak, to have nothing in common with those provinces. I believe, on the contrary, that Lower Canada would gain by causing herself to be better known, and by causing the spirit of justice and of liberality which prevails among her inhabitants and her institutions, as they at present exist, to be

better known. Does not the best understanding exist between the people of different origins in all classes of society? We every day perceive with pleasure, and I am happy to say it, that Lower Canada has risen greatly in the estimation of hon. members from Upper Canada, since it has been their lot to reside in our midst, and to see for themselves what our institutions are, and what we are ourselves. (Hear.) I hope that my honorable friend the member for Lotbinière will forgive me if I take the liberty of discussing, for a few seconds longer, certain portions of his speech; but I am very anxious to convince him that I listened to him with great attention, and that if he did not succeed in convincing me, it was from no fault of mine. To set us on our guard against the proposed union, the hon. member laid before us a hasty sketch of the history of Ancient Greece, in order to shew us the hatred which the Athenians bore to the Spartans. No doubt he fears that that hatred, should the union be consummated, will manifest itself between the inhabitants of Lower Canada and the inhabitants of Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island. He also took us a long journey through various countries, in which he pointed out to us frequent insurrections, *échauffourées* and troubles of all kinds among people living under a system of Federal union, and therefrom he drew the conclusion that Federal unions are bad and pernicious. But did the honorable member shew us that the political condition of those nations, previous to their Federative union, was analogous to ours? Did he shew us that the basis of those Federal unions was similar to the basis of that which we propose to establish? Did those unions cause those nations to pass from a state of prosperity, tranquillity, and happiness, to the state in which they have been held up to our view? Were they situated as we are? Had they the same proclivities, the same tastes, and the same antecedents as we have? Did they, as we do, trace their descent from the two wisest, the two greatest nations in the world? Lastly, had they, as we have, the Crown of England to protect them? No! they were not possessed of any of the advantages of which we are possessed, and no comparison between the two cases was possible. (Hear hear.) Besides, Mr. SPEAKER, is it not sufficient to cast a glance at the history of all countries, to perceive that everywhere, under all possible institutions, there have arisen, not

only *échauffourées*, but even frequent wars and sanguinary revolutions, characterized by the greatest horrors? Have not the institutions of England and France been consecrated in rivers of blood? All these arguments and reasonings adduced by the honorable member for Lotbinière are therefore not applicable to the question which is submitted to us, and are not of a nature to change the opinions of those who are in favor of a Federal union of all the British North American Provinces. (Hear, hear.) I now return to certain objections offered by other honorable members of the Opposition to the present scheme of the Government. Thus, they spoke to us of divorce, and tried to show us that great inconvenience would result from leaving to the Federal Parliament the right of legislating on that subject. But they do not remark that by this means the members from Lower Canada, that is to say, in the Local Legislature, will be exonerated from taking those questions into consideration. At the present day, all the Catholic members from Lower Canada are opposed to divorce as a matter of expediency and of conscience, and yet, even in the existing Legislature, they cannot prevent it. Why, therefore, blame the Government for not having prevented in the Federal Parliament that which they cannot even prevent here?

HON. MR. LAFRAMBOISE—They could prevent divorces in Lower Canada.

MR. RÉMILLARD—Has it ever been very easy to impose in Lower Canada laws upon the English inhabitants of that province, and to prevent them from obtaining what they consider as a right? No; it would have been an act of injustice to endeavor to force our opinions on this subject on the English and Protestant population of Lower Canada; and if an attempt had been made to do so, Confederation would probably have failed, because the majority of the members of the Conference would have maintained their claims, and this would have been sufficient to prevent Confederation. (Hear, hear.) It is not to be urged as a crime against the Government that they have permitted the Federal Legislature to have the power of legislating upon subjects upon which we ourselves may legislate. For my part, Mr. SPEAKER, I did not enter upon this question in order to judge the scheme of Confederation. I have sufficient confidence in the clergy to admit that on this question they

are the best judges, and it is they who ought to decide whether there is danger or not; and there can be no doubt but that the bishops and the clergy have consulted together respecting this article, and that they came to the conclusion that it is an evil which there are no means of preventing. The honorable member for Verchères (Mr. GEOFFRION) maintained that it was necessary to state clearly in the resolutions what were the intentions of the members of the Conference in relation to marriage and divorce, in order that the Imperial Government may not impose upon us a Constitution other than that for which we ask. Now, I have more confidence than he has in the word of our public men, and in the sense of justice of the Imperial Government. Our public men having made a compromise, and asked a Constitution for the British North American Provinces, which is to do away with the difficulties which exist in the province, are we for a single instant to believe that when this scheme, which is framed to reestablish that peace, harmony and concord of which we stand in need, is carried to England that a clause will be inserted which would raise the Lower-Canadians like one man? In such a case we should see petitions pour into the House headed with the signatures of the principal members of the clergy, exclaiming against such injustice; in such a case we should see real petitions against this attack upon our religious rights. If our institutions should be so menaced, the Lower Canadian people would do themselves justice, if it was refused to them, and we should no longer enjoy that peace which now prevails in Canada between populations of different origins and belief, in consequence of the absence of disquietude among the people—(hear, hear)—I have confidence enough in the clergy and bishops of Lower Canada to believe that if that clause, on which so much stress is laid, was of a nature to do any injury to our religious interests, they would loudly exclaim against it and have justice done us. Our bishops are not in the habit of standing in fear of the civil authorities, when their duty calls them to defend the interests which are entrusted to them. (Hear, hear.) It is stated also that the clergy are not in favor of the scheme of Confederation, because two or three of its members have written in newspapers and have signed petitions opposed to the scheme. But is that a manifestation of the opinion of

the clergy? No; for they do not write in the name of the clergy, but simply in their individual capacity as citizens; for they sign their writings under their title as citizens. Certain members of the clergy may differ widely in opinion from the remainder of their brethren; as citizens they may believe that the scheme of Confederation is a bad one, but those who hold that opinion are certainly a minority, just as in the House it is the minority of the members who are opposed to Confederation. (Hear, hear.) Mention is also made of the use of the French language; it is said that it cannot be used in the Federal Parliament. But, for my part, I am of opinion that if the scheme is adopted, the French language will be more used and will be held in higher estimation in the Federal Parliament, than it has been in this Legislature for some years. It is feared that the laws, the documents and the proceedings of the Federal Parliament are not to be printed in the French language. But what does the 46th clause of the resolutions say? It says:—

Both the English and French languages may be employed in the General Parliament, and in its proceedings, and in the Local Legislature of Lower Canada, and also in the Federal courts, and in the courts of Lower Canada.

Thus, if the use of the French language can be excluded, so also may the use of the English language be excluded, for both are on an equal footing. Because it is not stated that the laws and the proceedings of the Federal Parliament shall be printed in the French language, the conclusion is drawn that they will be so in English; but the same thing might be said of the English language, as it is not stated that they will be printed in that language. The honorable member for Verchères (Mr. GEOFFRION) would have something more; instead of the resolutions setting forth that the French language may be used, he would have them declare that it shall be used; in that case the members from Lower Canada might be compelled to speak French; but are the Upper Canadian members also to be forced to speak that language, they who do not understand a word of it? I should be with the honorable member for Verchères if we could compel Lower Canadian members to speak French, and Upper Canadian members to speak English, as in that case each would learn the language of the other. I am really of opinion that if the Hon. Attorney General

for Lower Canada had never spoken anything but French in this House, the members from Upper Canada would have learned that language in order to understand him; but as he wishes to make them understand him without putting them to that trouble, he most frequently speaks English. (Hear, hear.) It is said that in the resolutions the guarantees which we seek to have for our language, our laws and our institutions are not clearly enough expressed, and that the Imperial Government might, consequently, confer upon us something other than that for which we ask. But could not the Imperial Government impose Confederation upon us as it did the union? And as it does not do so, but is merely desirous of being consulted, we ought not to believe that it will impose upon us conditions which are opposed to our interests.

HON. MR. LAFRAMBOISE—It is proposed to impose it on the Lower Provinces, who do not wish for it.

MR. RÉMILLARD—Certain hon. members consider our present position an excellent one, and say they do not wish it altered. But that is not the opinion of the greater number, and nearly all the hon. members of the Opposition have declared that changes are indispensable and necessary. The hon. member for Hochelaga has acknowledged it, and has expressed his opinion on the subject. When I was a supporter of the MACDONALD-DORION Administration, I understood that the members of that Government were of opinion that changes were necessary, and that we could not very long remain in our present position. The hon. member for Hochelaga has admitted that the opinion of Upper Canada must be respected, and that to it would have to be granted representation based on population; and the influence of Upper Canada made itself felt by the MACDONALD-DORION Administration; it made itself felt especially when, just before the last general elections, it became necessary to oust the Honorable Mr. SICOTTE from the Ministry to satisfy Upper Canada. By means of Mr. SICOTTE, elections had been secured sufficiently advantageous in their results to overthrow the CARTIER-MACDONALD Administration, to which I was opposed, because I did not wish to see a coalition between the parties, and because I considered that that Government had made too free a use of the public money. But I foresaw that sooner or later I should return to the

Conservative party, from which I had detached myself in consequence of the extravagant conduct of two or three of its leaders, and in consequence I was then elected without the assistance of any party. Alone I strove with the Conservative party in my county. I was faithful to the friends with whom I went at the time, and I do not regret that I went with them; so long as they stood in need of me, I supported them in order that they might avail themselves of circumstances to bring about a change in the financial affairs of the country. I would not change my party then, but matters and circumstances having changed, I consulted my friends in the county which I represent, and I was then able to go with the men whom I consider able to protect and preserve our institutions and the interests of the country in general. For this reason I am prepared to accept the scheme of Confederation prepared by them, for I have more confidence, as regards the preservation of our rights and our institutions, in the men who are now in power than in those with whom I formerly worked. (Hear, hear.) I cannot do otherwise than declare it. It is not my wish to insult any one; I merely state the reasons which have decided me to go with them; and as I find that it is always necessary to be in favor of one party or the other in this House, that is to say, for that one which is considered to be the best, I do not hesitate to state my opinion and to declare myself in favor of the Conservative party. (Hear, hear.) It was my intention to reply to the speech of the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. PÉBRAULT), but I perceive that my ideas do not flow rapidly, and moreover, I do not wish longer to fatigue the House.

SEVERAL VOICES—Go on! go on!

MR. RÉMILLARD—Well, I listened with pain to the language used by the hon. member for Richelieu. Should what he said in French be repeated by some one in English, I should greatly fear that it would give rise to prejudice against us among the English members. (Hear, hear.) Last year he said to the members from Upper Canada,—“The French-Canadians are learning the use of arms, and if you insist upon having representation based upon population, they will be turned against you;” and this year he says that one Lower Canadian can stand against ten Upper Canadians. He considers himself fortunate in being under

the protection of the English flag, and yet his whole speech was one insult to the English Government. (Hear, hear.) Does he forget, then, that the French-Canadians are in a minority? He talked a great deal about the great men who saved our nationality; but if those men had made use of such language as the hon. member has done, they would not have obtained that which they did obtain. (Hear, hear.) Our nationality would long since have passed away; for, I repeat it, his whole speech was one insult to England and Englishmen. Fortunately his speech was not understood by the English members of this House, and consequently it could produce no effect upon them; and those who did understand him, moreover, are aware that he spoke for himself alone, and that he does not represent the opinions of the Lower Canadian members or of the Lower Canadian people. I am therefore convinced that they will bear no ill-will to the French-Canadians in consequence of that speech. (Hear, hear.) It has been said that the scheme of Confederation would entail the imposition of enormous taxes, and that we should have to provide for the defence of the country. And yet most of the hon. members who oppose this scheme acknowledge that the defence of the country must be provided for, or at least that we must contribute our share to it. Under the present *régime*, the Government has the right of presenting a bill respecting the militia or the defences, and the members may accept it or may reject it if they consider it too burdensome for us; and will the case be different in the Federal Parliament? We shall lose nothing, under Confederation, in respect of defence, for we shall have allies who will assist us in economising and in preventing the adoption of any measure which would be beyond the strength of the country, for the people of the other provinces are no fonder of taxation than are those of Lower Canada. It is perfectly well known that any change in our position would be only to our advantage, under Confederation, in relation to defence; for if the United States should attack the English provinces, they would attack all the provinces together; they would probably begin by attacking Canada, because they think more of Canada than of the Lower Provinces. In case of difficulties arising between England and the United States, the burthen of war would fall upon us, for we should be first attacked.

It is, therefore, our interest to be able to receive aid from the Maritime Provinces, and to be able to convey the reinforcements which they would send us, and which England would send us, by railway. As regards defence, I am of opinion that Lower Canada would be found to occupy the most advantageous position in the Confederacy, being situated in the centre of all the provinces. (Hear, hear.) In a material point of view, we could not but grow and advance. The annexationists of the district of Montreal only are afraid of Confederation. Indeed, all the commercial transactions of the district of Montreal are with the United States. But if we are not desirous of being annexed to the United States, and if we are desirous of preserving the institutions which are so dear to us, I maintain that we must construct a Confederacy which shall be competent to protect us from the United States. If we will do nothing to show England that we are disposed to improve our position in relation to the defence of the British North American Provinces, we expose ourselves to see England withdraw her forces and abandon us, because she cannot, unaided, carry on the strife with the United States. With our help, she would be certain of victory. (Hear, hear.) We ought, therefore, to build up a Constitution which will establish such relations between all the provinces as shall make of them a single state and a single people, who will unite in case of war. We may change our Constitution without altering our institutions, and I maintain that the more monarchical our government is, the safer will our institutions be, for in those institutions the monarchical principle especially predominates. It is in consequence of our having always been at peace that those institutions have grown and prospered. If England should abandon her colonies, the United States would take possession of us, and we should soon disappear, for the American Constitution is not sufficient to protect our institutions. The citizens of the United States would show but little respect for those institutions, and the law would not be powerful enough to prevent the masses from spreading themselves in our midst, and from depriving us of what we hold most dear. (Hear, hear.) In conclusion, I say that I unite with pleasure with the men who are now proposing a scheme which I consider to be of a nature to preserve our institutions, our language, our laws and our

religion, with that great party which possesses the confidence of a large majority of the inhabitants of this country. (Cheers.)

DR. PAQUET — Mr. SPEAKER, although I am not in the habit of addressing the House, and although the question now under consideration has already been discussed at great length, I cannot allow so important an occasion to pass without making known the reasons which induce me to protest against the constitutional changes which are now proposed, and which tend to nothing less than the complete overthrowing of the Constitution under which we have been governed since the union of Upper and Lower Canada. Since the prorogation of Parliament in June last, I have endeavored in vain to explain to myself the advantages which we, Lower Canadians, would derive from Confederation, and I had lost myself in the motives and the object of a union of this kind, when I had the opportunity of reading in the speech of the honorable member for Sherbrooke that "the scheme of Confederation had not been a new question since the days of Lord DURHAM, that only the question of carrying it into effect was wanting." After having read this significant passage, I set myself to work to study and ascertain what were the tendencies and spirit which actuated Lord DURHAM, and more especially, what object he had in view. I did not take long to convince myself, as any Lower Canadian member may do on reading his celebrated report, that everything he had in view was calculated to secure our annihilation as French-Canadians, and that he desired neither more nor less than to subject us to a ruling power exclusively English. When we see, Mr. SPEAKER, the hon. members from Upper Canada rejoicing over such a scheme, and declaring themselves so much the more satisfied from the fact that they would obtain, by this fine stroke of policy, more than they had at first hoped for, when the honorable member for Lambton (Mr. A. MACKENZIE), whilst avowing, as he has always done, that his views are but incompletely expressed in the language which I am about to read, there is reason for some little alarm. This is what that honorable gentleman said in the House the other night:—

I believe then, sir, in the first place, that Confederation is desirable; in the second, that it is attainable; and in the third place, that it is the best thing we can get, and this last is perhaps the strongest reason of all for accepting it. It is quite clear that we must have a settlement of our difficulties in some way, and I think the scheme

proposed is a very favorable settlement of them. I think it is more than, perhaps, some of us expected, at the time when the present Government was formed, to bring about a settlement, and I do think, sir, it would be the greatest act of madness that western members of this House could perpetrate, to vote against it. (Hear, hear.) I am not, however, afraid that it will be voted against by them. I believe that under it we have obtained representation by population, that we have obtained what we have long contended was justly due to us, that we have obtained our legitimate influence in framing the financial policy of the country, and that beyond this we have obtained the prospect of building up a great British union on this continent. We should therefore, I think, in view of these great advantages, overlook those objections which may be regarded as antecedent to the scheme, and endeavor heartily to carry out the work successfully. I shall willingly yield my support to the scheme, and I believe it will be acceptable to the people I represent—not only to the people of the locality, but to those who surround me in Upper Canada.

If Mr. SPEAKER, honorable gentlemen from Upper Canada are permitted to give utterance to such opinions as these, I hope that my fellow-countrymen from Lower Canada will permit me to vindicate their rights. (Hear, hear.) But let us proceed to examine this Confederation, to which the practical question is alone wanting. I read from the report of Lord DURHAM:—

I entertain no doubts as to the national character which must be given to Lower Canada; it must be that of the British Empire; that of the majority of the population of British America; that of the great race which must, in the lapse of no long period of time, be predominant over the whole North American continent. Without effecting the change so rapidly or roughly as to shock the feelings and trample on the welfare of the existing generation, it must henceforth be the first and steady purpose of the British Government to establish an English population, with English laws and language, in this province, and to trust its government to none but a decidedly English legislature.

A little further on in the same report, I read as follows:—

If the population of Upper Canada is rightly estimated at 400,000, the English inhabitants of Lower Canada at 150,000 and the French at 450,000, the union of the two provinces will not only give a clear English majority, but one which would be increased every year by the influence of English emigration; and I have no doubt that the French, when once placed, by the legitimate course of events and the working of natural causes, in a minority, would abandon their vain hopes of nationality. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. CAUCHON—He was in error. That all related to the Union Act and to nothing else.

MR. PAQUET—Yes; it had reference to the beginning of the end. (Hear, hear.) A little further on I read as follows:—

A general Legislative union would elevate and gratify the hopes of able and aspiring men. They would no longer look with envy and wonder at the great arena of the bordering Federation, but see the means of satisfying every legitimate ambition in the high offices of the judicature and executive government of their own union.

Again I find the following passage:—

But even in the administration of justice, an union would immediately supply a remedy for one of the most serious wants under which the provinces labor, by facilitating the formation of a general appellate tribunal for all the North American colonies.

And again:—

The completion of any satisfactory communication between Halifax and Quebec would, in fact, produce relations between these provinces that would render a general union absolutely necessary. Several surveys have proved that a railroad would be perfectly practicable the whole way.

And thus we come to the Intercolonial Railway; and it is easy to perceive that Lord DURHAM, from the beginning to the end of his report, preaches in favor of the very Confederation which we are about to have imposed upon us. Even before Lord DURHAM, Judge SEWELL, in 1814, had expressed opinions nearly similar to those of the noble lord, and in 1839 the whole of the present plan of Confederation was traced out. The honorable member for Montmorency pretends that Lord DURHAM was mistaken; but for my part I find, in addition to the other causes of reproach which have been accumulated against the members of the Conference, we may urge this, that they did not give Lord DURHAM credit for the work he had already done, and that they did not endorse upon the scheme of Confederation now laid before us the words "True copy of the scheme of Lord DURHAM as set forth in his report to the British Government." (Hear, hear.) French-Canadian nationality has been talked about. Lord DURHAM speaks of it in his report in the following terms: "The error of Lower Canada consists especially in that vain attempt to preserve a French-Canadian nationality in the midst of Anglo-American states and colonies." When is the imposition of a new nationality

spoken of, if not at the time when it is sought to snatch from a people that which it already possesses? There will be opposition, I trust; for otherwise, Mr. SPEAKER, I cannot comprehend the logic of honorable members who emphatically declare that they will stand by it at any risk. I am well aware that the nationality of a people cannot be changed by a mere act of the Legislature; but why should obstacles be placed in our path, why should we submit to the yoke of the oppressor, when there is no legitimate ground for imposing it upon us? Another reason which gives me good ground for hoping that the work of destruction will not be accomplished in a hurry, as desired by the honorable members of the Administration, is that it is a difficult matter to ostracise a people which numbers more than a million. The example of Belgium suffices to prove it to us, and also that of Greece, which, after three centuries of tyranny and oppression, stood up manfully and exclaimed, "We are still Greeks." I am confident, then, that following their example, in defiance of all the constitutions that may be framed for us, and of all the vexations to which we may have to submit, we also shall come out triumphant from our trials, exclaiming, "We are still French-Canadians." (Hear, hear.) The honorable members of the Government, and especially those from Lower Canada, ought not to forget, either in our interest or in their own, that a generation which detaches itself from the generations which preceded it runs the risk of being repudiated by the generations which come after; that social existence is not concentrated in a single period, that it influences the future. These honorable gentlemen would do well to reflect on this before imposing upon us the practical question of Lord DURHAM. Passing now, Mr. SPEAKER, to the financial question, I regret that I cannot agree in the views expressed by the honorable member for Dorchester (the Honorable Solicitor General for Lower Canada), who claims to have expressed an official opinion on this head. Although he has affirmed that he drew them from authentic sources, the results which he has obtained from his calculations differ from those which I have obtained, founded upon the figures which he has made use of to establish his proposition. He has declared that we shall have a surplus of \$200,000.

MR. ERIC DORION—And he added that we should be in a position to lend the amount.

MR. PAQUET—I shall now submit to this honorable House a statement of the expenditure which will be incurred by the Government of Lower Canada :—

Administration of justice.....	\$364,785
Deducting the salaries of the judges..	50,000
	\$314,785
Education.....	254,000
Scientific institutions.....	5,900
Hospitals and charities.....	124,949
Board of Arts and Manufactures.....	3,500
Agriculture.....	50,000
Repairs and public buildings.....	15,000
Colonization and roads.....	113,000
Timber cutters.....	35,000
Office and other contingencies.....	77,000
Public works.....	30,000
Slides.....	15,000
Surveys.....	30,000
Court houses and gaols.....	10,500
Rent of site of Parliament house....	4,444
Legislation.....	200,000
Executive Government.....	100,000
Public departments.....	100,000
Public lands.....	37,000
Publication of the laws.....	20,000
Elections.....	15,000
River police.....	30,000
Unforeseen expenditure.....	10,000
Interest on the Federal debt, share of Lower Canada.....	300,000
Total expenditure.....	\$1,885,078
Local revenue estimated at about....	1,400,000
Deficit.....	\$485,078

These figures are taken from the Public Accounts for last year. Subtracting from that sum the estimated amount of the revenue of the Local Government, instead of a surplus there will be a deficit of \$485,088; and I ask you, Mr. SPEAKER, how are we to meet it otherwise than by direct taxation, or by diminishing the public appropriations, which are by no means excessive now? (Hear, hear.) If we do not adopt the latter alternative, there will remain, I say, no other means than direct taxation. The Hon. Minister of Finance, moreover, told us so expressly, in these words :—

The Federal Legislature will have power to impose any system of duties which they may think proper to meet the expenses of its administration, whilst the local legislatures will be obliged to have recourse to direct taxation for the same purpose, if their revenues prove insufficient.

For my part, Mr. SPEAKER, I affirm that

the country is not ready to submit to such a state of things, and in this matter, as also upon the scheme itself, I am quite certain that I express the opinion of my county. (Hear, hear.) A third point, which I would humbly submit for the consideration of the House, is the expediency of pressing for the adoption of this measure before an appeal has been had to the people. I believe and I hope that the House will have too much respect for itself and for the people to vote at once upon the resolutions now submitted to us. If, however, public opinion is not to be regarded, I flatter myself that at all events precedents will not be treated with contempt. We find in the *History of Canada*, by CHRISTIE, that in 1823, when a proposition was made in the Lower Canadian Parliament to effect changes in the Constitution, the following decision was come to by the Government of Lower Canada, and the paragraph I am about to read formed part of the Speech from the Throne :—

I am commanded to inform you that His Majesty's Ministers proposed to Parliament certain alterations in the act thirty-first George the Third, [chapter thirty-one, principally with a view to unite into one the two legislatures of Upper and Lower Canada; but the measure was withdrawn and postponed to the next session, in order to afford an opportunity of ascertaining the sentiments of the people of those provinces upon it.

(Hear, hear.) In the same history we find another example, which will, I believe, strongly support me in the position I have taken :—

In 1839 Lord JOHN RUSSELL gave notice in the House of Commons, on the 3rd June, of certain resolutions which he intended to submit relating to the projected union of the Canadas. He was, however, induced, on the suggestion of Sir ROBERT PEEL, to waive them, and at once to introduce his bill for the purpose. In doing which he stated it to be his intention to carry it only through a second reading, in order that it might undergo discussion, but that having received a strong protest, on the part of Upper Canada, against the intended union, he did not deem it advisable to legislate that session finally on the subject.

Here we have another fact which proves that in England, in 1839, the measure was opposed at its second reading, and that a year was given to the Canadian people to reflect upon the merits of the proposed union of the two Canadas. (Hear, hear.) I trust then, Mr. SPEAKER, that what was done in 1839 will again be done in relation to the

project of Confederation. For those reasons I am of opinion that the Government ought not, in the first place, to humiliate us by taking from us the privileges to which we are entitled, then ruin us by a scheme which must triple the expenditure, and lastly, fail in the respect which they owe to the people, by refusing to consult them before changing the Constitution. If I am not greatly mistaken, the party which is seeking these constitutional changes is the very party which calls itself Conservative, who obtained their elections to preserve and guard the Constitution, and which has always opposed us because, it exclaimed, we were the allies of the hon. member for South Oxford (Hon. Mr. BROWN), to whom, said they, we were ready to concede representation by population, the powerful lever which was to endanger all our civil and religious institutions. Well, what do these hon. gentlemen do to-day? Instead of preserving the Constitution, they change it and indeed destroy it, by granting to Upper Canada preponderance in the representation. I prove this by citing the following extract from the speech of the Hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. GALT):—

Now it became necessary to introduce into the constitution of the Lower House the principle of representation proportioned to population; for without that, Upper Canada, who has so long demanded this reform, would never have consented to enter into the Confederation.

If Upper Canada would never have consented to enter into the Confederation without representation by population, then she has obtained it, as she has consented to enter the Confederation; and why say that that measure has not been conceded? In conclusion, I affirm that the proposed Confederation of the provinces is only a Legislative union in disguise, and I will cite the language made use of a short time ago by a man well known throughout the country for his talents and his eloquence, at a meeting, held in the city of Montreal, to condemn the Ministerial scheme, that the present Confederation is but the chrysalis of a Legislative union, and that the butterfly would not be long in making its appearance. (Cheers.)

MR. O'HALLORAN—Before proceeding, Mr. SPEAKER, to offer a few observations on the resolutions in your hands, I may say that if I had any hesitation in pronouncing on the merits of this scheme, I might have taken a preliminary exception to the jurisdiction of this House to pass this measure. You,

sir, and I were sent here to make laws, not legislatures. (Hear, hear.) We were sent here to work out the Constitution of this country—not to undermine and destroy it. There is not an elector from Gaspé to Sarnia, however humble he may be, who has not just as much right to pronounce upon this question as you and I have. Therefore, if it were my wish to shirk this question, which it is not, I could justify myself by saying it was no part of my mandate, or of the compact between me and those who sent me here. When we assume the power to deal with this question, to change the whole system of Government, to effect a revolution, peaceful though it be, without reference to the will of the people of this country, we arrogate to ourselves a right never conferred upon us, and our act is a usurpation. But I rise not for the purpose of discussing this scheme in detail, as it has already been discussed so fully—and I cannot possibly say much which may not already in substance have been said, and much better said than I could expect to say it—but I rise to record my protest against the usurpation which this House, in my humble opinion, is guilty of in undertaking to pass this measure, or, so far as in its power lies, to impose upon the people of this country a Constitution contrary to their wishes—a Constitution which they will never have an opportunity of seeing, until they are called upon to submit to it and obey it. I rise to protest also against this parliamentary gag by which the attempt is made to suppress free discussion in this House, and to compel it to adopt against its will, or against its reason and judgment, a measure with which, perhaps, a very large number of the honorable members of this House have no real sympathy. It is no answer to me to say that I may express my views freely—that I may fully discuss this question. It is no answer to say that I have the privilege of pointing out the defects of this measure, if I am denied the privilege of obtaining the sense of this House, and of putting on record what I may consider its objectionable features—if I am denied the right of submitting to the House substantive motions and resolutions, which might perhaps meet the sense of the majority of this House, and which at all events would afford to the people of this country the opportunity of knowing the views of the honorable members of this House upon possible amendments which might be proposed to this measure. At an early period of this session, I gave notice

of substantive resolutions which, however little they might have met the sense of the majority of this House, express the views of a large majority of my constituents. It would interest them to see how far those views met the approbation of the representatives of the people here; it would interest them to know how far honorable gentlemen from Upper Canada are prepared to go to insure to the English speaking minority of Lower Canada those rights and liberties which they claim for themselves; it would afford us some criterion by which we might measure the degree of protection we should find in the Federal Parliament, from possible oppression in our Local Parliament. For if honorable gentlemen from Upper Canada, on the floor of this House, will not hear us to-day, if they manifest an indifference to the injustice about to be inflicted upon the English speaking inhabitants of Lower Canada by the proposed Constitution, what guarantee have we that similar selfishness may not mark their conduct after we shall be powerless to rebuke it? I will read those resolutions which I had designed to propose, for the purpose of obtaining the opinion of the House on a modification of this measure, which, if it must be adopted, might possibly have been so amended as to remove many serious objections now entertained to it by a large portion of the people of Lower Canada. They are in these words:—

Resolved, That assuming the Federal system of government to be a political necessity in a union of the British North American provinces, any Confederation of those provinces which ignores the difference of race, language and religion of the inhabitants of the respective states or territories sought to be thus united, and is not framed with a view to secure to the inhabitants of each such state or territory the management of their own local affairs, in accordance with their own peculiar views and sentiments, is unwise and inexpedient, and not conducive to good government, or to the peace and tranquillity of those for whom it is framed.

This resolution I put forth simply for the sake of shewing the idea which I had in my mind, without, I am free to confess, any expectation that the particular modification which I was about to propose would meet the sense of the majority of this House, but as giving an indication of the direction in which the English-speaking inhabitants of Lower Canada would consider that their interests might be best preserved. The second resolution I designed to propose is as follows:—

Resolved, That with a view to secure to that

portion of the inhabitants of Lower Canada speaking the English language, the free exercise and enjoyment of their own ideas, institutions and rights, in any proposed Confederation of the provinces, Canada should be divided into three civil divisions, to wit: Western, Central, and Eastern Canada.

Why is it that objection is made to a legislative union? The reason why so large a portion of the people of Lower Canada of French origin will not consent to a legislative union, is the very reason that makes it desirable to the English speaking population of Lower Canada. We are in favor of a legislative union. We desire that Canada should be a united people, ignoring sectionalism, and basing our institutions upon one broad principle of Canadian nationality, which shall blend all races, and in time obliterate all accidental distinctions of language, religion, or origin. Our French-Canadian fellow-subjects will not consent to this. If they will not hear our arguments, let them listen to their own. If Federalism is necessary for the protection of their rights, it is necessary in a tenfold degree for the protection of the rights of the English speaking minority. They tell us we may rely upon their well-known liberality and toleration. We cannot consent to hold our liberties by mere sufferance, when we are entitled to hold them by right. It would be unworthy of us to submit to such humiliation. In these remarks which are forced from me, and which I am compelled to make in defence of the rights and liberties of those who sent me here, I mean no disrespect to those of another origin—to the French-Canadian honorable gentlemen whom I see around me. (Hear, hear.) In many respects I sympathise with them, and have always sympathised with them. I desire to live among my French-Canadian fellow-subjects in peace. I desire to maintain those amicable relations which have always subsisted between the English-speaking and the French-Canadian populations of Lower Canada. As I said before, I sympathise with my French-Canadian fellow-subjects in many respects. I respect their character, I admire their laws. But this antagonism is not courted by me. It is forced upon me. Let me call the attention of honorable gentlemen, more especially of those from Upper Canada, to the position in which this proposed Constitution now before the House would place the English-speaking people of Lower Canada. I may say at the outset, that although they number only one-fourth of the population, they possess at least one-third of the property,

and pay one-half of the taxes. The French-Canadian differs very materially in many respects from the Englishman, or the Anglo-Saxon. He is more simple in his habits, more frugal in his mode of life, and less disposed to novelty. He is content to ride in a carriage of the same fashion as that of his grandfather. He is wedded to his institutions, his old customs, and old laws. It is different with the English-speaking people. They are, as a people, more extravagant, more eager for novelty, and in many other respects widely different from the French-Canadians in their tastes and habits. Of course a comparison would be invidious, and I do not desire to institute one. But I am not at liberty to ignore the facts. Let us see how, under this proposed Constitution, the English-speaking people would be placed in reference to their peculiar interests and their peculiar ideas. In the first place, I would desire to direct your attention to the 14th resolution, by which it is provided how, especially after the local governments are established, the Legislative Council of the General Government is to be constituted—by its members being appointed by the Federal Government on the nomination of the respective local governments. We must bear in mind that in this Local Legislature which will be imposed on Lower Canada, the English element will not certainly be more than one-fifth in number. Under these circumstances, and under the peculiar provisions with reference to the powers granted to the local governments, by which the legislative councillors are to be appointed by the General Government on the recommendation of the local governments, and in the case of Lower Canada, when its Local Government will be four-fifths French-Canadian and only one-fifth of English origin, think you how many English members from Lower Canada would ever find their way to the Legislative Council? How would it be possible, when the Legislative Council is to be appointed on the recommendation of the Local Government, and that Local Government four-fifths French-Canadian, for the English element to obtain fair representation in the Legislative Council? When, I say, would an English-speaking inhabitant of Lower Canada ever receive such a recommendation, unless he approved himself more French than English? (Hear, hear.) Again, by the 23rd resolution, it is provided that "the Legislature of each province shall divide such province into the proper number of constituencies, and define the boundaries of each of

them." How easy would it be, under the provisions of that clause, for the Local Legislature to snuff out one-half of the English constituencies in Lower Canada. They might arrange their bounds in such a manner that the English-speaking element would be confined within very narrow limits. There would be a few constituencies left entirely English, but the English population would thus be deprived of the influence which their numbers and wealth should give them in the Local Legislature. (Hear, hear.) Again, the Local Legislature will have power to alter or amend their Constitution from time to time. We to-day may frame a Constitution—the English-speaking majority in this House may frame a Constitution which would give proper protection to the English-speaking population of Lower Canada. But, by this scheme it will be in the power of the local legislatures to change that, and to modify it so as to suit it to the wishes or prejudices of the French majority. We would be powerless, after we leave these halls, any longer to conserve our rights, and the privileges which this Parliament might give us may be taken away at the very first session of the Local Legislature. Then look at the powers which, under this Constitution, are conferred on the Local Government. The first I find is the power of direct taxation. In the case of all governments, the power of taxation is the most important power they can possess. It is that which concerns all portions and all classes of the community, and which gives rise to the greatest controversy, and the greatest amount of difficulty. It is the most important of all legislative powers, and this power is to be conferred on the Local Legislature of a province, where one nationality has four-fifths of the numbers, and the other nationality contributes one-half of the taxes. Then the Local Legislature is to have the control of immigration—a very important subject, which deeply interests the English-speaking population of Lower Canada—but they would have no voice in framing the measures which might be adopted for directing and controlling that important matter. Then the Local Legislature is to have the control of education. And what subject can there be of greater importance? And what subject is there which might be a source of greater strife between the two nationalities, which by this provision would be brought into antagonism? Even under our present system, with sixty-five Upper Canadian English-speaking members, who would naturally

be expected to sympathise with the English-speaking people of Lower Canada, it is a crying grievance with the latter that they cannot get such legislation on the subject of education as they desire. What, then, would they have to expect if they went into a Legislature where four-fifths of the representatives were of a different nationality and a different religion, and whose prejudices and interests were in opposition to the claims of the one-fifth minority? (Hear, hear.) Then the Local Legislature is to have control of "the establishment, maintenance and management of hospitals, asylums, charities, and eleemosynary institutions." Now it is a positive fact, as I have stated before, that the English-speaking population of Lower Canada, on account of their wealth and expensive mode of living, their extravagant habits, their desire for change and progress, their different ideas generally from the French-Canadians, consume more than one-half of the dutiable goods that are brought into this country, and pay one-half of the taxes; and yet the money which they would pay into the public chest would be distributed by a majority over whom they had no control—a majority who would not in any manner sympathise with them; and their taxes would be applied to objects which they might not deem desirable—which they might, perhaps, consider detrimental to their interests. And they would be completely without remedy, should this proposed Constitution unfortunately be imposed upon them. (Hear, hear.) It is painful to me to be compelled to refer to these matters. It is not with pleasure that I bring before the House the antagonism which would inevitably arise between the two nationalities, should they be brought together into one Legislature, with such a vast disproportion between their means of taking their own part. We are told, and told very truly—I rejoice that it is the fact—that hitherto the two races in Lower Canada have lived in peace. But it would be impossible that they could any longer live in peace; it would be impossible that with such a disparity of numbers, and with such antagonistic interests they should not come into conflict. It would be a constant warfare, and this new Constitution, instead of settling the sectional difficulties in this country, instead of bringing peace to this country, instead of removing jealousies and heart-burnings, would have the very opposite effect. From the fact that the

field of conflict would be smaller, that the arena would be more circumscribed, the strife would be all the fiercer. You are not bringing peace, but a sword. (Hear, hear.)

MR. POWELL.—Does the leader of the Opposition in Lower Canada assent to that? (Hear, hear.)

MR. O'HALLORAN.—It is not my province to inquire what any hon. gentleman assents to or dissents from. What I have to do is to see that the interests of those who sent me here are not put in jeopardy. And it will be for the leader of the Opposition to see that he too, on his part, faithfully discharges his duty to those he represents. But, sir, the English-speaking people of Lower Canada are to be amused, and their attention is to be diverted from a full examination of those serious matters which press themselves upon our consideration, by cleverly drawn abstractions and sophistries, such as new nationalities—union is strength—a great empire—and the other plausible pretxts that are attempted to be imposed upon them. It would be easy to refute and show how baseless are all these schemes of greatness with which the people of this country are sought to be misled. We are gravely asked: "What man would remain poor, when he could at once become rich? What man would remain weak, when he could at once become powerful? Who would be diminutive, when by merely taking thought he could add cubits to his stature? What people would continue to be a mere colony, when by the stroke of a pen they could at once become an empire, under a new nationality?" Sir, these sophistries will not impose upon the people of this country. Where is the demonstration furnished us that by this scheme you would add one dollar to the wealth of this country, or one human being to its inhabitants, or one inch to its territory? We do not find it afforded during the course of this debate. I have listened attentively to the arguments in favor of the scheme, but no attempt has been made to demonstrate these things. It has been repeatedly stated that we are about to consolidate the strength of this country, in order to resist invasion; but I should like to know in what manner such an end is promoted by this measure. Are we not already united under one Government? Are we not already living under the control of the same executive power? Do we not fight under the same flag, and pay allegiance to

the same Sovereign? Is not every man in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, and Prince Edward Island just as much under the control of the head of our Government as the inhabitants of this province? It is all sophistry this idea that we are going to increase the strength of this country by the proposed union with the Lower Provinces. An attempt is made to alarm us by sensational rumors about invasion, and it is stated that we must put forth every possible strength to save ourselves from being swallowed up by the neighboring republic; and we are gravely told that through the action of a number of self-constituted delegates assembled around a green table, and adopting certain resolutions, the whole of the physical laws relating to our country are to be changed. Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island are to be brought up into Lake Ontario, and the whole of our territory is to be compacted, consolidated and strengthened. Our extended frontier is no longer to be exposed to attack, and, if attacked, will be much more easily defended. Is not this the most absurd sophistry? Can paper resolutions change the laws of nature, or modify the physical geography of the country. Will not Newfoundland be as isolated from this province after Confederation shall have been adopted, as it is to-day? I think, sir, it is generally admitted that Canada is unequal to the defence of its own frontier against invasion from the only quarter from which it is apprehended. It is also admitted that the Maritime Provinces are alike unequal to the defence of their own frontier. By what process then will you demonstrate to me, that by adding the frontier of the Lower Provinces to that of Canada, and by adding the force of those provinces to our own, there will not be the same defencelessness as at present? Will there not be the same disproportion between the defensive power and the object to be defended? (Hear, hear.) Mr. SPEAKER, in the first place I perceive no immediate necessity for those constitutional changes. I think that our present Constitution is ample for the wants of the people of this country, and that all the difficulties, either real or imaginary, under which we labor, might be solved, within the limits of our present Constitution. I consider all our difficulties to be merely sectional, arising neither from differences of religion, of origin, of language, or of laws. On examination it

will be found that they are merely fiscal difficulties, and that they arise from the fact that our General Government does not confine itself to the true end and object of its existence. Do away with your local grants, and your absurd system of compensating for one improper expenditure by the creation of another. Let there be no expenditure for merely local purposes, or for purposes that do not properly come within the functions of the General Government. (Hear, hear.) By what rule of right, for instance, are the inhabitants of Upper Canada called upon to pay for the redemption of the seigniorial tenure of Lower Canada; and what right has Lower Canada to be called upon to meet the extravagant municipal indebtedness of Upper Canada? If our difficulties arise from differences of language and races, how comes it that the English-speaking people of Lower Canada have so long harmonized and sympathized with the extreme Ultramontane party of Lower Canada? (Hear, hear.) I think you cannot find any reason for it, except on the supposition that they remain united for the purpose of maintaining their sectional power and influence, under a system by which the common exchequer is deemed a legitimate object of public plunder. Each section seems to have always regarded the public chest as fair game; and it is undeniable that Lower Canada has generally had the best of it. These things caused dissatisfaction in the minds of people from other sections of the country, and they undertake to form combinations for the purpose of obtaining from the public chest similar undue advantages. The remedy for this state of things is to deprive the Legislature of the power to make grants for local objects. Let there be no revenue collected more than is absolutely necessary for the general expenses of the country, and let it be distributed for those general purposes with due economy, and we shall hear nothing more of sectional difficulties. (Hear, hear.) Mr. SPEAKER, in connection with this same idea, I find in my own mind another very important consideration connected with the administration of the government of our country. It has now, I believe, ceased to be a crime to "look to Washington." Not long ago, the term "looking to Washington" was one of reproach. But that time has passed away, and our friends on the other side of the

House have not only looked to Washington, but absolutely gone there, and imported the worst features of the republican system for incorporation in our new Constitution. While they were doing this, I regret very much that they did not import from Washington, or from some other parts of the United States, their ideas of economy in the administration of the fiscal affairs of the country. (Hear, hear.) I regret they did not import from that country a very important principle prevailing there, to the effect that the Government of the day shall impose as few burdens upon the people as possible. To-day, sir, we are paying the man who stands at that door to admit you to this chamber a greater annual salary than is paid to the Governor of the State of Vermont. We are paying the man who stands in that corner with his paste brush to wrap up our papers, more than the indemnity allowed to a United States senator. We pay the Governor General a greater allowance than is received by the President of the United States of America. We are the most heavily taxed people, and pay larger salaries for the work performed, in proportion to our resources, than any other people in the world.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—We pay ourselves well too. (Laughter.)

MR. O'HALLORAN—It has been said, and it seems to be thought a strong argument in favor of this scheme, that we must do something; that our affairs cannot with advantage go on in the same channel in which they have been doing; and that there is a necessity for some change. It is made a complaint that legislation is obstructed by party strife, and that the country suffers for the want of new laws. Sir, if there is one vulgar error in political economy more false and unsound than another, it is that the prosperity of any country depends on the amount of its legislation. We have, as a general thing, too much legislation. If I may use the term, we are legislated to death. And when I have seen bills pouring into this House by the hundred at every session, I have said to myself:—"What, in Heaven's name, will become of this country if all these bills should, by any possibility, ever become law?" (Laughter.) The idea seems to prevail, that in this country even the grass cannot grow unless its growth is regulated by an Act of Parliament. No change in the Constitution of this country will remedy the difficulties of which you

complain, for they have their source within ourselves. It is honest, economical administration you require, not legislation, or a change in our form of Government.

"Bout forms of government let fools contest,
That which is best administered is best."

You may remove your seat of government to Ottawa, and increase your Legislature from 130 to 194 members, but you will find the same difficulties under any system of government which you may adopt, so long as you continue extravagant sectional expenditure. Those difficulties will still meet you in the face, so long as the legislature or legislatures of the country are permitted to exercise functions that do not properly belong to a general government; so long as you refuse to compel localities to meet their own local expenditure by local means, you will find the same causes producing the same effects in Ottawa as in Quebec. *Cælum non animam mutant qui trans mare currunt.* (You but change your skies by the proposed constitutional changes.) I remarked, at the outset, that I must deny to this House the right to impose on this country this or any other Constitution, without first obtaining the consent of the people. Who sent you here to frame a Constitution? You were sent here to administer the Constitution as you find it. Throughout the length and breadth of British North America, there is not one other government that has dared to arrogate to itself the right of changing the Constitution of their people without consulting them, except ours. I am surprised, sir, that even this strong Government of ours have dared to assume this power, when, sooner or later, they must go before the people of the country. (Hear, hear.) There comes to my hand, this evening, a resolution proposed by the Honorable Attorney General of Newfoundland in the Legislature of that colony. It is instructive as shewing that there was one uniform sentiment, throughout all the Lower Provinces, in favor of submitting the question to the people. It was so submitted in New Brunswick—it met its fate. It is now about to be submitted to the people of Nova Scotia. The Administration of this province have been wiser in their generation than those of the Lower Provinces. They did not dare to submit it for the consideration of the people—a course which, if not exhibiting wisdom on their part, shows, at the least, that skill and craft in public matters for

which most of them have become famous. (Hear, hear.) The resolution I have referred to, and which embodies the policy of the Government of Newfoundland on this question, is as follows:—

Resolved,—That having had under their most serious and deliberate consideration the proposal for the formation of a Federal union of the British North American Provinces, upon the terms contained in the report of the Convention of delegates, held at Quebec, on the 10th of October last—the despatch of the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated December 3rd, 1864—the observations of His Excellency the Governor in relation to this subject in his opening Speech of the present session—and the report of the Newfoundland delegates—this committee are of opinion, that having regard to the comparative novelty and very great importance of this project, it is desirable that before a vote of the Legislature is taken upon it, it should be submitted to the consideration of the people at large, particularly as the action of the other provinces does not appear to require that it should be hastily disposed of, and as (the present being the last session of this Assembly) no unreasonable delay can be occasioned by this course; and they, therefore, recommend that a final determination upon this important subject be deferred to the next meeting of the Legislature.

(Hear, hear.)

AN HON. MEMBER—That is the report of a committee.

MR. O'HALLORAN—Yes, it is the report of a committee; but it was submitted to the Legislature by the Hon. Attorney General as the policy of the Government. Of course, if the resolution is not carried in the Legislature, then the scheme is doubly defeated. In this little, petty province, whose interests, as compared with ours, are of trifling importance in relation to the scheme, the Government considers that the question is one of sufficient moment to demand that before the slightest action is taken upon it by the Legislature, the people should be consulted; but in this large province, with its comparatively large population, and with important interests to be affected, the scheme is to be hurried through without allowing the people to have a voice in the matter, or even to have time for its consideration. (Hear, hear.) They are to have no voice in determining what kind of government they and their children are to live under for years to come. MR. SPEAKER, I know very well that it is a bold declaration for me to make, that this Parliament has no right to deal with this question; but, sir, I

make it not hastily nor unadvisedly, because I defy honorable gentlemen to find a precedent for their proposed action in any free country under similar circumstances. We are not living to-day in a time of revolution or of great emergency; but, even if our circumstances were different, I doubt very much if any of the precedents that have been referred to, as having occurred many years ago and in troublous times, could again be practised or adopted, even in England, from which country we draw all our precedents. The precedents which have been invoked in approval of the course that has been adopted by the Government prove too much. If they form a justification for the course we are pursuing, then you might prove by the same means that this House had the power to perpetuate its existence beyond the limit fixed for the termination of the present Parliament, or vote ourselves members for life. We might just as well constitute ourselves life members of the Federal Legislature of the proposed Confederacy, as to take the action that is contemplated. I know that it is represented as very important that the measure should be carried into immediate operation; but that is a matter of mere expediency, and has nothing to do with constitutional principles. (Hear, hear.) The Irish union has been triumphantly referred to as a precedent for this measure. To my mind it is a most unfortunate one, and little deserving of our imitation. Let me show you how this matter has been regarded by one, whose authority will not be disputed. I read from MAY'S *Constitutional History of England*, page 505 of the 2nd volume. Speaking of the union of Ireland with England, he says:—

A great end was compassed by means the most base and shameless. GRATTAN, Lord CHARLEMONT, PONSONBY, PLUNKETT, and a few patriots, continued to protest against the sale of the liberties and free Constitution of Ireland. Their eloquence and public virtue command the respect of posterity; but the wretched history of their country denies them its sympathy.

This, sir, is the judgment of the impartial English historian upon the means by which this great national crime was consummated, and it is the just encomium on the noble few whose patriotic efforts failed to prevent it. I read it, in anticipation, as the future history of the wrong now about to be perpetrated on the people of this country; and while it implies, on the one hand, in no doubtful terms, the well-merited praise of

the small band who stand here to-night for the rights of the people, in opposition to this scheme, it pronounces, on the other, the just condemnation of those who trample on those rights, and who forget, in the pride of their brief authority, who it was that raised them to the positions they occupy, not that they might coerce, but carry out the will of the people, the only rightful source of all political power. (Cheers.)

MR. J. S. ROSS—I will not attempt to address the House at any great length at this late hour of the evening, as I think it very desirable that this debate should be brought to a close at as early a day as possible; and believing that that is the prevailing opinion in this House, I shall endeavor to be as brief as I can. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has referred to one matter on which I shall not at present say anything, on which I shall not commit myself. I suppose that it will be very well understood what I refer to, without my alluding to it more particularly. But there was another statement which he made—that there was no necessity for any change—on which I shall dwell shortly, and endeavor to show that there was a necessity for a change. It must be in the recollection of every hon. member in this House, that one year ago affairs were in such a state—such difficulties presented themselves, that legislation was becoming almost impracticable. No better proof of this could be desired than that the Government of the day found themselves so surrounded with difficulties in the House, that they declared themselves unable to carry on the administration of the affairs of the country in a satisfactory manner. Now, why should a Government possessing so much talent and ability as that Government did, make that declaration, if there was no necessity for it? (Hear, hear.)

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—If you had voted with us, it would have been all right. (Hear and laughter.)

MR. ROSS—Although I always entertained a very high opinion of the honorable gentleman who was Premier of that Government, I differed from him politically. Then, MR. SPEAKER, there is another matter to which I shall refer, to show that this House did acknowledge that there were difficulties in the way. A motion was made by the honorable member for South Oxford for the appointment of a committee on constitutional changes. That committee reported to this

House, and I will just read the last paragraph of that report in support of what I have said:—

A strong feeling was found to exist among the members of the committee in favor of changes in the direction of a Federative system, applied either to Canada alone, or to the whole British North American Provinces, and such progress has been made as to warrant the committee in recommending that the subject be again referred to a committee at the next session of Parliament.

Now, this was signed by twelve gentlemen, and among them I find the honorable member for Chateauguay, who then declared that there was a necessity for some change. I think, MR. SPEAKER, that this clearly shows that the matter was not brought upon us in a hurry, that the scheme now before us is a subject which has been looked forward to for some time. When we refer to that period, we find that the Government of the day placed their resignations in His Excellency's hands, a new Government was formed which met the House on the 3rd of May, and on the 14th of June they were defeated. At that time, I believe, they had obtained from His Excellency permission to dissolve the House. An effort was made, however, to effect a change in the Administration, in order that it might command a majority of this House, and be enabled to carry on the business of the country. After some time, a reconstruction was effected, and in the programme which the present Government adopted, they did announce that they would take up this question, and that when they met the House the next session, they would be prepared to lay before the House a measure for the purpose of removing existing difficulties, by introducing the Federal principle into Canada, coupled with such provision as will permit the Maritime Provinces and the North-West territory to be incorporated with the same system of government. If there were objections to a change, why were they not made at that time? Did not the House commit itself, then, by receiving it without any objection? Hence I think that the Government pursued a manly, straightforward course in coming down and announcing what their scheme was; and whether that scheme is a good or a bad one, they have redeemed their pledges; they have met this House with a scheme for the Confederation of the British North American Provinces. (Hear.) Whether this scheme is all that we could desire or not, is perhaps a matter on which

we shall not be unanimous. I for one, ever since I have thought anything about politics, have always looked forward to the time when such a scheme as this might be carried out. I have been an advocate of a legislative union. I think that is the correct principle, but I am not ashamed to say that I am open to conviction, and in dealing with a great question like this we must not expect to have everything to meet our own views; we must be prepared to make concessions, and take the best we can get. (Hear, hear.) We know the hesitation with which the Constitution of the United States was accepted; that WASHINGTON—the father of that great country—expressed himself, as well as many other eminent persons, against it, but accepted it as the best that could be had. We find the same expressions falling from the gentlemen of the Conference which prepared this measure. They believe that it was the very best that could be had under the circumstances. (Hear.) Now, if we look for one moment at the work of the Conference which met here in Quebec, whether the scheme is what we all could desire for the benefit of the country or not, we must admit that the gentlemen who composed that Conference were men of ability, men of mind, men who have for years been the guiding spirits of public affairs. (Hear, hear.) And the honorable gentlemen from the Lower Provinces stand in their respective provinces equally high with those who represented Canada, and I am ready to believe that the delegates who composed this Conference approached the question in a spirit of the truest patriotism, with the honest endeavor to settle the difficulties of the country, and in the hope that the scheme would be acceptable to the people, and be the means of bringing us together, and consolidating and building up in this part of the glorious Empire, a government that would be lasting and stable. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) And, Mr. SPEAKER, I think there has been nothing that has proved more acceptable, or that has been better received by the people of the country. (Hear, hear.) So far as I am concerned, I took the opportunity of bringing the subject before my constituents, and when I read the first clause of the resolutions—“The best interests and present and future prosperity of British North America will be promoted by a Federal union under the Crown of Great Britain, provided such union can be effected on principles just to the several provinces,” sir, it met with their hearty

cheers. (Hear, hear.) Although I have not the honor to represent one of the largest constituencies in Upper Canada, yet I represent one that I am proud of—the people of the good old county of Dundas are sound at the core; they do glory in British connection, and nothing would induce them to support me or any other representative who would give an uncertain answer to the question of whether we should retain that connection or not. (Cheers.) Sir, I believe that the time is upon us, when we look at the surrounding difficulties, for us to make some change, and there is an uncertainty in the minds of Canadians at present that we ought to get rid of, and the sooner we approach the subject the better. The sooner we find out that we have a great future to establish, that we have a country here of which we may feel proud and rejoice in, I think, sir, the sooner that state of things is brought about the better. (Cheers.) Not only in a Canadian point of view is this desirable, but also for the sake of our position alongside of our neighbors, with whom, I am sure, we all desire to remain at peace, if they will only leave us in quiet amongst ourselves. That is all that we desire, but at the same time it is well that these people should understand that we have no desire whatever, not the most remote intention, of connecting our destinies with theirs. (Cheers.) Now, Mr. SPEAKER, it is said that this matter is new, and that it is forced upon us. I recollect reading, some years ago, most able letters written by Hon. Mr. HOWE, of Nova Scotia, addressed to Lord JOHN RUSSELL, to show how necessary this union was.

DR. PARKER—I would like to ask the honorable gentleman if those letters were not in favor of a legislative union?

MR. ROSS—I think they were; but I believe that if he—the writer of them—had found himself at Quebec as one of the delegates, he would have done just as they did. Again, I find that at another time in our country, in 1849, in the city of Kingston, one hundred and forty gentlemen, chosen by the people—the ablest and foremost men of the country, and presided over by a gentleman who has since left this state of action—a gentleman of high mind, and universally respected—I mean the late Hon. GEORGE MOFFATT—that organization, the British League, acknowledged that to lay a basis for the future of this country, a union of the British North American Provinces was essential. (Cheers.) If I had time, sir, I could show that at several

periods in the House of Commons, the union of these provinces has been spoken of as what must eventually take place. And since the subject has been under discussion in this country, I have read with the greatest satisfaction, in the press of the United States, articles showing the advantages of this union; and in particular one very able article in the *Chicago Times*, in which the writer pays the people of this country a high compliment for the foresight with which they are seeking to protect their interests in the future. (Hear, hear.) There are other authorities to which I could refer to show the advantages of a union of these provinces. Whether Legislative or Federal unimportant—union is strength, and union is desirable if we expect future growth and greatness. I think the arguments are in favor of a legislative union. When we approach the subject fairly, we must acknowledge that it is not reasonable to suppose that the people of the Lower Provinces should prefer a Federal to a Legislative union. I can quite understand why they appreciate the advantages of the local parliaments; to ask them to give up their whole machinery of government, and to place themselves in the hands and at the tender mercies of a people who would have the commanding influences in the legislation of the country, and with whom they are comparatively little acquainted, would be asking rather too much. There is also some reason to fear why a legislative union would be too cumbersome. Many think that too much of the time of the Legislature of the country would be taken up with the local business of the different sections of the province. I believe, after this machinery has been well in operation, and after we have become better acquainted with each other, that we shall find we can work together, and that this has been a movement in the right direction, by bringing together the people from all parts of the country. We shall find that our interests are better understood, indeed that they are one; it will be the more easy to do away with the local parliaments, and to merge them all into one. (Hear, hear.) Then, sir, there will be this advantage from the present scheme—we shall have the machinery for governing the whole country in existence; and it will be easy for those who desire it—if in the wisdom of the people who will be living under the institutions of the country at that time, it is thought desirable—the necessary machinery will be in existence for consolidation, and the change will not be of that radical nature that it would be at the present moment. Take another view of the case, which I believe will

be borne out by the facts; if we are united—if we shew to the world at large that we have resolved upon a more enlarged sphere of existence for the future—the population of this country will increase to such an extent, that there will be work enough for the local governments as well as for the General Government. I think, also, that the system will have the effect of inducing, on the part of the local administrations, a spirit of emulation in the way of conducting their respective governments as cheaply and as economically as possible. I have no doubt, too, that when the local parliaments are once established, the people will see the advantage of material changes in the municipal institutions of the country; those institutions being to a greater degree subordinated to the local governments. At all events, these are all matters for future consideration, and possibly for future action. (Hear, hear.) I shall now, Mr. SPEAKER, refer briefly to the question of Confederation in a commercial point of view. It is stated that in this respect no benefit will accrue to the country—that there will be no increase of trade between the provinces. But I ask this House to look at the matter in this light—and I am sorry to say that we have good reason for so viewing it—there can be no doubt of the fact. The United States have given notice of the abrogation of the Reciprocity treaty, and there is too much cause for the apprehension that the bonding system will also be done away with. Well, if we are cut off from all these facilities and advantages, what is our position? We are cut off from the ocean for six months of the year, and in this respect our position of dependency on a foreign power is a most humiliating one. (Hear, hear.) The construction of the Intercolonial Railway has been insisted upon as a commercial necessity, and although it may be an expensive work, I think the time has come when it must be built. I may briefly state my own position in regard to that undertaking. When the appropriation was brought up for the Intercolonial Railway survey, so strongly was I opposed to that scheme at the time that I voted against it. But, as I have already stated, I now see the necessity for it. I believe the time has come when this railway should be constructed. (Hear, hear.) I hope it will be constructed in a proper and economical manner, and, when it is built, I believe that in a commercial point, our position will be greatly improved. (Hear, hear.) It is impossible for any honorable gentleman to shew that by means of that railway no increase of trade will spring up between the

different provinces. Western Canada is decidedly an agricultural country; it has a large surplus of grain, and it must find an outlet for it. Shut out from the United States, and deprived of winter communication, where are we to go? To store and house it throughout the winter months would be a great cause of loss. It is said that the export of grain during the winter is not profitable. But do not the United States ship continuously large quantities of flour and products to England and to other parts of the world in the winter season? And what should hinder us from pursuing the same course if we have the Intercolonial Railway? (Hear.) Hon. gentlemen may attempt to argue that such is not the case, and endeavor to conceal the facts; but I firmly believe it to be the policy of the United States to introduce coercive measures, with the view of making us feel that our commercial interests are identified with them, and I believe they will continue that course of policy towards us, not perhaps to the extent of immediate invasion and attempted subjugation, but I fear that their policy will be one of a restrictive kind, so as to make us feel as much as they can our awkward position of dependence. Such, I believe, is their policy. They do not intend immediate invasion, but instead of that, they will, so to speak, put on the screws, in order, if possible, to make us feel that our interest is with them and not separate from them. (Hear, hear.) I can very well see and very well understand the meaning of this desire to annex Canada, although many have maintained that such is not their wish. Going back to the early history of the United States, I find that even in the articles of Federation of the United States, it is provided by the 11th article that Canada, acceding, shall be entitled to participate in all the rights and privileges of the union, whilst they refused to allow any other country to come in unless with the consent of nine states. The war of 1812, too, evinced a strong disposition on the part of our neighbors to attach Canada. And I believe that the statesmen of the United States, in our own day, are animated by the same far-seeing policy in regard to this country, and that they are now applying a little gentle pressure to make us feel that our interest is no longer to remain isolated from them, but to connect our destiny with theirs. Not long since I listened to a certain lecture in this city, in which it appeared to me that inducements were purposely and designedly held out for us to connect our destinies with those

of the people of the neighboring States. It was said that the great cause of difficulty in the United States was now removed, and that there was no obstacle now in the way of their material and social progress. Well, sir, I acknowledge that they are a great people, and that their advancement has been great; but I fail to perceive that, if true to ourselves, we have not the same advantages. (Hear, hear.) At all events, if our advantages are not so great, they are sufficient for all our purposes, and we ought to be satisfied. There is one other consideration to which I desire to allude. When we look at the people who inhabit these provinces, and consider from whence they come and what are their characteristics, that they are a progressive, enterprising and go-ahead people, is it reasonable to suppose that we are always going to remain in this state of uncertainty? Is it reasonable to suppose that we are always to be divided into different provinces, with an imaginary line? Have we no desire or wish to expand and grow? And, I ask, is it possible that we can hope to attain national greatness in a separate state of existence? I think that the interests of the several provinces should be consolidated. There is no disputing the resources of the country, so far as territory is concerned. Stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific, it is ample for the support and sustenance of a great people. I have even heard it said, by persons who are good authority on the subject, that they believe the child is now born who will see British North America inhabited by a population of 60,000,000. This may be going too far, but I think there can be no doubt a large increase to our numbers will take place when we shall have given effect to the scheme now in contemplation. (Hear, and cheers.) The honorable member for Hochelaga (Hon. Mr. DORION) stated in the course of his remarks that it would be a dark day for Canada should these resolutions be adopted. Mr. SPEAKER, that may be that honorable gentleman's opinion; but I must say that I differ from him entirely. On the contrary, I believe it will be a dark day for the whole country if we cannot agree upon some plan for securing our speedy union. (Cheers.) The honorable gentleman also stated that the scheme was far too conservative in its character. Well, I can understand why the honorable gentleman should find fault with it on that account, but I confess that that does not trouble me in the slightest degree. (Cheers.) He declares that it will destroy

the great Liberal party. I should be sorry to see such a calamity. I have always professed to be a liberal—a moderate man in politics. (Hear, hear.) While I would be sorry to see any great party destroyed by this scheme, I would particularly regret to witness the destruction of the great Liberal party. (Hear, hear.) I believe, however, that that party will not be destroyed in any such manner. After this great scheme is perfected, we will have parties the same as before. There may be some changes as regards individuals, but I trust that at all events there will still be a great Liberal party. (Cheers and laughter.) Party is necessary for the good government of the country; but I trust that party feeling will not be manifested for the sake of creating divisions and discords, but that all parties will unite to build up a power here which will be felt and respected throughout the world. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) The honorable member for Brome (Mr. DUNKIN) made some remarks which it struck me were very singular in their character, but which are a fair instance of the manner he adopts to illustrate and substantiate his views. He quoted from English statesmen and English publications all that could possibly be cited to throw doubt upon the scheme; but the moment English opinion was invoked in its favor, he turned round and declared that English views on Canadian affairs were entirely unreliable. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) As, however, that honorable gentleman is not present, I shall not refer further to his statements. The honorable member for Cornwall (Hon. J. S. MACDONALD), for whom I have always entertained the highest respect, said that the cry of annexation had been raised in order to push this scheme through. Well, sir, if I am not mistaken, the honorable member for Hochelaga (Hon. Mr. DORION) said that this was the very measure to bring about annexation. (Laughter.)

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—The Premier stated that we were being driven towards annexation, and that this scheme would stop it.

MR. ROSS—I think I have detained the House too long already; and if opportunity presents itself I will claim the indulgence of the House while I refer to one or two other points hereafter. (Cries of "Go on!") As I said before, I believe the gentlemen who met in Quebec approached the matter in a spirit and with a desire to adopt a Constitution which would be for the good of the whole country.

And although I do not entirely concur in the resolutions—although there are some things about them which I would desire to see changed, I shall give them my support as a whole. Take the Constitution of the Upper House for instance—I would prefer rather to see the present system retained; but as the delegates thought fit to change it, I would not feel justified in voting against the whole scheme on account of my objection to one or two items of detail. (Hear, hear.) We must expect to give up to a certain extent our opinions in order to the attainment of greater benefits than we at present enjoy. I, at any rate, feel it my duty to act in this manner, and I feel also that the honorable gentlemen will deserve the best thanks of the country if the scheme which they have brought down shall be carried into effect. I do hope that whatever may take place—that whatever checks this scheme may meet with—it will eventually be successful, and that Addresses will be passed by the respective legislatures asking Her Majesty to pass a measure giving effect to this scheme. When this Constitution shall have been perfected and ratified—when there shall no longer be any doubts about its containing the principles upon which the government of the country is founded—every true-hearted and loyal Canadian will have cause to rejoice that his lot has been cast in such a highly-favored land. (Cheers.)

MR. BOWMAN—As the discussion on this great question appears to be rapidly drawing to a close, I desire to offer a few remarks upon the scheme of Confederation before voting for it. The question of constitutional reform is not a new one in Canada. It is a question which has occupied the attention of the statesmen, the press and the people of this country for a number of years; and so urgent have been the demands for reform on the part of the people of Upper Canada, that it has been found impossible to form a Government under our present system, for several years past, which could command a majority in the House sufficiently large to carry on the business of the country with success. The people of Western Canada have, for a number of years, agitated strongly for increased representation in Parliament, the justice of which few will pretend to deny. Owing to the disparity in the population of the two sections of the province, and the manifest injustice which is done to Upper Canada, I am satisfied that some change must be made soon, with a view of establish-

ing a more satisfactory system of government. (Hear, hear.) The people are so thoroughly in earnest on this question, that I am persuaded they are prepared to give a fair trial to any scheme which offers a reasonable prospect of inaugurating a better and more satisfactory state of affairs. (Hear, hear.) There are, in my opinion, two methods by which this may be done. The first is a legislative union between Upper and Lower Canada, based upon representation by population; the second is by a Federal union either between the two Canadas or between all the British North American Provinces. Unless one or other of these two remedies is speedily applied, there is great danger that an entire separation of the two provinces may ultimately take place, which, in my opinion, would prove fatal to our existence as a British colony. (Hear, hear.) Our proximity to the United States makes it necessary that the union should be maintained at almost any cost. In order to effect a change in our Constitution, it is highly desirable to obtain the consent of a majority of the representatives of both sections of the province; for, although a scheme might be adopted by the majority of one section, aided by the minority of the other section, it would not give such general satisfaction as could be desired. The demands made by the people of Upper Canada for representation by population under the existing union, have hitherto been resisted by the people of Lower Canada with a degree of determination that has convinced even the most sanguine advocates of that measure that it is impracticable, at least for some time to come. Admitting, then, that representation by population under the existing union cannot be obtained, I think it is our duty to endeavor to find some other solution of our sectional difficulties. In my opinion the formation of a system of government based upon the Federal principle, with a Central Parliament which shall have the control of matters common to all the provinces, and a Local Legislature for each province to manage local affairs, is the only system which will prove satisfactory to the people of these provinces. Such is the scheme now under discussion by this House. It is said by some of the opponents of the present scheme that there is no necessity for a change, that the people of Upper Canada have abandoned their agitation for constitutional reform, and that they are perfectly content to go on as they are. I can only say to those honorable gentlemen that they are entirely mistaken. The

desire for a change is as strong now as ever, and the people of Western Canada will never be satisfied until their just demands are conceded in some shape or other. (Hear, hear.) We are not the only people who have found it necessary to alter their Constitution. There is hardly a nation in the civilized world which has not, from time to time, found it itself compelled to change its form of government in order to keep pace with the ordinary progress of events; and we generally find that those great political changes which result in the consolidation or disruption of empires, are brought about by violent civil commotions, involving the sacrifice of thousands of valuable lives and the expenditure of millions of money. Of this fact we have a melancholy example in the present condition of the United States. The Constitution of that country was laid down by some of the wisest and ablest statesmen, yet in less than a century after its formation, the people who have hitherto looked upon it as being the most perfect Constitution in the world, find themselves in the midst of a most disastrous war, trying to remove a constitutional difficulty which has given them a vast deal of trouble. Now, if we shall succeed in laying down a permanent basis for the consolidation of these provinces—if we shall succeed in forming a union which will result in the perpetuation of British institutions on this continent, and thus check the absorbing influence of the neighboring republic—we shall confer a great boon upon posterity, and prevent much bitter strife among ourselves. (Hear, hear.) While deliberating upon this scheme, we should divest our minds as much as possible of old political associations, in order that we may give it that calm and deliberate consideration which its great importance demands. When we consider the sectional difficulties to be adjusted, the conflicting interests which are to be reconciled, and the prejudices which are to be overcome, it is evident that we must consider this scheme in the spirit of compromise. Mutual concessions must be made, so as to respect the rights and feelings of all, so far as it can be done without doing an injustice to any. In reference to the scheme now before the House, allow me to say that although there are some of its details to which I am opposed, yet, taking it as a whole, I believe it is the best that can be obtained under our peculiar circumstances, and therefore I feel it to be my duty to support it. That part of the scheme which provides for a nominated Legislative

Council I believe to be contrary to the wishes of a majority of the people of Western Canada, and particularly of my own constituents. I think it will be admitted that the elective system has given us a class of representatives in that body which would do honor to any country in the world, and I should prefer to see that system continued. But while I would be prepared to vote for an amendment which would have for its object the perpetuation of the present system, provided it could be done without interfering with the success of Confederation, yet I do not believe that my constituents are prepared to reject the whole scheme, simply because there are a few features in it which are not exactly in accordance with their views. And I can assure you, Mr. SPEAKER, that I have no desire to do so. The opponents of the scheme appeal to the French population, telling them that their nationality is in danger, that they will be entirely absorbed in the Central Legislature, and that their rights and liberties will be interfered with. Then the same parties tell the English of Lower Canada that their nationality and their schools will be entirely at the mercy of the French in the Local Legislature. And, with a view of obtaining the defeat of the scheme in the west, they appeal to the pockets of the people of Upper Canada, asserting that they will have to bear the greater proportion of the taxation under the new system. Now, I think it has been clearly shown that the Maritime Provinces will contribute their full share towards the public revenue—that they will pay as much per head as Upper Canada, and much more than Lower Canada, so that the financial argument against Confederation cannot be substantiated. Those honorable gentlemen who are trying to defeat the scheme by appealing to the prejudices and sectional animosities of the people of Lower Canada, should bear in mind that they are pursuing a course which is calculated to mar the harmonious working of any system of government, and that if they should succeed in defeating the scheme, it would go very far to convince the people of Upper Canada that Lower Canada is determined not to consent to any measure of justice to Upper Canada. (Hear, hear.) It is also asserted that this scheme will bring about a separation from the Mother Country. Now, I believe that the advocates of union are as desirous to perpetuate our connection with Great Britain as its opponents, and that it is desirable to maintain that connection as long as possible. But

assuming that we are laying the foundation of a British North American Empire, which is destined to become independent of the Mother Country, after our resources have become sufficiently developed, and our vast territory has been filled up with an industrious, intelligent and thrifty population, I do not think such an anticipation should induce us to vote against it. Another objection which is raised against this scheme is the supposition that the Maritime Provinces will oppose the opening up of the North-West territory, which is an unwarrantable assumption on the part of the opponents of Confederation; for I think it will be found that even the people of those provinces will see that it is for their interest to have that portion of our dominions opened up for settlement. Such a course would extend their field for trade and commerce, in which the Maritime Provinces are extensively engaged, so that the advantages would be of a mutual character. A great deal has been said about submitting the scheme to the people before it is finally adopted, and I must say that I could never make up my mind to vote for it without first having an expression of popular opinion upon it in some way or other, unless I were perfectly satisfied that a large majority of my constituents are in favor of it. I took the precaution to hold a number of public meetings in the constituency which I represent, in order to obtain the views of the people upon it, and, in almost every instance, a large majority present at those meetings, not only expressed themselves in favor of the general features of the scheme, but also expressed a desire that it should be dealt with and adopted by this Parliament without first holding a general election. I shall take much pleasure in voting for the scheme now before the House, believing that by so doing I shall best discharge my duty to my constituents and to the country at large. (Cheers.)

MR. WALSH said—It was my intention, during the earlier stages of this debate, to have asked the House to bear with me while I made some lengthened remarks on the important subject embraced in the resolutions now in your hands. It was my intention to review the circumstances which made it necessary that the scheme now submitted should be placed before the inhabitants of British North America—to trace fully the course of the sectional agitation with reference to the difficulties between Upper and Lower Canada—and to show how it had gradually grown in importance, until the time had arrived when we had to accept

one of two alternatives—a dissolution of the existing union between Upper and Lower Canada, or some larger scheme, such as that now contemplated by the people of these provinces. I should also have stated at some length my reasons, if we had to decide between these alternatives for opposing the former. I believe—and I think hon. gentlemen almost unanimously in this House agree with me—that the union existing between these provinces at the present time has, in all its important bearings, more than realized the most sanguine anticipations of those who were concerned in bringing it about. We have seen, since the union, an increase in the population, revenue and resources of these provinces seldom witnessed in the history of any country. We have seen two peoples entirely dissimilar in race, language and institutions—having nothing in common but their joint allegiance to the same Crown—we have seen those two peoples rapidly becoming one people—one in name, one in object, one in feeling. And I believe that in every respect the union under which we now live has been most happy in its results. If I had gone, therefore, into the subject, as I originally intended, I should have stated fully my views upon it in all its bearings. And I should have stated, as I now state, that if I had had to give my vote whether the connection between these two provinces should remain, or whether it should be dissolved, and we should go back to the state of separate existence in which we were before the union, I should have been found for one most hostile to a dissolution of that union. (Hear, hear.) But circumstances, over some of which this House has not control, while others are within our control, have led to a probable termination of this debate at an earlier period than I had anticipated, and I will not trespass on the patience of the House, at this late hour, by detaining honorable members with any lengthened remarks. In the few observations I shall offer, I will confine myself to a reference to some of the leading features of the scheme now before us. I shall not, as many honorable gentlemen have done, go into lengthy quotations of other men's opinions, or comment on the effect of different systems of government in other countries. I will confine myself to what I consider, from the best means of information I can obtain, the probable effect and bearing of this proposed scheme upon ourselves. (Hear, hear.) I agree with

many honorable gentlemen who have preceded me, when I say that since I first gave attention to public matters, I have looked forward to the time when a more intimate connection between these British American Provinces would not only be desirable, but would become absolutely necessary. I look upon it as desirable in a military point of view, and in a commercial point of view. It must be evident to any honorable gentleman who has occupied a seat in this House—even for the short period that I have had the honor of a seat here—that the opinion of the House of late years has very materially changed with reference to the defences of the country. I am satisfied that we have, irrespective of party, become more alive to our duty in that respect; and that the people of this country, acting through those who sit here as their representatives, are prepared to take upon themselves their just share of responsibility for the defence of these provinces. (Hear, hear.) And I look upon this scheme of union as a most important step in that view; because while we rely, as we do rely to a great extent, on the assistance of the home Government for the defence of this country, it must be evident to all of us that these provinces, acting in concert with each other, and all acting in concert with the home Government, can organize a more effective system of defence than we could do if we remained separate and isolated. (Hear, hear.) I believe this question should be considered chiefly from a commercial point of view. We must necessarily consider the question in connection with the more intimate commercial intercourse which it is contemplated will result from the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. A new market for our commodities will be opened up by the removal of the barriers to trade which now exist between us. Believing, as I do, that our commercial relations with our sister provinces should be free and unrestricted, I am heartily in favor of the construction of this railway. After stating that upon these general principles I am in favor of the union of these provinces, I may also state that had I my choice, and were my vote to decide the question, I would say “give us a legislative union,” because I believe it would have, for its effect, the bringing of all the colonists more immediately into contact and connection with each other, rendering our interests much more identical than by the Federal plan. But I infer, from the speeches made on the floor of this House at the opening of

this debate, by honorable gentlemen who were delegates to the Conference held in this city, that the two schemes were discussed in that Conference—the Legislative and the Federal—and that the former was found to be impracticable. It is, therefore, not possible for us now to decide the question in favor of a legislative union. We have evidence before us that is satisfactory to my mind, that probably all of the other provinces would refuse to take part in a legislative union. The Honorable Attorney General West, in his speech at the opening of the debate, gave us sufficient information on the point to convince the House that this question had been fully discussed in the Conference, and the legislative plan rejected, on account of its being impracticable. For this reason, sir, believing that the choice before us is either to accept a Federal union or reject the proposal entirely, I give my assent to the present scheme without hesitation. (Hear, hear.) It is brought as one of the strongest arguments against this union that the Federal Government will be far more expensive than our present system. That may be true to some extent; but my impression is that it will not be found true to the extent represented. We must bear in mind that we have in each province a Government fully constituted, with all the machinery necessary for carrying on the business of government. Therefore the new machinery required would be very little, and would amount simply to the local legislatures for Upper and Lower Canada. Upon these general principles then, I must say that I shall give my adhesion to the scheme of union submitted to us; and as was well remarked by the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. J. S. Ross), the language in which the scheme has been laid before us must prove very acceptable to all who are in favor of a union such as that proposed. The gentlemen composing the Conference could not have used language more acceptable to me than that in which the first resolution is couched, except in the use of the word "Federal," instead of "Legislative." The resolution reads:—

The best interests and present and future prosperity of British North America will be promoted by a Federal union under the Crown of Great Britain, provided such a union can be effected on principles just to the several provinces.

Now, sir, I am prepared to say here, and I think I but echo the voice of every hon.

gentleman present, that all the people ask is that the union be based upon principles just to the several provinces. (Hear, hear.) We ask nothing more. Again, sir, the language employed in the third resolution is most satisfactory:—

In framing a Constitution for the General Government, the Conference, with a view to the perpetuation of the connection with the Mother Country, &c., to the promotion of the best interests of the people of these provinces, desire to follow the model of the British Constitution, so far as our circumstances will permit.

Surely, sir, we all agree that no better model can be found, or better system of government followed, than that of the British Constitution. (Hear, hear.) One of the features of this scheme that commends itself strongly to my approbation is the marked distinction between the system that is submitted to us, and that which is in existence in the neighboring republic. I believe that to a great extent we may trace the unfortunate difficulties that exist in that country to the absurd doctrine of state rights. Instead of their Central Government having, in the first instance, supreme power, and delegating certain powers to the local or state governments, the very reverse is the principle on which their Constitution is founded. Their local governments possess the principal power, and have delegated certain powers to the General Government. In the scheme submitted to us, I am happy to observe that the principal and supreme power is placed in the hands of the General Government, and that the powers deputed to the local governments are of a limited character. (Hear, hear.) I am glad also to observe that in the proposed organization of the General Legislature of the united provinces, that question which has so long agitated the people of Canada—representation by population—is in a fair way of being satisfactorily solved. It is proposed that in the General Legislature, or House of Commons as it is to be called, each province shall be represented in accordance with its population, thereby removing that which has been so long a source of agitation in Upper Canada, and of vexation to Lower Canada, and which has led to the discussion of the scheme now before the House. In reference to the organization of the Legislative Council, I may say that I have always been found among those who opposed the introduction of the elective principle into the constitution of that body

in this province, and I, therefore, find no difficulty in giving my hearty assent to the change now proposed. I have always believed, and I still believe, that we could not expect two branches of the Legislature, owing their existence to the same source, and being elected by the same class of voters, to work in harmony for any length of time. (Hear, hear.) It may be called a retrograde movement, yet I can heartily assent to it, because, in my opinion, it places things where they should have been left. In pressing upon this House the adoption or rejection of these resolutions as a whole, I believe the Government are actuated by the best motives, and that it is their duty to do so. But whilst I am prepared to give my vote in that direction, I am also quite willing to admit the force of the objections urged by the Colonial Secretary in his despatch to the Governor General of the 3rd December last, in relation to the constitution of the Upper House, so far as the limiting of the number of members is concerned. I for one, although there is no doubt that these resolutions will be passed by this House precisely in the form in which they have been submitted to us, am quite content that the Imperial Parliament should make such alterations in that, or any other respect, as they consider necessary, and I shall bow with very great satisfaction to such amendments. (Hear, hear.) There are two or three questions in connection with these resolutions upon which I desire to offer a few remarks. One of them is that of education. We have already had, in the course of this discussion, a good deal said on this subject. I would simply say, as one of those who gave effect by my vote to the present law of Upper Canada for the establishment of separate schools, that in doing so I believed that I was according to the minority of one section of the province what I conceived the minority of the other section were entitled to, thus doing justice to all. It gives me, therefore, great satisfaction to observe the recognition in these resolutions of the principle that the rights of the minorities, in each section, with respect to educational facilities, should be guaranteed. I confess that if I were living in Lower Canada, I should not feel that I was being justly treated in being called upon to contribute by taxation to the support of schools to which I could not conscientiously send my children. (Hear, hear.) I have the satisfaction of knowing that, after giving my vote upon the last Separate School

Bill, and going back to my constituents, they were fully satisfied with the explanation I gave them, and my action was endorsed by them. Another question that I look upon as of very great importance to these colonies, is not dealt with in these resolutions in that manner to which its importance entitles it. I refer to the management and sale of our Crown lands. I am very sorry to observe that they are to be confided to the control of the local legislatures. I believe that if, in any one question more than another, the Government of this province have failed in their duty in times past, it is in the management of our Crown lands. The complaint I have to make is that they have not made use of those lands in establishing a wise and liberal system of immigration, by offering them free to all who would come and settle upon them. It cannot but be humiliating to every person having a stake in this province to observe the torrents of immigration that pour from the Mother Country into the neighboring republic; and especially so when they see them passing through the whole length of Canada by multitudes to the Western States. (Hear, hear.) We have, in times past, failed to hold out such inducements as would stop that tide of immigration from flowing past us. I fear that by leaving those lands in the hands of the local legislatures, the immigration question will be dealt with, in future, in the same narrow spirit in which it has been treated in times past. I would have been very highly pleased if I could look forward to the future with the hope that our General Legislature would adopt a large, enlightened, and liberal scheme of immigration, sending their agents to all the European ports from which the largest tide of immigration sets in, for the purpose of explaining to the people the advantages they could derive from settling in these provinces. I am, therefore, very sorry to see that the delegates were obliged to make the arrangement they have made with reference to this important question. (Hear, hear.) Now, sir, in reference to another of the questions embraced in these resolutions, though not forming a part of the proposed Constitution, I am prepared to admit here that my opinions have undergone a very material change since I first came into this House. I refer to the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. I came here, in 1862, decidedly hostile to our assuming any portion of the expense of constructing that road. I believed, at that time, that it

construction would be of no advantage to Canada; but the course of events has convinced me that the time has now arrived when we should take upon ourselves our fair share of the expense of constructing this important work. It cannot be satisfactory to any Canadian, on going to New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, to find that he is a stranger in a strange country, and among a people who, though living so close to Canada, have no commercial intercourse with us. Although they are neighbors of ours, in one respect, yet they are neighbors with whom we have no intercourse. It is very desirable that the barriers to our intercourse should be removed, and the construction of the Intercolonial Railway is, in my opinion, the only effectual means of removing them. Mr. SPEAKER, it has been argued by a great many of those who have taken part in debating this subject that this House is assuming for itself a power that it does not, or ought not to possess, in disposing of the question without submitting it to the popular will. It is said that before these resolutions take effect an expression of public opinion should be had through a general election. Some of those honorable gentlemen who have taken this position have stated as a reason for advocating that course that the public mind was not yet properly informed as to the effect of the proposed change, and that, therefore, time should be given until public opinion is prepared to decide upon it. But with a strange inconsistency those same gentlemen are flooding this House with petitions from the electors, not asking for delay, not asking for further time to consider the matter, but asking that the scheme be not adopted. They in effect show by their petitions that they have considered the subject—that they know all about it—that their opinions are fully formed—and that the measure ought not to be adopted. Either the public mind is fully ripe for the adoption or rejection of the scheme, or else those electors are signing petitions without having sufficient information on which to base the opinions they express. But, sir, there is such a thing as obtaining public opinion on almost any question, and very correctly too, without going to the polls; and, for my part, I find elections very inconvenient. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) I believe the majority of the electors of Upper Canada have read those resolutions, and understand them about as well as many members of this House; and,

sir, we have every reason to believe that the sentiment of Upper Canada at least is largely in favor of the adoption of this scheme. (Hear, hear.) I took occasion to consult my constituents before coming to this House on the present occasion. I held meetings in the various municipalities in the county, and I believe, sir, according to the best of my ability, I did submit this scheme to the electors of that portion of the province. I have heard a good deal said here about the importance of having the question submitted to a vote of the people.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—I would like to ask the gentleman whether he laid any figures before his people to shew the difference between the cost of a Legislative and a Federal union. Unless he did that, the people were not in a position to express an opinion as to what was best for their interests.

MR. WALSH—I did not submit figures to shew the difference in cost between a Federal or Legislative union, for the simple reason that until the organization of the local governments is decided upon, it is not possible to give reliable figures, and I therefore think the people as competent to make calculations on this subject as myself or my hon. friend, lawyer though he be. (Hear, hear.) I may say, however, in answer to the hon. gentleman, that I did state to my constituents that the resolutions now under consideration place in the hands of the present Legislature the preparation of the constitutions and the organization and composition of the local governments of Upper and Lower Canada; and that as the Federal Government is to pay an annual subsidy of eighty cents per head of its population to the respective provinces, for carrying on their local governments and the construction of local works, any sum required over and above that subsidy must necessarily be raised by direct taxation, and in that fact we have the strongest possible guarantee that in the arrangements made by this Legislature, and in the subsequent management of their domestic affairs by the local governments, the strictest simplicity and economy will be observed. (Hear, hear.) So much, Mr. SPEAKER, in answer to the question of the hon. gentleman. The difference between us on this question being that whilst we are both advocates of a legislative union, he will accept none other. I, believing that unattainable at present, am prepared to accept

the system now proposed, hoping that the experience of the people will soon induce them to agree to the abolition of the local governments, and the adoption of the legislative system. (Hear, hear.) I may add—and I do so with great personal satisfaction—that the meetings which were held in my own county were largely in favor of the scheme, and that resolutions approving of it were moved and seconded, in almost every instance, by persons of different political opinions. (Hear, hear.) I was going on to remark, that it is said by many members of this House that the scheme could not be submitted to the people, because the Government in sending the resolutions to the members of the Legislature marked them "Private." Now, sir, I managed to get over that difficulty without trouble. A copy of the resolutions was sent to me, and as I was precluded from making use of them in that form without violating the confidence reposed in me, I turned to the newspaper version of the same resolutions, and finding it to be a *verbatim* copy of the original, when I attended my meetings I read from the newspaper and not from the private document itself. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) I think other hon. gentlemen might have taken the same course with safety to themselves and profit to their constituents. (Hear, hear.) Without wishing to detain the House longer, I shall content myself by simply expressing my regret that on a question of such paramount importance—a question which towers in magnitude above all others that have ever come before this House—a question which not simply affects Canada, but the whole British North American Provinces—a question which does not only interest us, but will be felt in its influence upon future generations—I have, I say, to express my deep regret that such a question should not have been treated apart from party feeling, party prejudices, and a desire for party triumph. (Cheers.) Our object in considering this subject should not be to put one party out of office and another party in, but to determine what will most conduce to the present and future prosperity of the British North American Provinces. (Hear, hear.) It is a matter of indifference to me, so far as it affects this question, who occupy the seats on the Treasury benches. I look upon this question irrespective of party feelings. From the present position of these provinces, I think it is our duty and our interest alike to give effect to these resolu-

tions so far as we can do so. If they fail through the action of the Lower Provinces, we shall not be responsible. If we believe that the resolutions will be conducive to our interests, we are bound to sustain the hon. gentlemen who agreed to them as a basis of union. Believing this to be the proper course to be pursued, I shall, as I have already said, have great pleasure in giving them my support. (Hear, hear.) There is just one other remark that I may perhaps be permitted to refer to, which fell from the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. BOWMAN), that I decidedly dissent from. The hon. gentleman spoke of this scheme as one which, if adopted, would conduce to independence. I must object to that view being taken of it. If I thought that the adoption of the scheme now before us could in any respect have the effect of severing these colonies from the Mother Country, whatever the consequences might be, I should have no hesitation in giving my vote against it. I believe there is nothing more ardently to be desired—no greater glory attainable than for these colonies remaining for all time to come, as we are now, dependencies of Great Britain.

HON. MR. COCKBURN—The honorable member for North Waterloo referred to it as a means of maintaining our independence against the United States.

MR. WALSH—I do not desire to misrepresent the hon. gentleman, and I am glad to hear that I have misconceived the tenor of his remarks. MR. SPEAKER, I have detained the House longer than I purposed doing when I rose. I have touched very briefly on some of the general features of the scheme; but I have not occupied valuable time in quoting authorities, or in reading passages illustrative of the past political history of hon. gentlemen on either side. It matters very little to me, in considering this question, what certain hon. gentlemen thought twelve months ago about representation by population or any other subject. This is a question to be decided by itself and upon its own merits; and believing that the adoption of this scheme, so far as we in Canada are concerned, will be fraught with great benefits to ourselves as well as to those who may come after us, I repeat that it will afford me great pleasure in giving my support to the resolutions. (Cheers.)

MR. GIBBS said—MR. SPEAKER, in rising at this late hour, I feel, in common with

many hon. members who have preceded me, that the debate has been sufficiently protracted, and should be brought to a close as speedily as possible. Nevertheless, as a member lately elected to represent a wealthy and populous constituency, largely engaged in commercial, manufacturing, and agricultural pursuits, I deem it my duty to state my views on the proposed union of the British North American Provinces, now under the consideration of this House. In my opinion, sir, the gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches deserve credit for the earnest and energetic manner in which they have applied themselves to carry out the pledges which they gave the country during the course of last summer. (Hear, hear.) I look upon it that the vote about to be taken is a foregone conclusion, and, for all practical purposes, might as well have been taken as soon as the resolutions had been read and spoken to by the Hon. Attorney General West. I have remarked, sir, that almost every hon. member that has spoken has expressed himself as favorable to a union of some kind or other with the Maritime Provinces. When the delegates from the eastern provinces met at Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, they contemplated a legislative union among themselves; but when invited to visit Quebec for the purpose of holding a conference with a view to a union of the whole of the colonies, the Federal principle was substituted for the Legislative, Lower Canada and the eastern provinces voting as a unit for it, while the members representing Canada West were divided, the Hon. Attorney General West preferring a Legislative union, and the Hon. President of the Council a Federal one. The subject of "Union of the Provinces" has been looked upon with favor, not only by our own statesmen, who have of late years regarded it as a measure calculated to remove the difficulties which have surrounded the legislation of the country, but by leading statesmen of England as well, who view the proposal favorably, as being the means of building up a great nation, and also of preserving monarchical institutions on this continent. (Hear, hear.) Mr. SPEAKER, whatever may have been the points of difference which gave rise to the lengthened discussions of the Conference, there was one upon which, judging by the speeches of the delegates, and also from the resolutions themselves, there was perfect unanimity—that of loyalty

and attachment to the Throne of Great Britain. (Hear, hear.) One would have thought it unnecessary to incorporate such a sentiment in the resolutions, yet the first of the series gives utterance to it and is thus expressed:—

The best interests and present and future prosperity of British North America will be promoted by a Federal union under the Crown of Great Britain.

With regard to the future of this proposed union, it is curious to note what is said and written in reference to it, some urging that its inevitable result will be a separation from our present happy connection with the Mother Country, and ultimate independence; while another class, equally confident, declares that it will lead to annexation with the United States. (Hear.) Whatever the ultimate fate of such a union may be, it is conceded by all parties that there exists a necessity for a change of some kind in the political relations existing between Upper and Lower Canada; and it is gratifying to reflect that an expedient has been devised for allaying the rancorous party spirit that has been too frequently exhibited on the floor of this House. (Hear, hear.) We may congratulate ourselves, sir, that while our republican neighbors are engaged in bloody strife, one portion spilling its best blood in order to obtain a new Constitution, we can discuss the propriety of making a change in our own, which has not been inaptly termed a "bloodless revolution," without let or hindrance, but on the contrary with the full consent and authority of the power to which we owe allegiance. (Hear.) The provisions of this new Constitution have been widely disseminated, and in some sections thoroughly discussed. In the riding which I have the honor to represent, public attention was drawn to Confederation during the recent election, and I am fully justified in stating, that with a few exceptions here and there, there were not to be found many dissentients to it. (Hear, hear.) It is true that upon one or two occasions there were found leading men who took the ground that they did not think it desirable to enter into this union, but such instances were rare. One of these gentlemen, the reeve of one of the most important townships in the riding, attended a meeting, where he met a large number of the electors; but after he had delivered his address, he could not find one to

respond to the sentiments he had expressed. (Hear, hear.) Another gentleman, an ex-reeve and an ex-member of Parliament—although he never had the honor of taking his seat in this House—also addressed a large meeting, but with the same result as in the previous case. The only opposition which was manifested throughout the contest was not to the scheme itself, but to points of detail. (Hear, hear.) The Constitution of the Legislative Council was the principal one referred to, my opponent contending that the Upper House should continue an elective body, as at present, instead of being a nominated Chamber, as it is proposed to make it. I can sustain the view taken by the Hon. President of the Council in his opening address the other evening, when he said he would not hesitate to go into any liberal constituency in Western Canada and obtain their sanction to this principle. (Hear, hear.) Such at all events was the result in South Ontario. I am free to admit that a change was not asked for in the constitution of the Legislative Council; but although the resolutions make the change, there is a feeling abroad in the country that on this account the scheme as a whole should not be rejected. (Hear, hear.) Whenever a point was attempted to be made against me that I was endeavoring, by my advocacy of the nominative principle, to build up an aristocracy in this country, and that the result would be the locking up of the lands of the province in the hands of a privileged class, I replied that such had not been the case in the past, and that in a country like ours such could never be its results; and I further stated that the leader of the Reform party, the Hon. President of the Council, had himself stood almost alone on his side of the House in 1850, in resisting the change from the nominative to the elective principle. My desire, sir, is to see the union carried out only on a fair and equitable basis, and this, I think, is likely to be attained in the manner proposed for the assumption by the Central Government (at \$25 per head) of the debts or portion of debts for which each province is now liable. I regret, however, that so high a figure as 80c. per head has been fixed upon as the subsidy to the local legislatures, for I fear the revenue will be so large that taken in connection with the revenues derivable from local sources, the surplus, after defraying the expenses of government, may induce that extravagance which has been so frequently

depreciated in the past, and which by this arrangement may be continued in the future. I have taken some pains, sir, to ascertain what will be the probable position of Upper Canada under the arrangement as proposed, and I find that its revenue and probable expenditure will be about as follows:—

REVENUE.

Law fees.....	\$100,000
Municipal Loan Fund.....	180,000
U. C. Building Fund.....	30,000
Grammar School do.....	20,000
Crown lands.....	280,000
Education Fund.....	8,000
Public works.....	64,000
Subsidy at 80 cents.....	1,117,000
Other sources.....	32,000
	<hr/>
	\$1,831,000

EXPENDITURE.

Administration of justice.....	\$275,000
Education.....	265,000
Literary and scientific institutions.....	10,000
Hospitals and charities.....	43,000
Agricultural societies.....	56,000
Gaols, from Building Fund.....	32,000
Roads and bridges.....	75,000
Expense of managing Crown lands.....	75,000
Interest on liabilities over assets.....	225,000
Interest on proportion of debt to be assumed, say.....	150,000
Balance available.....	625,000
	<hr/>
	\$1,831,000

In this statement I have not included the Municipality Fund, as the receipts are distributed the following year amongst the municipalities. Estimating the expense of the Local Government at \$150,000, we have a balance of \$475,000 per annum for local purposes. I regard the subsidy as altogether too large, and shall hope to see it very materially reduced. (Hear, hear.) My hon. friend from North Ontario, upon the hypothesis that the Maritime Provinces contribute one-fifth of the revenue of the proposed Confederacy, and the balance by the Canadas, in the relative proportion of two dollars by Upper Canada to one dollar by Lower Canada, founds an argument thereon, shewing that each additional representative gained for Upper Canada will cost \$17,000. Now, Mr. SPEAKER, I apprehend that when the union is accomplished and the duties equalized, this seeming objection will, to some extent at least, be removed, for it is well known that the Maritime Provinces consume much more largely of imported

goods, per head, than we do. (Hear.) But let this principle be extended to county and township matters, and it would necessitate appropriations to the wealthier townships, in the proportion each contributed to the revenue of the county—a principle which has never been contended for, and facts will go to show that it is seldom done even upon population, as is proposed by this scheme. But as it was necessary to establish some basis for contributing to the expenses of the local governments, without compelling them to resort to direct taxation, I think the principle adopted, that of population, is not unjust. (Hear, hear.) Again, it is argued that as Canada West contributes in the proportion already alluded to, that in the payment of subsidies she will contribute more than her fair proportion in the proposed Confederacy. To this I reply, if the hypothesis that the proportion which Upper and Lower Canada respectively contribute to the general revenue be correct, and that the subsidy should be based upon revenue and not population, then undoubtedly the argument is a good one. But, sir, let us see if the proposed arrangement is not a great improvement on the present method of distributing the public funds. It is well known, sir, that the complaint which Upper Canada has made in the past was that the appropriations were made, not upon revenue, nor even according to population, but in utter disregard of both. Under the system which has hitherto prevailed for dividing money grants, of the proposed subsidy to the two Canadas (\$2,005,408, or 80 cts. per head),

Upper Canada would have received one-half.....\$1,002,701

Whereas, according to population 1,116,872

Difference in favor of the proposed system over the old one.....\$ 114,171

As the moneys have been distributed equally in the past between Upper and Lower Canada, I maintain that the balance of the public debt, say \$5,000,000, to be apportioned between them, should be divided in the same way, and not, as proposed by the Hon. Finance Minister, on population. But it is said the scheme will lead to extravagance. I had hoped, Mr. SPEAKER, that an alliance with the frugal and thrifty population of the eastern provinces would induce the very opposite, and lead to greater economy in the public expenditure than we

have had in the past. (Hear, hear.) With reference, sir, to the cost of the local governments, that subject has been left in the hands of the local legislatures entirely, the resolutions shewing whence their income shall be derived, and what the subsidy shall be without compelling a resort to direct taxation. I claim for this scheme, Mr. SPEAKER, that it will give us national importance. (Hear.) But here again it is objected that to obtain this we must have a vast population. When the colonies now forming a portion of the American union severed the connection from the parent state, their population was set down at 2,500,000, and although an impression has very generally obtained that they have increased in population faster than we have, an examination into the facts shows that such is not the case—for in 1860 their population reached 30,000,000, an increase of 1,200 per cent, while ours in the same period had increased from 145,000 in 1784, to 3,000,000 in 1861, or over 2,300 per cent. (Hear.) Confederation, sir, would give us nationality—I speak of British nationality—a nation created from the fragmentary portions of the provinces of Britain on this continent, but still retaining its allegiance to the British Crown. Then, sir, it is claimed that the commercial advantages which may arise from Confederation of the provinces can as readily be obtained by a Legislative as a Federal union. This is admitted; but as that is not obtainable, and as a union would remove the barriers to commercial intercourse and foster the trade between the colonies (each of which now effects more exchanges with the United States than with all the rest of the provinces), it is desirable that the union should take place. (Hear.) This leads me, sir, to remark upon the probable abrogation of the Reciprocity treaty. The country will be glad to know, from the announcement made to the House on Monday last, that the Ministry is alive to the importance of entering into immediate negotiations, through the English Government, with that of the United States, for the renewal of this treaty. (Hear, hear.) I am not of the number who believe that the advantages accruing from this treaty have been all on the side of Canada; for, from the statements lately published, it appears that the whole trade of 1854 was... \$24,000,000 And in 1863 43,000,000

An increase in ten years of

nearly 180 per cent.....	\$19,000,000
The exports from Canada to the United States amounted in ten years to	\$150,000,000
Imports into Canada in do ...	195,000,000
	<u>\$45,000,000</u>
The difference in favor of the United States being paid in gold.	
In 1854 free goods imported into Canada from the United States amounted to	\$ 2,000,000
And in 1868	19,000,000
Increase in ten years 850 per ct.	<u>\$17,000,000</u>

I do not fear, sir, but that the treaty will be renewed; enlightened counsels will prevail, and, with the better feeling existing between the two countries, the subject will be taken up in a proper spirit, and legislated upon accordingly. (Hear.) The construction of the Intercolonial Railway is said to be a necessity of the proposed union, and without it there can be no union except in name. Calculations have been made which show that this road cannot be used for carrying heavy merchandise at remunerative rates, more especially flour, which it has been shown would cost \$2.25 per barrel from Toronto to Halifax, at two cents per ton per mile. The Grand Trunk Railway now carries flour from Toronto to Montreal for 25 cents per barrel during winter, and at the same rate a barrel of flour would cost \$1.22. If this could be done, the difference in cost between winter rates and shipping *via* the St. Lawrence in summer, at 85 cents per barrel, would be made up in a saving of storage, interest, and insurance. Then there is the military aspect of the subject, which has already been thoroughly discussed. I contend, sir, that union with the Maritime Provinces not only allies us more closely to them and to each other, but also to that power which alone could render us aid whenever subjected to attack; and, regarded from this point of view, this railroad is said to be a necessity. Lord DURHAM in his report said:—

An union for common defence against foreign enemies is the national bond of connection that holds together the great communities of the world, and between no parts of any kingdom or state did the necessity exist of such a union

more obviously than between the whole of these colonies.

(Hear, hear.) In conclusion; sir, if we reject the proposed union, what is offered as a substitute? In the absence of anything better which will settle our existing difficulties, shall we reject the opportunity now presented and that may never recur? Rather let us, as members of the same family, unite for weal or for woe. By it we secure enlarged commercial intercourse, greater security in case of attack, a remedy for the existing difficulties between Upper and Lower Canada, and also render more lasting the connection now existing with the Mother Country. (Hear.) While in favor of this measure, but believing that it should be submitted for the approval of those who are to be affected by the contemplated change, I shall feel it to be my duty in the first instance to vote against the "previous question," in order that such an amendment may be put, reserving the right to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Peel, when that shall come up for discussion, its object being to submit the question for popular sanction. (Cheers.) If this, however, shall fail, I shall vote, Mr. SPEAKER, for the resolution now in your hands.

The debate was then adjourned.

THURSDAY, March 9, 1865.

MR. D. FORD JONES resumed the adjourned debate. He said—I rise, Mr. SPEAKER, to address the House on the resolutions which you hold in your hand in favor of a Confederation of all the Provinces of British North America. I feel that the question is one involving such very great interests, involving a change in the whole Constitution of the country, and involving consequences which may plunge us into great difficulties, or which may have the very opposite effect—that I feel great diffidence and embarrassment in approaching it. But I feel it is a duty I owe to myself and to those who sent me here, that I should express my opinions on this proposed union, before I record my vote on the resolutions now before the House. I desire to do this, because I cannot give my approval to the whole scheme, some of its details being such that I cannot support them.

HON. MR. HOLT—Hear, hear.

MR. JONES—The way in which I look at this question does not at all depend on whether this hon. gentleman or that hon. gentleman may be at the head of affairs in this country; or whether we may have a Coalition Government or a purely party Government; but I consider we should look at the scheme on its own merits, and deal with it as a whole, giving a fair and square vote on the resolutions as a whole. (Hear, hear.) I think, therefore, that the course which has been taken by the Government to obtain such a vote is the wise and honest course. (Hear, hear.) I think they deserve credit for the step they have taken with a view to bringing this debate to a close. We have been debating this question day after day for a number of weeks, and I must say that the opposition given by hon. gentlemen on the other side has been of a very factious character; time after time they have risen to make motions on this, that, and the other thing, keeping the House from addressing itself to the matter really under debate, and protracting unnecessarily the decision of the question. Only the night before last, when an hon. gentleman had risen for the purpose of addressing the House, they cried out that it was too late, and called for an adjournment of the debate; and yet, when that was agreed to, they wasted two or three hours in moving additions to that motion for adjournment. This was done, too, by hon. gentlemen who were well conversant with the rules of this House, and who must have known that these motions were not in order. At midnight they were too tired to allow the debate to go on, and yet they kept the House sitting after that till three in the morning, discussing mere points of order. (Hear, hear.) That has been the course pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite. And what, on the other hand, has been the course pursued by the Administration? Did they not put a motion on the notice paper—a motion which the factiousness of hon. gentlemen opposite prevented from being put to the vote—to give further time for the discussion of this question, by resolving that instead of its being taken up at half-past seven, it should be taken up at three, the whole time of the House being devoted to it? We have been debating the question for weeks, and though hon. gentlemen opposite have been in their places, they have not proposed a single amendment. And yet, after this had gone on for such a length

of time, so soon as the "previous question" is moved, those hon. gentlemen get up and cry out that they are gagged. Even after the House began to discuss the question at three o'clock, these hon. gentlemen day after day wasted the time by getting in one side-wind after another, in order to create delay, to see if something might not turn up against the scheme. Now, at last, they have got something. Something has turned up in New Brunswick, and I suppose they will now permit us to come to a vote. (Hear, hear.) In discussing this question, I do not see any necessity for going back eight or ten years to the speeches of hon. members. I do not see why lengthy extracts should be read to show that the hon. member for Montmorency opposed the union of the provinces in 1858, or that the hon. member for Hochelaga, at that time, was in favor of it. I do not see what that has to do with the question before us. It is now submitted in a practical form for our decision, and what we have to do is to give a square vote, yea or nay, that we are in favor of this Confederation, or that we are against it. Our circumstances have changed within the last few years; but it is not on that account merely that I now support this union. I have always, upon every occasion, on the hustings, at public meetings and elsewhere, advocated a union of the British North American Provinces; and were our relations with the United States in the same favorable form that existed some five or six years since, I would still give my support to a union. It is, therefore, sir, not because I think there is a great present necessity for the scheme being brought to a speedy conclusion that I now support it. That present necessity, however, now exists, and I do not see why other hon. gentlemen, after a lapse of five or six years, when times have changed, and a greater urgency has arisen for such a union, should not be allowed to change their minds. "Wise men change their minds; fools have no minds to change." (Hear, hear.) Shortly before the meeting of this House, I advertised that I would hold a series of meetings in the riding of South Leeds, for the purpose of placing my views upon this question before my constituents, and to see whether their views accorded with my own; men of all shades of politics were requested to attend these meetings, and they were very numerous and respectably attended, not only by those who supported me, but also by those who were my most bitter opponents at the last

election. And at all of those meetings, some six or seven, not a single voice was raised against the union of these provinces with the Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, and Prince Edward Island. All appeared to think such a union advisable and necessary, not only for commercial purposes, but because it would tend to strengthen the ties that bound us to the Mother Country. It has been said that this union has never been before the people, that it has never been a test question at the polls. Now, sir, so long ago as the year 1826, this union was advocated by Sir JOHN BEVERLEY ROBINSON, one of the most able men this country has ever produced; subsequently, on different occasions, it was adverted to by Lord DURHAM in his celebrated report—also by the British American League, presided over by the late lamented Hon. GEO. MOFFATT of Montreal, and latterly in that despatch to the home Government in October, 1858, over the signatures of the Hon. Messrs. CARTER, GALT and ROSS. Why action was not taken upon that despatch, I cannot say; I leave this matter in the hands of those who at that time administered the affairs of this country, and who are responsible for the course they pursued in allowing it to be dropped. Sir, the union of these provinces would, in my humble opinion, be of the very greatest advantage to us in many points. It would strengthen, and not weaken, as has been said by its opponents, the ties that bind us to the Mother Country. It would give us a standing in the eyes of the world. Instead of being several small, disjointed and fragmentary provinces, as was so ably expressed in the Speech from the Throne, we would form one great nationality, with a population to begin with of nearly 4,000,000 people, which would place us among the list of the first countries of the world. (Hear, hear.) It would tend to strengthen our securities both here and in the Mother Country. Instead of our stocks and our bonds being quoted as if by accident on the Stock Exchange in London, they would be looked for daily, and sought after. It would give us an increased market for our produce and our manufactures, and it would tend more than anything else to cause a tide of emigration to flow to our shores. (Hear, hear.) Now the emigrant in coming to America is preplexed to know to which of the different provinces he shall go, and when he speaks of going to America, the only place he thinks of is New York.

It would create a daily line of steamships from the different points of Europe to Halifax, the nearest point and shortest sea voyage to this country—and with the Intercolonial Railway to bring the emigrant directly through to Canada, who will say that we shall not have a tide of emigration to our shores such as we can scarcely imagine? The only emigration we now have is that induced to come by friends who have made this country a home and have prospered. These, sir, are the reasons, from a political point of view, why I support the resolutions now in your hand. And, sir, in speaking in a commercial sense, and as a commercial man, they shall also have my full and hearty support. (Hear, hear.) Does any one pretend to say that by the addition of nearly a million of inhabitants to these provinces, a thrifty and intelligent people, that this country will not be made more prosperous? Does any one pretend to say, that by taking away the barriers that exist to trade, with a million of people living close alongside of us, that this country will not be advanced? Will we not have largely-increased markets for our manufactures when those hostile tariffs that now meet us at every port in the Maritime Provinces, restricting our trade with them, are removed? Will we not have an increased market for our produce when we are linked together by the Intercolonial Railroad, and when a free interchange of all our commodities exists? Can we remain, as at present, without any highway of our own to the Atlantic, for ingress or egress, for five months of the year? (Hear, hear.) When we see the hostility existing towards us, and forcibly shown towards us, by the press, the people, and the Government of the United States, by the enforcement of the obnoxious passport system, by the notice of the abrogation of the Reciprocity treaty, by the annulling of the bonding system, by the notice given to the Government of Great Britain that the treaty regarding armed vessels on our lakes is to be done away with—when our farmers cannot send their produce for five months of the year to a market; when our merchants, for the same period, cannot get their stocks of merchandise for the supply of the wants of the country; when we are dependent on the generosity of a foreign country even for the passage of our mails to Old England—when that is our position, shall it be said that this union with the Lower

Provinces is not desirable, and that we shall not, as soon as possible, have a railroad across our territory to the Atlantic seaboard, to Halifax, one of the best harbors in the world? Shall we be indebted, be subservient to, be at the mercy of a foreign country for our very existence? (Hear, hear.) Sir, shall we remain dependent upon that country for all these things, or shall we not rather put off our supineness and inertia, and by building the Intercolonial Railway, provide an outlet for ourselves? (Hear, hear.) And simultaneously with the construction of that great work, I hold that for the benefit of the commercial interests of the country we ought to enlarge and deepen our canals. (Hear, hear.) I desire now to read a Minute of the Executive Council, issued by the SANDFIELD MACDONALD-DORION Government, under date 19th February, 1864. It is as follows:—

Although no formal action, indicative of the strength of the party hostile to the continuance of the Reciprocity treaty, has yet taken place, information of an authentic character, as to the opinions and purposes of influential public men in the United States, has forced upon the committee the conviction that there is imminent danger of its speedy abrogation, unless prompt and vigorous steps be taken by Her Majesty's Imperial advisers to avert what would be generally regarded by the people of Canada as a great calamity.

And in another place it is stated:—

Under the beneficent operation of the system of self-government, which the later policy of the Mother Country has accorded to Canada, in common with the other colonies possessing representative institutions, combined with the advantages secured by the Reciprocity treaty of an unrestricted commerce with our nearest neighbors in the natural productions of the two countries, all agitation for organic changes has ceased, all dissatisfaction with the existing political relations of the province has wholly disappeared.

From this Minute it appears to have been the opinion of the SANDFIELD MACDONALD-DORION Government that the abrogation of the Reciprocity treaty would probably be a great calamity to this country. But I am not of that opinion, and I believe that the people of this country will never be so reduced as to go on their knees to pray the Government of the United States to continue the treaty. (Hear, hear.) Indeed, for the past year or two, in consequence of the difference in the

currency between the two countries, we have felt almost as though that treaty had been put an end to already. In consequence of the state of the currency, many of the best interests of this country have been injured, the mining interest of the province has been put a stop to, and the lumbering interest, one of the most important of our many important interests, crippled and paralysed. (Hear.) What much greater injury can befall us, by the abrogation of the Reciprocity treaty, than that we now suffer through the derangement of the currency? Instead of the repeal of the Reciprocity treaty being a great calamity, it will lead to an agitation for organic changes which cannot fail to be of the greatest advantages to the future prosperity of the country. For my part I do not at all like the idea of a document of that kind, emanating from our Canadian Government, falling into the hands of the American people, and leading them to believe that in our estimation the repeal by them of the Reciprocity treaty would be calamitous to this country. (Hear, hear.) I repeat that I do not believe that the abrogation of that treaty will eventually be detrimental to our interests. It is true that we may suffer for four or five years, and suffer greatly, but we will be thrown upon our own resources, and ultimately become strong and self-reliant. Our merchants will no longer be denied an outlet to the ocean during five or six months in the year, except by the favor or forbearance of our Yankee neighbors. Let us put our hands into our pockets to build this Intercolonial Railway, and we will be opening a way to the ocean to our merchants and our farmers for shipping their products over their own territory. And when we are in that position, we shall be able to say to the people of the United States—"You shall no longer be allowed to participate in the benefits of our fisheries—we will close the navigation of our canals against you—and we will cease to permit, without the payment of a heavy duty, the importation into this country of your coarse grains for the supply of our distillers and brewers." And, sir, when it is stated that the importations of these grains have amounted to nearly two millions of bushels annually, it will be seen that after all the reciprocity is not altogether on one side. (Hear, hear.) I think that they will then acknowledge it will be better for them to be on more friendly terms with this province, seeing that we control the navigation of the Welland and St. Lawrence canals, the

natural outlet for the products of the Western States, which in 1863 amounted to the enormous quantity of five hundred and twenty million bushels of grain—they will be dependent upon us, instead of our relying upon them. Compared with the St. Lawrence navigation the Erie canal is but a ditch, and it is closed by the frost earlier in the season than our lake and river navigation. When all these advantages which we enjoy are considered, the people of the United States will see how much better it is to live on terms of friendship and amity with us, instead of, to use a vulgar but forcible phrase, “cutting off their nose to spite their face.” (Hear, hear.) With regard to the proposed resolutions, I stated at the outset that there were portions of the scheme to which I objected, and I may now, sir, be allowed briefly to advert to them. I would prefer that the whole power was concentrated under one head by a legislative union, rather than a Federal union. I fear that the machinery will be complex, and that we will find, under the proposed system, that the expenses of the Government will be much greater than if we had one General Government without these additions of local legislatures for each of the provinces. (Hear, hear.) But I am happy to say that the proposed Federal system is not a reflex of the old Federal union of the United States. Notwithstanding some honorable gentlemen have praised the Federal system in the States as worthy of imitation, still I think our proposed system much to be preferred. It differs in this—the United States Federal system was formed from a number of sovereign states, with sovereign powers, delegating to a central power just as much or as little of their power as they chose; thereby the doctrine of state rights obtained, and, as we have seen within the last four years, has been the cause of bloodshed and civil war, it may be to the probable destruction of that Federal union. Our case is exactly the reverse. Instead of the Central Government receiving its power from the different provinces, it gives to those provinces just as much or as little as it chooses. Hear what the 45th resolution says—“In regard to all subjects in which jurisdiction belongs to both the general and local legislatures, the laws of the General Parliament shall control and supersede those made by the local legislatures, and the latter shall be void so far as inconsistent with the former.” This places the whole control in the hands of the

General Government, making the union as nearly legislative as the circumstances of the various provinces would admit. So much is this the case that the hon. member for Hochelaga fears that it would eventually result in a legislative union—a result to my mind most devoutly to be desired. (Hear, hear.) There are two or three more of the points of the resolutions to which I have objection. The public lands are placed at the disposal of the local legislatures; immigration also is in the hands of the local legislatures, and the seacoast fisheries are in the hands of the local legislatures. These are matters common to the whole, and should, for many reasons, be under the control of the General Government. These various interests, however, are all covered by the 45th resolution of the Conference which I have just read, and which declares that when consistent with the welfare of the General Government, their control will be taken from the local legislatures. (Hear, hear.) I have, as briefly as possible, shewn that in my opinion, in our political and our commercial relations we would be benefited by the union of Canada with the Maritime Provinces. I have also adverted briefly to the objections which I hold to the proposed mode of carrying out the union. I shall now endeavor to show that as a means of defence it is highly desirable. If there is one thing more desirable than another, it is to have the whole forces of the country under one governing power. How might it fare with us, in case of war or invasion, with the provinces disunited? Objections could now be made against the withdrawal of a portion of the militia from one province to the others, without the consent of the government of that province, and before they could be brought into the field, valuable time would be lost, red-tapeism would stand in the way, and the delay might be dangerous. (Hear, hear.) By being united and controlled under one head, troops could be thrown upon any point attacked, at a moment's notice. Objections have been made by hon. gentlemen to any expenditure for the purpose of building fortifications, at proper points, for the defence of the country; but I am satisfied there is no reasonable sum that may be required that will be grudged by the people of Canada; for if there is any purpose for which they will contribute cheerfully, it is for the defence of their country, and to continue the connection and cement the tie that binds us to the Mother Country.

(Hear, hear.) It has been also stated that we could not defend ourselves against an overwhelming power such as the United States. Time was when we did defend ourselves, and that successfully; and if the time should ever come again, the people of Canada and of the Maritime Provinces will not be found backward to defend everything they hold sacred and most dear. (Hear, hear.) It has also been said that we should keep a strict neutrality; in fact that our neutrality should be guaranteed by England, France and the United States, in case war should unfortunately take place between them. But such an idea is too absurd to be considered for a moment. Would the people of this country submit to such an arrangement even if attempted to be carried out? Would we allow England, if forced to go to war with the United States, want the assistance of her Canadian subjects? Could we restrain the people of Canada from doing their duty, when they saw the Mother Country battling with her foes? If I thought such would be the case, I should deny my country, for we should be held up to the scorn and derision of the world. (Hear, hear.) On the question of our defences, I desire to read an extract from the report of Col. JERVOIS, the able engineer sent out to report upon the practicability of defending Canada against attack:—

The question appears to be whether the British force now in Canada shall be withdrawn in order to avoid the risk of its defeat, or whether the necessary measure shall be taken to enable that force to be of use for the defence of the country. The sum required for the construction of the proposed works and armaments at Montreal and Quebec would only be about one year's expense of the regular force we now maintain in Canada. It is a delusion to suppose that force can be of any use for the defence of the country, without fortifications to compensate for the comparative smallness of its numbers. Even when aided by the whole of the local militia that could at present be made available, it would, in the event of war, be obliged to retreat before the superior numbers by which it would be attacked, and it would be fortunate if it succeeded in embarking at Quebec, and putting to sea without serious defeat. On the other hand, if the works now recommended be constructed, the vital points of the country could be defended, and the regular army would become a nucleus and support, round which the people of Canada would rally to resist aggression, and to preserve that connection with the Mother Country which their loyalty, their interests, and their love of true freedom alike make them desirous to maintain.

Such is the report of Col. JERVOIS, one of

the ablest men on those subjects in the English service, and I think it can with greater reason be relied upon than all the mere assertions of hon. members, who are not supposed to know much, if anything at all, upon a subject which they have never made a study, and upon which they have had no experience whatever. (Hear, hear.) Sir J. WALSH also, a few days since, in a speech upon an Address to Her Majesty for papers and correspondence with the American Government in relation to the Reciprocity treaty, and the notice for a finality of the treaty restricting the number of armed steamers upon our inland waters, spoke thus:—

There might be some hon. gentlemen who would contemplate, without shame or regret, the total and entire severance of the connection between England and Canada, and who would say that this country would get rid thereby of a source of much embarrassment, expense and trouble. He would, however, tell those hon. gentlemen that Great Britain could not, if she would, cut Canada adrift. As long as Canada retained her desire to be connected with this country—as long as Canada preserved her spirit and her resolution to be independent of America, so long would England be bound by her honor, by her interests, and by every motive that could instigate a generous or patriotic nation, to sustain, protect and vindicate the rights of Canada, and to guard her, whether as an ally or a dependency, against the aggressions of the United States; it was impossible for England to shrink from the obligation. The day might come when the Chancellor of the Exchequer would come down, and in happy phase and with mellifluous eloquence, congratulate the House upon having emancipated itself from a source of military expenditure. He might felicitate the House that Birmingham was sending admirably finished Armstrong and Whitworth guns to arm the new naval forces of America on the Canadian lakes. He might congratulate the House that Birmingham was sending out a plentiful supply of fetters and handcuffs to be used in coercing the refractory Americans. The right hon. gentleman might, at the same time, be able to congratulate the House upon a vast amount of commercial prosperity, and announce that he was able to reduce the income tax a penny or two pence on the pound. But if ever that day should come, and if ever that speech were made, the whole world would observe that the old English oak was not only withered in its limbs, but was rotten at its heart. There was, in fact, no escape from the obligation which bound Great Britain, by every tie of national honor and interest, to maintain and defend Canada. The question was not one merely between England and Canada, but was one between England and the United States. It appeared to him that the notice given by the American Government was an act of such unmistakable hostility, that it almost

amounted to a declaration of war, and at a much earlier period of our history, it would have been so regarded.

When such views are held in England, when so strong a desire is manifested in Canada to maintain our connection with England, and to remain under the sheltering folds of that flag we love so well, shall it be said that we have not the spirit left to defend ourselves? I know, sir, that the people of Canada will not be backward, should ever that time arrive. I feel that there is some of the spirit of 1812 still left among us. I am convinced that the blood of those men who left the United States, when they gained their independence, and who gave up all in order to live under the protection of the laws of Old England—the blood of those old U. E. Loyalists, I say, still courses through our veins. (Hear.) Sir, I trust that this union may be consummated, in order that British power on this continent may be consolidated, our connection with the Mother Country cemented and strengthened, and that under this union this country may be made a happy home for hundreds of thousands of emigrants from the Mother Country—a happy and contented home for all now living here, and for our children and children's children for generations to come. (Hear, hear, and cheers.)

MR. CARTWRIGHT, said—MR. SPEAKER, the turn which this debate has assumed of late is somewhat remarkable. Up to a very recent period, hon. gentlemen opposite have dwelt chiefly on the extreme—I think they even said the indecent—haste with which this project has been pushed forward. They have asserted that this scheme was the sole, the only bond of union between the members of the present Ministry, and further, that so rash, so inconsiderate was their eagerness to effect their end at any cost, that they have seriously compromised our interests by undue concessions to the remaining provinces, and notably to Newfoundland and New Brunswick. Latterly, however, the question has assumed a new and different phase. It has been discovered that so far from being a bond of union, the project of Confederation is a mere pretext, a blind to cover their predetermination to maintain their position at all hazards. Now, sir, passing over the obvious inconsistency of these contradictory accusations, passing over the absurdity of calling the Confederation the sole bond of union, and yet a sham to cover that union, I shall have a few words to say as to the reasons which induced me, in com-

mon with a great majority of this House, and I believe with a great majority of the people of this country, to support honorable gentlemen on the Treasury benches, not only as regards the project we are now discussing, but as to their general policy in effecting the extraordinary fusion of parties which took place last summer. Sir, it is idle to talk of that step as if those honorable gentlemen were alone responsible for their conduct on that occasion. What they did was done with the full knowledge and consent of their supporters, and reflects on our honor, if wrong, quite as much as on theirs. But, sir, I am very far indeed from admitting that we were wrong. I think the reasons which influenced us then were strong enough to justify us fully; those reasons are tenfold stronger now. To understand them, MR. SPEAKER, we need only glance at the parliamentary history of the last few years, and then ask ourselves whether any language is too strong, any sacrifice too great, to put an end to the state of things which prevailed throughout that period. But first, sir, let me pause to deal with the charge of undue haste. Doubtless the rapidity with which these negotiations have advanced was as remarkable as it was unexpected. I believe there is hardly an instance in which a political project of such magnitude and delicacy has made such astonishing progress in so short a time; and so far from holding it an objection, so far from allowing that this is any evidence that the country has been taken by surprise in assenting to this scheme, I hold that it is, on the contrary, the best possible omen of its ultimate success, no matter what temporary checks it may encounter, because it shows conclusively not only how zealously and honestly Ministers have devoted themselves to the task of carrying it into effect, but, which I think of even more importance, because it proves how powerfully the events of the last few years have contributed to mature men's views on this subject, and shows that, so far as this province is concerned, my honorable friends are but aiding to carry out a foregone conclusion—a conclusion long since arrived at by every man among us who desires to maintain our independence or our connection with the British Crown; that in this, or some such scheme as this, lies our best, if not our only hope of escaping absorption into the great republic which adjoins us. Sir, this is an argument which perhaps has more weight with me than with some hon.

gentlemen before me. It may be that there are some even here who are secretly dazzled by the magnificent vision, so dear to American statesmen, of an empire which shall spread from sea to sea, and unite every scattered state and province from the Gulf of Mexico to Hudson's Bay under one law and one rule. Sir, I can understand the fascination which such an idea can exercise; I can even sympathise with it to some extent; and it is just because I do understand it that I am prepared to oppose it to the utmost, believing that in the long run the establishment of a power so gigantic could not fail to be fraught with the greatest misfortunes to those who might live under it, if not to the whole human race. And now, sir, to return to my subject, I would like to take a rapid glance at the perils from which we have but lately escaped; and in so doing, I shall speak only of those of which I have myself been, cognizant in my own parliamentary career, brief though it is; and I appeal again to the consciousness of every honorable gentleman, whether there is anything in the events of the past two sessions of which we have much reason to feel proud, save, perhaps, their closing scene? What was our position, Mr. SPEAKER; what was that position which some honorable gentlemen have the hardihood to affect to regret? Two dissolutions granted (though in the latter case the Royal prerogative was not exercised); three changes of Ministry within the space of a single twelvemonth; the fate of cabinets dependant on the vote of a single capricious or unprincipled individual, in a House of 130 members; a deficient revenue and a sinking credit; all useful legislation at a stand-still—these, sir, were circumstances which might well have filled us with apprehension, had they occurred in a time of profound peace; but which, sir, coming, as they did, at a period when we are menaced with the gravest danger which can befall a free people, would have argued us deaf and blind to every lesson which the misfortunes of our neighbors ought to teach us, had we not embraced the very earliest opportunity to extricate ourselves from such a position; and the wonder to me is not that our statesmen should have shown themselves willing to bury their private grudges and paltry personal animosities, but rather that we could have been infatuated enough to permit such a state of things to continue

at such a crisis for two whole years. It is not for me to say who has been most to blame in the past. I judge no one, still less do I undertake to defend them; but I speak of acts patent and known to all, when I say that the position of parties in this province, the bitterness and virulence of party feeling, and the narrowness and acrimony to which those feelings gave rise, were degrading and demoralizing us all to a degree which it is not pleasant to look back upon even now. And so far from regarding the union of parties which has taken place as a political misfortune in itself, or as tending to deprive the people of any safeguard, I say that it was of the greatest importance to our people that they should be relieved, if only for a brief period, from the desperate party struggles in which they have been engaged—that a lull of some kind should be afforded, that they should have some opportunity of considering the grave dangers which encompass them, some chance of escaping from the state of practical anarchy into which they had been drifting. It is to their credit, Mr. SPEAKER, and to the credit of those who control the press of this country, that ever since this project has been fairly before us a very marked improvement has taken place in the whole tone and temper of public discussion. Of the press, in particular, I must say that the moment they were relieved from the necessity of supporting party manoeuvres—the moment a subject of sufficient importance was submitted for consideration, they seem to have risen at once to the level of the subject, and to have abandoned all those unhappy and rancorous personalities which, in times past, were too apt to disfigure their pages. Sir, I believe the people of Canada have learned a lesson which they will not easily forget. I believe that henceforward it will not be found so easy to array citizen against citizen, race against race, as it has been heretofore. I believe our people have discovered that men who rise to be the heads of great parties are not of necessity villains and scoundrels—that both sides may have great political principles to maintain—that the words Reformer and Revolutionist, Conservative and Corruptionist, are not absolutely convertible terms, and that men who have given up the best part of their lives, and sacrificed too often, the best part of their fortunes in the service of their country, have had some better and higher reasons than mere love of

jobbery and intrigue for doing so. To me, sir, this appears a matter of great moment. It is only too notorious how much of the misery and misfortune which has befallen the United States, is to be traced to the systematic degradation of their public men. It is well for us that the matter is still in our own power. It is well for us that we have still the choice whether we will have statesmen or stump orators to rule over us—whether this House shall maintain its honorable position as the representatives of a free people, or whether it shall sink into a mere mob of delegates, the nominees of caucuses and of wire-pullers. It is still in our power to decide whether we shall secure a fair share of the best talent we possess to carry on the affairs of the country, or whether we will ostracise from our councils every man of superior ability, education or intelligence—with what practical results we need not look far abroad to see; and I think, sir, it is fast becoming apparent that in this, as in other matters, the people of Canada are well disposed to adhere to the traditions of their British ancestry. There is one objection, Mr. SPEAKER, which has been advanced perpetually throughout this debate by some hon. gentlemen who, while unable or unwilling to show any valid reason against Confederation in itself, profess themselves bitterly scandalised at the political combination by which it is likely to be brought about. Now, sir, I admit at once that there is a prejudice, a just and wholesome prejudice, against all coalitions in the abstract. I admit that that prejudice is especially strong in the minds of Englishmen, and that, in point of fact, a coalition is always an extreme measure, only to be had resort to in cases of extreme emergency. A coalition, Mr. SPEAKER, may be a very base act, but it may also be a very noble one. It may be a mere conspiracy, for purposes of revenge or plunder, on the part of men hating and detesting each other to the uttermost—or it may be an honorable sacrifice of private personal enmity before the pressure of overwhelming public necessities, to escape from great danger or to carry a great object. Sir, I shall not insult the intelligence of the House by enquiring whether this present existing Coalition has proposed to itself an object of sufficient importance to warrant its formation. Even those who censure the details of this scheme most strongly are fain to do homage to the grandeur of the project, and

are compelled to admit that a union which should raise this country from the position of a mere province to that of a distinct nation, is a project well worthy of the utmost efforts of our statesmen. To determine the remaining question whether the position of our affairs were so critical as to require the utmost energy of all our leaders, and to justify any union which gave a reasonable hope of extricating ourselves from our difficulties, I must again revert to the condition in which we found ourselves during the last few years, and I ask every hon. member to answer for himself whether it was one which it gives him any pleasure to look back upon? Was it pleasant for us, Mr. SPEAKER, a young country without one penny of debt which has not been incurred for purposes of public utility—was it pleasant for us, I ask, to find our revenue yearly outrunning our expenditure in the ratio of 20, 30 or even 40 per cent. per annum? Was it pleasant for us to know that some of our once busiest and most prosperous cities were being depopulated under the pressure of exorbitant taxation? Was it pleasant for us, inhabiting a country able to sustain ten times its present population, to find capital and immigrants alike fleeing from our shores, even if they had to take refuge in a land desolated by civil war? Was it pleasant for us, sir, the only colony of England which has ever vindicated its attachment to the Empire in fair fight, to know that our apathy and negligence in taking steps for our own defence was fast making us the byword to both friend and foe? And lastly, Mr. SPEAKER, I ask was it pleasant for us, needing and knowing that we needed a strong Government above all things, one which should maintain a firm and steady policy, and possess the good-will and support of at least a large majority of our people—I say, sir, was it pleasant for us at such a crisis to find ourselves the victims of a mere political see-saw—to be sure only of this one fact, that whatever course of policy was adopted, the circumstance that it emanated from one party would cause it to be viewed with jealousy and suspicion by the whole remaining moiety of the nation? I would not have it thought, Mr. SPEAKER, that in saying this, I am blind to the difficulties with which our statesmen have had to struggle. So far from this I believe that it has been quite too much the fashion to underrate them in times past. We have spoken of them as if it were the easiest task in the

world to blend together, in less than one generation, two distinct peoples—peoples differing from one another in race, in language, in laws, customs and religion—in one word, in almost every point in which it is possible for men of European origin, and professing one common Christianity, to differ from each other. Sir, this could never have been an easy task. It is one which has again and again baffled the ablest statesmen of the most powerful monarchies of Europe; and I will not undertake to say whether it is ever capable of complete accomplishment. Be that as it may, I know that in every empire which has ever existed, from the English to the Roman, which has held different races under its sway, it has always been found necessary to make large allowances for distinctive national traits—has, in fact, been found necessary to introduce in some measure the Federal element, though it is equally true that in every state which deserved the name of an empire, the supreme authority of the central power in all that concerns the general welfare has been acknowledged unreservedly. And, sir, it is just because this seems to have been effectual in all essential points in the scheme now before us—because, while reserving to the General Government the power of the purse and the sword, it accords the amplest defensive powers to the various local bodies—because, even where there may be some conflict of jurisdiction on minor matters, every reasonable precaution seems to have been taken against leaving behind us any reversionary legacies of sovereign state rights to stir up strife and discord among our children. For all these reasons, I say, I am disposed to give my hearty support to the scheme as a whole, without criticising too narrowly the innumerable details which it must inevitably present to attack. All I hope is that in adjusting our new constitutions, local and general, we shall not allow our minds to be warped by antiquated notions of the dangers which threaten our liberty. No fear here, Mr. SPEAKER, for many a day to come at least, of perils which await us from the tyranny of hereditary rulers, or the ambition of aristocratic oligarchies. No, sir, no; and while it is true that here as elsewhere, there are always dangers enough to retard our progress, I think that every true reformer, every real friend of liberty will agree with me in saying that if we must erect safeguards, they should be rather for the security

of the individual than of the mass, and that our chiefest care must be to train the majority to respect the rights of the minority, to prevent the claims of the few from being trampled under foot by the caprice or passion of the many. For myself, sir, I own frankly I prefer British liberty to American equality. I had rather uphold the majesty of the law than the majesty of Judge Lynch. I had rather be the subject of an hereditary monarch, who dare not enter the hut of the poorest peasant without leave had and obtained, than be the free and sovereign elector of an autocratic President, whose very Minister can boast the power of imprisoning one man in New York and another in St. Louis by the touching of a bell-wire! I said, sir, that there were many reasons why we should all unite in furthering this project. It is not merely because of the barriers to material progress which it will remove—though I am far from undervaluing their importance; it is not merely because of the higher prizes which it will throw open to individual ambition—though I do not affect to despise this either; but it is chiefly, after all, because I believe it will be found to have the most beneficial results, in elevating our politics and in inspiring our people with those feelings of dignity and self-respect which lie at the bottom of all real national greatness. Sir, I can only liken our position for some time past to that of a youth who has been allowed to take possession of his inheritance at an age when he is not yet legally responsible for his actions. I do not believe that such a position is good either for a nation or an individual, and I for one rejoice that it is about being brought to a close. There were several other subjects, Mr. SPEAKER, which I had intended to allude to; but I find my voice is still too weak to allow more than a few remarks. Still, sir, I do not wish to sit down without saying briefly that I am glad to find one lesson at least, which the British Constitution ought to teach us, is beginning to be impressed upon our people. That Constitution, Mr. SPEAKER—though we have not always been sufficiently alive to the fact—while it does not require the possession of those lofty, impracticable virtues which most republican institutions demand from their votaries, does nevertheless presuppose a reasonable amount of discretion at the hands of those who are intrusted with the

carrying out of its details. And, sir, though it is true that it does recognise the calm, deliberate, just decision of the majority—and the calm and deliberate decision is almost always just—as final in the last resort, it does still so abound with safeguards—with latent checks of all kinds—checks established, many of them, more by custom and usage than by positive law—as to make it all but impossible for any majority, however strong, to perpetrate any gross act of injustice on a minority, so long as that minority could command but one or two resolute representatives on the floor of Parliament. Sir, it is impossible not to feel that it is in a very great degree to this fact, to the instinctive sense of the inherent powers of self-defence which our customs give to the weak against the strong—to the conviction that to drive any party to despair would create an inevitable dead-lock—that England owes it that she has contrived to administer her affairs for near two hundred years without any overt acts of tyranny or one direct collision or irregular interference with the ordinary course of law. Sir, I rejoice to see that we will continue to adhere to a system which has borne such good fruit, as a whole, in the parent land; and I think the reflection how difficult, if not how dangerous, it is to oppress a determined minority under such a system, may serve to calm the fears of those honorable gentlemen who dread the loss of local rights and privileges at the hands of the stronger race. For the rest, Mr. SPEAKER, though I will venture upon no predictions—though I know we must expect many difficulties, many checks before we can hope to bring so great an enterprise to a successful issue—I trust I may be pardoned for expressing my conviction that the loyalty and fidelity of the early settlers of this country—and I speak here without regard to any special nationality—is destined to be rewarded in the way in which they would most have desired to see it rewarded if they had lived to see this day, by the establishment of a kingdom on the banks of the St. Lawrence, which, without binding itself down to a slavish adherence to the customs of the old world, would yet cherish and preserve those time-honored associations our American neighbors have seen fit so recklessly to cast away. Sir, our forefathers may have had their faults; but still, in spite of all, I dare affirm that the brave, self-sacrificing spirit they dis-

played—their manful struggle against heavy odds—and last, but not leaſt, the patient, law-abiding ſpirit which has ever induced them to prefer reform to revolution, even when engaged in ſweeping away the laſt veſtiges of worn-out feudal ſystems in Church and State from their miſt—I ſay, ſir, that theſe afford us ample proof that the men to whom, I hope, we ſhall ſoon look back as the founders of a new nation, were anceſtors of whom any people might be proud; and I truſt that we, their deſcendants, may prove ourſelves but half as capable of adminiſtering and developing the vaſt inheritance which awaits us. Sir, I believe that even we ourſelves are but juſt beginning to grow aware of the immense reſources, whether in field or foreſt, in mine or in minerals, in ſeas or in fiſheries, with which it abounds; that we are but juſt beginning to appreciate the advantages which ſurround us—our all but unparalleled internal navigation; a healthy and far from over-rigorous climate, and a country which, even if it does not preſent the ſame facilities for accumulating enormous fortunes in the hands of a few individuals which ſome other lands may afford, ſtill promiſes, and, I think, will continue for many a day to promiſe, comfort and competence to every man who is willing to work for it. Older nations, Mr. SPEAKER, are working for us even now. Older nations are accumulating the ſkill and the capital which will yet be transferred to our ſhores, if our own folly do not prevent it. Older nations are even now buſied in ſolving thoſe problems which advanced civilization is ſure to bring to us in our turn; and we, if we are wiſe, may learn and profit by their example. A little patience, a little forbearance, a little timely conceſſion to mutual prejudices, a little timely preparation againſt poſſible dangers, and we may well hope to eſtabliſh a ſtate which, in all eſſential attributes of power and happineſs, need not fear comparison with any other on this continent. Let us not be daunted by any accidental checks—we muſt lay our account to meet ſuch in matters of not one-tenth its importance—this is the time and this the hour; never again can we hope to enter on our taſk under circumſtances better fitted to remove the natural, the inevitable prejudices which muſt exiſt between ſo many different provinces—never again can we hope to receive a warmer and more energetic ſupport from the Imperial authorities—never again can we hope to ſee a

Ministry in office which shall command more completely the confidence of the great mass of our people, and which shall possess the same or equal facilities for adjusting those sectional difficulties which have disturbed us so long; and I trust that in this most important crisis, this House will show itself not altogether unworthy to be intrusted with the destinies of three millions of their countrymen. My own years are not very many, Mr. SPEAKER, but yet even I can remember when Canada was but a petty province, an obscure dependency, scarce able to make its voice heard on the other side of the Atlantic without a rebellion; forgotten or ignored, as if, as the French Minister said when he signed the treaty for its surrender, "it mattered not what became of a few barren acres of snow!" And yet, sir, in less than thirty years I have lived to see Canada expand into a state equal in numbers, in resources and power of self-government to many an independent European kingdom—lacking only the will to step at once from the position of a dependency to that of an ally—a favored ally of the great country to which we belong, and to take that rank among the commonwealth of nations which is granted to those people, and to those only, who have proved that they possess the power as well as the wish to defend their liberties. This, sir, is what I think Canada can do; this is what I think Canada ought to do; and if, as I believe, this project of Confederation would contribute most powerfully to enable us to do so, there are few sacrifices which I would refuse to make for such an object—much more, forgive my honorable friends yonder for having in time past spoken somewhat over harshly and hastily of each other. Let them only persevere, let them only go on and complete the task which I will say they have so nobly begun, and they will have made good their claim—I do not say to the forgiveness—but to the regard, the affection, the esteem of every man who shall hereafter bear the name of Canadian. (Cheers.)

MR. HARWOOD said—Mr. SPEAKER, the importance of the proposed measure; the fatal consequences which would result to the country if the plan of Confederation were rejected by this House; the sources of social, political and commercial prosperity with which the measure of Confederation is pregnant, if it is adopted with a firm determination on the part of all to contribute their part towards its perfect working, are such,

that notwithstanding the eloquent speeches delivered on the subject on both sides, and which seem to have completely exhausted it, I consider it my duty to make known to the country the reasons which influence me to assist in passing it. Called, as we all are, to record our votes either for or against this great constitutional change, it is no more than right that every one should in his own way account for the part which he may take in a measure which will naturally inaugurate a new era in the parliamentary annals of Canada. (Hear, hear.) I have listened attentively to the opponents of the measure, and read their speeches again and again, and truly the only effect they have had on my mind is a stronger conviction that in the anomalous position of the country, a Federal union of all the Provinces of British North America is the only remedy for all the innumerable difficulties which are shadowed forth on our political horizon. (Cheers.) The opponents of the measure, not being able positively to deny the advantages of Confederation to all the five provinces of British America, endeavor to get up a cry that this union would involve the loss to us French-Canadians, and Catholics, of our nationality, our language, our laws and institutions. I, for my part, cannot look upon it in so terrible a light—having all history before me, I cannot come to that conclusion. I shall soon shew clearly that there exists throughout the world confederations in which are included different nationalities, different religious sects, and in which, nevertheless, the most thorough equilibrium prevails of the political, civil and religious rights pertaining to the different classes of which they consist. Do we find any other means of settling our difficulties of all kinds besides this of Confederation? No, I find none; and none is proposed to us by the opponents of the plan now before the House! Mr. SPEAKER, the country is come to a political dead-lock; we have arrived at a crisis; ambition, the thirst of power, political passions worked upon in all ways and on all sides, have so clogged the wheels of the machine of government, that it has been brought to a stand-still; and those who guided its movements have had to rack their brains to find some way of continuing the transaction of public business—a way by which we may arrive at a solution of the difficulty, and escape from the slough of *status quo* in which the wheels of government are stuck fast, and by which we may return to the

high road of progress and improvement. Truly, Mr. SPEAKER, if the bitterest enemy of Canada had had it in his power to invent an inclined plane on which he might place us to hurry us to ruin, he could not have done it better than the different political parties have done it within the last few years. Elections on elections, one Ministry succeeding another; one crying out extravagance, the other issuing commissions of inquiry to try to make places for its friends—what, in short, has been the course of events for the last few years? Since the 21st May, 1862, have we not had four or five governments who have managed the affairs of the country? One we had which seemed to be “the darling of the nations,” the paragon government of economy and retrenchment, the MACDONALD-DORION Government. What did it do for the country? Nothing, absolutely nothing; it had not even the moral courage to stand by its own measures. In the beginning of February, 1864, it brought in a bill (that respecting sheriffs). Well, what did it do in the circumstances? Afraid of its own work, it stood aghast at the remonstrances of some of its own partisans, who were contumacious—despair fell upon the leaders—the camp was a scene of confusion; and lo! one fine day this Ministry, which was to bring back the golden age of happiness and prosperity, sank placidly to rest—became a thing of the past, and left “not a wreck behind” to mark its accession to power. In a word, that pattern Administration died in its virginity, died with the famous scheme of retrenchment in its hand, and a still-born “budget” on its conscience! (Continued laughter and cheers.) I ask every man of sense how many such governments as that we should require to take the ship of the country’s welfare into port—to redeem us from our unhappy condition—to calm the strife of parties—to settle the many questions, often irreconcilably incompatible with each other, which had so long agitated the different sections of the country—a strife which threatened to become perpetual? What would have become of us if a providential piece of good fortune had not brought together the men who compose the present Administration? Every one can conceive that the Coalition Government, the only possible one in such circumstances, came in just in the nick of time; and, as a proof of its fitness for its mission, it “took fortune by

the forelock,” as the proverb says, and cleverly made use of opportunity. In fact, three months after the present Ministry was formed, three of the Lower Provinces, comprehending the utility of a union among themselves, conceived the idea of forming one from which might flow strength and prosperity to all; being convinced that a state of disunion such as theirs had always been—their commerce paralyzed by hostile tariffs—was a political suicide. They therefore sent delegates to Charlottetown, to devise a plan among themselves for the purpose of solving, in some profitable manner, the difficulties which beset them, the three provinces. What course did our Government then take? The members of the Cabinet—too wise to disregard the importance of the movement—too statesmanlike to neglect its advantages—found means to take part in the proceedings at Charlottetown; and being convinced that a Federal union of all the Provinces of British North America would be the real salvation of the country, laid before the delegates at Charlottetown a large, well-digested scheme based on a regard for justice and equality in respect of the rights and privileges of all; a scheme by which each origin and each belief will enjoy full and complete protection; a scheme of Federal union, in a word, having for its apex the powerful axis of England; for its foundation, social, political and commercial prosperity; and for its cornerstone, constitutional liberty in all its amplitude and strength. (Cheers.) This idea of a Confederation of the provinces is not a new one. All who are in the slightest degree acquainted with the parliamentary history of the country, are aware that a plan for the Confederation of the British North American Provinces was one of the bases upon which the programme of the CARTIER-MACDONALD Administration rested in 1858. It may be asked—“Why should we have Confederation?” “Why should we not remain as we are?” It is impossible, and its impossibility is proved by the past. Let those who do not see the seasonableness of the Confederation look at what is going on on the other side of the line—what do they see there? The threatened abrogation of the Reciprocity treaty. The abrogation of the transit system is threatened. A passport system, which throws the greatest possible obstacles in the way of our free travel through the States, and does serious injury to the development of our trade, has been inaugurated. We have no means of com-

manicating during the winter with the Mother Country, except by passing over American soil, and our passage over that soil is merely tolerated; we may at any moment be deprived of this privilege, and in that case we should find ourselves all at once, during the long winter season, without any possible means of communication with Europe. These reasons are more than sufficient to cause us to seek to improve our position, and the only possible means by which to effect that object, is a commercial, social and political union with our sister colonies, the Maritime Provinces. I hear honorable members say—"Why not rather have the repeal of the union?" "Why not leave Upper and Lower Canada separate as they were previous to 1840?" Such a measure would probably put an end to the reiterated demands of Upper Canada for representation based upon population, and the fears entertained by Lower Canada, the fear of seeing her institutions endangered, should that system of representation be conceded; but that measure would be rather a retrograde one, which would throw the country back, and would place it in the position which it occupied previous to the union. That measure would abrogate an agreement which has long existed—a union which has proved to the country a well-spring of progress, riches and prosperity. Such a dissolution would only tend to weaken us still more, and we should be but two weak and insignificant provinces, whereas our union has converted us into one province comparatively strong. We can realize the gigantic works which have been carried out when we look upon our canals and our railways. Is there any one man endowed with ordinary fairness—any one man who has not completely taken leave of his senses, who will venture to say that Upper and Lower Canada would have been as far advanced; each of them, as they now are, if they had remained separate, with tariffs inimical the one to the other? "Soon or than have Confederation," will exclaim an opponent, root and branch, of the scheme proposed, "let us concede to Upper Canada representation adjusted on the basis of population wholly and entirely, as the honorable member for Hochelaga would appear in his celebrated manifesto of 1865 to desire;" but this is positively absurd—it is a violation of the spirit and the letter of the Union Act of 1840; it is the principal source of all the difficulties of a sectional nature which have proved the source of difficulty, both in this House

and throughout the country, for several years past. It would be asking for the utter ruin of the civil and religious rights of the French-Canadians. Under such melancholy circumstances, Mr. SPEAKER, what is then left for us? There is left for us the Confederation of all the British Provinces in North America. That is the only possible remedy under existing circumstances. Of two alternatives we must select one. Either we shall form part of a Confederation of the British North American Provinces, or we shall fall into the unfathomable gulf of the Confederation of the neighboring States, formerly the United States. (Hear, hear.) How absurd are they who believe that the United States do not want us, with our mineral wealth and our fisheries, which latter are of themselves an inexhaustible source of riches to the country! The United States did not, in 1776, number more than four millions of inhabitants; there were then only thirteen states; now there are thirty-one states and seven territories—at least that was the number before the war—and a population of more than thirty millions. We know that the prodigious growth of the United States is owing to their purchases, their treaties and their conquests. They want us, and would stir heaven and earth to have us in their grasp. (Hear, hear.) Let us beware! We stand on the brink of the yawning gulf of the American Confederation, falling into which we encounter, first, our share of liability to pay a national debt of three thousand millions of dollars, and an annual expenditure of five hundred millions; and next, a share of their national quarrels and civil wars. Exposed to persecution by the conqueror, and loaded with the heavy burthen of enormous debts incurred in the prosecution of a cruel and fratricidal war—a war of which, be it said, everybody knows the beginning, but of which nobody knows the end—the uncalculating opponents of the measure before us will regret their obstinacy and their disregard of their country's weal. Then they will see the naked features of those democratic institutions which are in reality inconsistent with true liberty—of those boasted institutions, under whose influence the last vestiges of liberty have faded away, as does the light at the close of a bright day. Under them the liberty of the press is unknown; under them, liberty is but a name, a dream, an illusion, a mockery, often a snare; under them no man can venture to speak frankly what he thinks, and must take care

that what he says is in unison with the opinions of the majority of his audience; under them the rights of the minority are unacknowledged, ignored, as if they had no existence: the will of the majority is law. For my part, Mr. SPEAKER, democratic institutions have no charms for me. Liberty, Equality, Fraternity! How many sad and mournful memories are connected with those three words in France? In the name of Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, in the year 1793, that country saw the best of kings led to the guillotine, provinces laid waste, blood flowing like water; the standard of rebellion and insubordination raised and borne triumphantly; the pillage of churches and monasteries, the desecration of the altar; priests, nuns, old men, women, and even children, murdered! Those three magic words were the signal and vindication of the "drownings at Nantes," sometimes called by the fine sounding name of "republican marriages." Yes, Mr. SPEAKER, civil war rages among our neighbors; but let us hope that Divine Providence will guard these new countries from the disasters and the horrid crimes which, to the eternal shame of civilization, stain the history of certain portions of Europe at the close of the last century. It was after a civil war that the terrible proscriptions of MARIUS and SYLLA commenced. Let peace once be made between the Federal and Confederate States, then we shall see the harvest of rancorous hatred cover the earth, the fires of revenge burst forth; then woe to those who have given offence to men of the type and character of the famous General BUTLER. What is incumbent on us, then, if we would escape sharing the horrors of the situation? What but to unite, one and all—to combine all our means, our resources, our energies, and to have confidence in ourselves and in one another—to show England that we intend to emerge from the state of isolation in which each several province has lain as regards the others; that we intend to organize a system, so as to be prepared to do our part in the hour of danger? We have every assurance that England will spend her last man, her last shilling, in defending and protecting us. Having a Federal union, all the wealth which abounds in the five provinces will be most highly developed; our mineral riches, our timber, our fisheries, our commerce, internal and external, our industrial arts and manufactures, will all receive a fresh impulse; capital will flow in, and with it the means of defence of every

description. I do not pretend to say that the mere fact of a "Confederation" will render us invincible. No, far from it, especially when opposed to so formidable, so warlike a foe as the neighboring Confederation has now become; but I do venture to say that if we do our best, England will never desert us, and if the armies of the neighboring Confederacy should occupy our country, it would not be hers to keep it long. It is not essentially a necessity, Mr. SPEAKER, that a small Confederation cannot exist by the side of a large one without being swallowed up and absorbed. If all great nations are bound to subject to their yoke all the little ones, why are there so many small states in Europe? (Hear, hear.) It may be that the mutual jealousies of the great powers are the cause; then who shall say that France—France which fought side by side with England in the Crimea—France which, looking at Mexico, is so deeply interested in the affairs of this continent—would not join with England in a war between that power and the neighboring States, if the latter should undertake to drive the English from the banks of the St. Lawrence? When a nation, strong in its rights, is determined to preserve them, it is often invincible. When XERXES, with a million of men, fell upon Greece, was he not driven back with the total loss of his immense army? When war was declared against the South, was not the North, with its population of twenty millions, going to annihilate the South in three months? It is now more than four years that the war has been raging, and the South, without friends, without allies, is not yet conquered and made to pass under the yoke. The history of Prussia affords a proof of what bravery can achieve, even when opposed to an enemy infinitely superior in numbers. In 1740, the youthful Prince FREDERIC ascended the Throne of Prussia. The country contained no more than 48,000 square miles, and had a population of only two millions and a half, less than the population of Canada alone, as it now is. Her frontier northward was a wall of ice, all the seaports were closed during the winter season; her only ally was lukewarm; to the east, west and south, she was bounded by powerful empires, the population of each of which alone far exceeded that which she could boast. The country was long and narrow; it was flat and well adapted at all points for the movements of troops; no country could be more exposed to an invasion; nevertheless the Prince, unchallenged, threw himself headlong

into a bloody war—as the aggressor—with all his neighbors. Alone, and simultaneously, he had on his hands Austria, France and Russia. Yet he left to his successor a kingdom of 74,000 square miles, and a people numbering nearly six millions. The small and heroic republic of Holland did not hesitate to enter into a war with the mighty monarchy of Spain, then mistress of the wealth of the Indies. At this day her vessels are found in every sea. Java and Sumatra belong to her. Yet her population is smaller than that of the Provinces of British North America. Single-handed in 1848, Piedmont dared to enter on a struggle with Austria. The King of Piedmont had then four millions of subjects; he now reigns over twenty-two millions. Even poor little Greece, with a million of inhabitants, must have its share in revolutions, choose a king, and talk of its rights, its pretensions, and its aspirations. No, Mr. SPEAKER, the one, the only means of safety for us, in the circumstances, is to have a Federal union of all our provinces—a social, political, commercial and military union. Happen what may, when we have done all that men of courage and energy can be expected to do to mend our position, our future will not be so dark as the friends and advocates of the *status quo* would have us believe. Do these wonderful patriots really believe in their hearts, that continuing to be isolated as they are from each other, having no cordial alliance, almost no relations or intercourse, the Provinces of British North America would be either stronger or less exposed to the attacks of the Northern States than they would be if united? Are those persons not original in their ideas who allege that the endeavor of the Provinces of British North America to form a Confederation is a kind of provocation and defiance to the Northern States? If the Northern States made this allegation, the most that could be said of it would be, that it would be a vain pretext, as futile as it would be absurd. Not less ridiculous and misjudging are those persons who pretend that the Confederation of the Provinces of British North America would be a step towards annexation to the Northern States. Truly, there are some minds which have an odd way of looking at things. If, indeed, the opponents of Confederation would only prescribe some other remedy to obviate the evils which threaten us as an effect of Confederation, we should have at least the benefit of a choice; but no—nothing of the sort—they attack, criticise, but suggest

nothing. On the other hand, the principal journals of Europe and several respectable journals in the neighboring States have recorded their approbation of the scheme of Confederation submitted by the Government, and predict a brilliant future for the new empire which is about to arise on this side of the frontier line. (Hear, hear.) Referring to history, we find that confederations have been formed in nearly all ages, and that the principal cause of their formation has been, not only the purpose of mutual protection, but a military object. These two motives combined with a third, that of commercial advantages, suggested the project which now occupies our attention. Among the ancient Greeks there were several Federal unions, the two principal being the *Ætolian* and the *Achæan*; the former, dating from a period long antecedent to that of ALEXANDER, was broken up by the subjection of the states composing the league to Rome, about 180 years B. C.; the second, which was formed about 280 years B. C., was destroyed by the Romans about 150 years before the vulgar era. The *Ætolian* Confederation comprised all the northern parts of Greece on the confines of Thessaly and Epirus, a portion of Central Greece, and several of the islands of the *Ægean* sea. This was a union rather of provinces than of cities. It had a "Constitution," "States General," a chief magistrate, a commander-in-chief, and different public officers, with different functions or powers; the power of declaring war and that of making peace, of levying taxes, coining money current at that time—all were intrusted to the Central Government. The *Achæan* League, on the contrary, was a union, not of provinces, but of cities or towns—not less than seventy in number. There was a Federal capital, a "Constitution," different public officers, each invested with privileges and certain powers and duties, too many to be enumerated in this place. Who has not read the life of ARATUS and that of PHILOPOMEN, the latter one of the greatest statesmen, the other the greatest captain of the *Achæan* union? In reading the history of these nations we shall find that it was their union which saved them so long from the inroads of their enemies, and which, for ages, preserved their autonomy. We next come to the Italian Confederation of the middle ages. Like those of Greece, they derived their origin from military necessity. The League of Lombardy, and that of the Tuscans, were projected principally as a mutual protection

against the emperors, who were greedy of conquest, and among them against **FREDERIC BARBAROSSA**. In that of the Tuscans, there was even an ecclesiastical element of a decided character, inspired by **POPE INNOCENT III.**, its principal author. The famous Roman Tribune **RIENZI** tried to form a Confederation of all the Italian States, but perished without realizing this dream of his existence. Rome was to be the Federal Capital. **RIENZI** died in 1352. The Swiss or Helvetic Confederacy existed from the twelfth century. In 1474 **LOUIS XI.** of France endeavored to subdue it, but lost his trouble. In 1477 **CHARLES THE BOLD** of Burgundy lost his kingdom and life while foolishly assailing this Confederate power. In 1488 the Emperor **MAXIMILIAN** tried also in vain to subjugate the country. Spain likewise endeavored on many occasions to subdue the Confederate States, but failed. In 1798 the Cantons of Switzerland became the Helvetic Republic. In 1803 they fell under the protection of **NAPOLEON I.**, and in 1813 the allies overran them. In virtue of the Federal Act signed at Zurich in 1815, important amendments were made in their Constitution. The purpose of the Helvetic Confederation is the protection of the country against foreigners, the maintenance of peace and tranquility at home, the preservation of public liberty in the Confederation, and the increase of its general prosperity. This Confederation has survived two European revolutions, without mentioning internal troubles, and it is now fifty years old. We must bear in mind that a population the most various, the most mixed in point of origin, language and religion, lives under this Constitution. The people number about two millions and a half; about one and two-thirds of a million speak German, half a million speak French, and the remainder Italian and other languages. One half of the population is Catholic, the other Protestant. Their interests arising from locality, race and faith, are as complicated and as various as are their manners, language and customs, and yet they all are free, all live securely, respected, happy and prosperous. They all enjoy the greatest and the purest liberty. There are twenty-two Cantons; and what is astonishing is that the chief of the Canton of Neuchâtel is a king, the King of Prussia. (Hear, hear.) I shall not speak of the Confederation of the United States of the Netherlands, which had their day, their glory and their use; but I shall say a word of the great Germanic Confederation. This is composed

of forty states of very different size, and contains thirty-four millions of inhabitants. There belong to it kingdoms, grand duchies, duchies, principalities and free cities. In this vast association are Catholics, Protestants, Jews, in short different religions and nationalities, and yet none tyrannise over others; all live happily under the same Federal union and under the protectorate of the Emperor of Austria. Of these states, Austria is, properly speaking, the first in importance; her army in time of peace is 280,000 men, in time of war she can bring into the field 800,000. Prussia is the second, with an army of 200,000 men, and a national militia of 400,000 men. There are, as I have said, in these states various nationalities and different sects of religion, and, nevertheless, the rights of each are preserved in all their integrity. Why then should not we, French-Canadians and Catholics, become a component part of the Confederation of the Provinces of British North America, without any apprehension of seeing our language, our laws, our religion and our institutions endangered? It seems to me that we could find no perfect and complete protection otherwise than by a Confederation of this nature, inasmuch as it is a union based on equity towards the inhabitants of the five provinces as its most vital and fundamental principle. As to the Confederation of the United States, I shall merely name them. Every one knows that in 1775, when the thirteen colonies revolted against England, they believed that the only means of securing internal prosperity and of defending themselves against the common enemy, was to unite together for their mutual protection; clearly perceiving that if they remained separate, and without any bond of union, as the uncalculating opponents of the present plan of Confederation would wish the Provinces of British North America to remain, their defeat was certain, and instead of coming victoriously out of the struggle, they would be easily conquered. I shall now, Mr. SPEAKER, ask to be allowed to say a few words on the other confederations which have existed on the continent of America. In the first place I shall mention that of Central America, or Guatemala. That Confederation was situated on the shores of the Pacific Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico. It consisted of five states—Guatemala, Honduras, San Salvador, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica. These states were peopled by Creoles, Mestizos, Indians and Negroes. Until the year 1821 this Confederation was rich and

prosperous. Guatemala, then, imitating the ill-advised example of other Spanish colonies, declared its independence, and thought fit to set up as a Federal republic; but in 1839 an insurrection detached the state of Honduras from the Confederation, and shortly after the other states also declared themselves to be independent (1847); and what are they now? They have fallen into complete insignificance, a prey to the ambition of numerous dictators, without any common bond, disunited, and therefore without vitality or strength. (Hear, hear.) We next come to the united provinces of Rio de la Plata, now constituting the Argentine republic. The Confederation of La Plata comprised fourteen states, the greater part of which formed at one time a portion of the immense Viceroyalty of Peru. In 1778, being united to the present province of Bolivia, to Paraguay and Uruguay, they formed a particular Viceroyalty, that of Rio de la Plata. In 1810 they took part in the important insurrectionary movement which shook all the transatlantic dependencies of Spain; from that time everything tended to republicanism; separate and independent states became republics. They are now a prey to anarchy and the confusion which attends such institutions. The industrial arts are unheeded, and the commerce limited. If, sir, that Confederation had proved to be faithful to the cause which gave it life, if union had prevailed instead of disunion, strength, power, prosperity and wealth would have fallen to the lot of the association, in place of poverty, misery, and decay, which seem now to be their inevitable fate. (Hear, hear.) But some of the honorable members of this House have maintained that the union would be beneficial to none but the Maritime Provinces, that they alone would derive advantage from it, as they are comparatively poor, while Canada is rich by means of its trade, through its industrial pursuits, its manufactures and its agriculture. I maintain for my part that we are as much in need of them as they are of us—(hear, hear)—both in regard to industry, to trade, and to military power. In the first place, let us consider the various resources of the several Maritime Provinces. Nova Scotia is not, certainly, altogether an agricultural country, but it contains valleys in which the soil is as deep, as rich, and as well suited for farming as the best lands of the West. A large portion of the population are devoted to fishing, and skilled in drawing from the bosom of the deep the inexhaustible treasures which will be a perennial source of

wealth and prosperity to that country; moreover, such a life tends to form men to brave the dangers of the sea, and, in case of need, those hardy seamen would be ready and willing to lend their aid and do their part in the defence of the country. Nor is this all; the country exports prodigious quantities of timber of all kinds, which will not be exhausted for ages to come. Every year they build a great number of ships, and, in proportion to its population, Nova Scotia has a larger amount of "tonnage" than any other country in the whole world. (Hear, hear.) Another source of wealth is possessed by that country, ever abounding, never failing. One would say that nature has especially favored it and endowed it with the most bountiful of her gifts—I mean the rich mines of coal which superabound in that country, which the hand of Providence has placed, as if by express design, not in the interior of the country, but along the sea side. Everybody knows that coal at the present day, when steam does so much that the hand of man formerly did, is one of the principal aliments which nourish the industry of mankind throughout the civilized world. Situated on the shores of the Atlantic, these mines can be worked very cheaply, and are easily accessible to ships of all nations. The charges of loading are small indeed, there is scarcely any land carriage required to convey it to the bays and ports to which the different trading ships resort for their lading. Geologists celebrated for their knowledge have explored these regions, and declare that there are thousands of square miles of coal, and in some places seventy-six beds or layers of coal one above the other. What a fertile source of revenue, of wealth! And when we reflect that the main source of the prosperity of England has been and still is her mines of coal, small in comparison with those of Nova Scotia, we shall find that no change of circumstances, no political ties or relations could ever prevent that province from possessing in its coal measures, a source, an element of wealth, incomparably greater than the famous gold and silver mines of Peru. Thousands of years must pass away, no doubt, before they will be exhausted. I say nothing of the mines of gold, silver and copper, with which the country seems to be covered. And now, am I to be told that Canada, having the benefit of free trade with such a country, is to be no better for it? Does not everybody know that firewood is beginning to run short in the district of Montreal and elsewhere in Lower

Canada, and that if we have no coal to take its place, the country people will in thirty years' time be obliged to abandon their farms for want of means to enable them to bear the cold of our long winters? We shall obtain wood from a distance, some will tell you; but thinking men know very well that firewood is not to be carried far without great expense, which must raise the price so as to put it beyond the reach of the great majority of consumers. Perhaps we shall find coal in Canada. No, says Sir WM. LOGAN, our learned geologist—impossible; science tells us that it does not exist. (Hear, hear.) Now every man who has the least idea of public order, of political economy, must be well aware that a mere commercial union, a union for the levying of customs—a “Zollverein,” in a word—would not suffice to create the well-being and general prosperity of the five provinces. The Maritime Provinces are immensely important to us in a social, industrial, commercial, political, and especially a military point of view. New Brunswick has also considerable resources. Looking at the seasonableness, and the other points making for the union of the provinces, we must not omit to consider it in its relation to our means of defence. In this point of view, Newfoundland is of paramount importance. Casting a glance at it on the chart, we find it lying across the Gulf of St. Lawrence, commanding the two straits by which the trade of the countries surrounding the gulf and the river reaches the ocean. Let that island but fall into the hands of foreigners, the trade of Canada would in war time be as completely stopped as if the ice of winter had erected its permanent domicile in the middle of the gulf. (Hear, hear.) These are the reasons which have led our statesmen to secure, by all possible means, the alliance of that province, as they well understood that, that wanting, the Confederation would lose the benefit of all other advantages and would be in continual danger. The seaboard of Newfoundland is 1,200 miles in length, and it possesses the finest harbours in the world, roadsteads which might shelter whole fleets. The main source of her wealth is her fisheries, in which more than 30,000 men are annually engaged—men accustomed to brave the waves of a tempestuous sea. Her trade in fish with foreign nations brings her in contact with nearly all the maritime countries of Europe, and with the United States, and yet she has at present scarcely any such connection with Canada. What is her position with relation to us at

this moment? Her merchants are forced to resort to the States to transact their business, for, in order to reach Montreal, they must pass through Halifax and Boston. The establishment of a line of steamers between that island and Canada would be a great advantage to both provinces; for Newfoundland possesses what we want and requires what we have. It appears that the Island buys from the United States to the amount of several millions of dollars yearly, and exactly those articles which we are able to furnish; and that the current of trade having taken its present direction, is owing to certain fiscal impediments to trade between the two provinces. With free trade, Newfoundland would buy from Canada woollen stuffs, cutlery and hardware—everything, in short, which she requires. Under Confederation, the town of St. Johns, in Newfoundland, would be the most easterly sea-port of the union, and by making it a port of call for our transatlantic steamers, it would bring us within six days of the Mother Country. As to Prince Edward Island, that also has its importance. Its revenue is well managed; it is in a prosperous state, and has no debt; on the contrary, it has a considerable reserve fund. Accordingly, now is the time to take a step in the right direction. This union of the provinces is a political necessity, and any delay would entail the danger of losing the opportunity altogether, which might never occur again. Canada, with her immense commerce, is indebted for her access to the seaboard during six months of the year to the tolerant good-will of a neighboring nation. If that permission were withdrawn, our merchants must import during the summer all the goods which they require in the year. This would, in the long run, be the loss of the consumer, because everything must, of course, be paid for at a higher rate. Finally—and this is the most important consideration of all for every one, and one which would of itself be sufficient to make us desire the union of the provinces—it would be the most effectual means of procuring the building of the Intercolonial Railway—a road which would open an uninterrupted line of communication between Sarnia and Halifax, thus connecting the two extremities of the Confederation. Three things are necessary, nay, indispensable, to the prosperity of a great empire—the personal element, the territorial, and the maritime element. In Canada we have the personal and the territorial elements; the maritime element alone is wanting, and this we may obtain by the union of the provinces.

(Hear, hear.) As to us, French-Canadians and Catholics, what have we to fear from Confederation? Our language, our rights and our privileges are guaranteed to us. Look at the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland; does it not consist of three distinct nations, holding several religious creeds? Those three nations have fought side by side on sea and land for ages, against the enemies of their country. What glorious victories, what noble deeds in arms have they achieved! And the most perfect harmony exists among them. In England, are the Jews persecuted, deprived of their rights and privileges? Are the Roman Catholics? Is there not residing in the very capital of England a prince of the Romish Church—Cardinal WISEMAN? And, Mr. SPEAKER, who would have believed the fact?—the last census shows that the city of London contains 100,000 Catholics more than Rome itself—Rome the seat of the Catholic Church! And a greater number of Jews than there are in Judea or all Palestine! (Hear, hear.) And yet all these people enjoy their respective rights and privileges, and worship their Creator according to the traditions of their forefathers, unmolested, undisturbed by any. (Cheers.) I now come to the plan of Confederation considered intrinsically. I shall not enter into a discussion of its details; four members of the Administration have given us explanations of it which were so clear and lucid, that it is useless to enter on the subject anew. There are, no doubt, certain points which are not all that we could desire; there are certain articles which I should be disposed to reject if I were not aware that we are to look at the question from five different points of view, and not from one sectional point of view. I can conceive that the Conference considered the plan as a compromise—a treaty in which the five provinces were the contracting parties; that many concessions were found to be necessary, to satisfy the interests of individuals or of localities; that great conciliation was an important element, with a strong wish, by great concessions on all sides, to carry forward an important negotiation, which in their absence would have utterly failed! I am, moreover, convinced that the Ministers of Canada did everything in their power to promote and guard our general and local interests; that their only aim was to make us a great and strong nation; that the dominant idea in their minds was that “a Federal union,” under the protection of England, would be for Canada a harbor of

refuge from all storms, particularly that which now assails us, as well as conducive to advance the best interests and the prosperity of all the provinces; that this union would secure to us the continued enjoyment of our laws and institutions, of our liberties and our relations with the Mother Country, while it would facilitate the development of our national, social, commercial and political prosperity. If we do not adopt it as a whole, if we meddle with its clauses to make radical changes in it, the other contracting parties, justly offended, will reject it wholly, as they understand that we have no right to depart from its provisions without their consent; or if, following our example, the Maritime Provinces should also make changes in it, the whole plan would be so mutilated and disfigured, that it would become a mark for universal disapprobation, and all the labors of the Conference would be rendered useless and abortive. Moreover, if in the meantime the Maritime Provinces, taking up again their old scheme of a union among themselves, should refuse to listen to any overtures we might make, we should, like madmen, have lost the golden opportunity. Nothing would remain for us but annexation to the United States—an idea most abhorrent to my feelings, but one which is, perhaps, in reality, the cherished desire of the unreasoning opponents of the present measure. (Hear.) As a British subject, I find most pleasure in that article of the scheme which declares the Sovereign of Great Britain to be the head of the Executive. The monarchical element will predominate in the Constitution, and we shall thus escape that weakness which is inherent in the Constitution of the neighboring States. Their President, Mr. SPEAKER, is no more than the fortunate chief of a party; he can never be regarded as the father of his people; his reign is but temporary; he is, for four years, a kind of despot, with unlimited power and immense patronage; his favors fall on those only who have elected him, and who can elect him anew at the expiration of four years; none feel the refreshing dews of his favors, save his party. Woe to the unlucky ones who have voted against him at his election! For them there is no smile, no gracious acceptance, no favors. Under the working of our Constitution, on the contrary, as the sovereign is permanent (“the King is dead—God save the King!”) we have at all times in him a father, whose interest and whose

inclination it is to extend his protection equally over the cottage of the poor and over the palace of the rich, and to dispense equal justice to both. (Cheers.) Our Ministers will still be responsible to the people. In the States, the President is under no obligation to consult his Cabinet, which is composed merely of the heads of departments. In the scheme which now engages our attention, all matters of general interest, which are not left to be disposed of by the local legislatures, will be settled by the General or Central Government, and the disposal of local matters will belong to the local governments. Accordingly all necessary power has been assigned to the general as to the local legislatures; and that source of weakness has been avoided which has been so frequent a cause of trouble in the neighboring States—the conflict of jurisdiction and authority between single states and the Federal or Central authority. It is really astonishing to see the different means employed by the journals in the interest of the unreasoning opponents of the plan of Confederation. They utter cries of distress, amidst which the veil of party is easily seen through. According to their views, no good can come out of the system for either party in the commonwealth. "Think twice of what you are doing, you English Protestants of Lower Canada! The Local Government will swallow you up," cries the *Montreal Witness*. "Take care of yourselves, you French-Canadians of the Catholic Church!" bellows the *Montreal True Witness*; "if the plan of Confederation is sanctioned by the Legislature, you will disappear like a dream: the hydra of the Central Government will poison you with its pestiferous breath." (Hear, hear.) And the other journals of the same party, inspired by the same spirit, open full cry on the plan of Confederation, as nothing less than a "political suicide!" Others there are—and some in the interest of the present Government—who have some misgivings, some doubts, touching the clauses relating to marriage and divorce. With respect to the provisions of the instrument which bears on these two important questions, they seem at first sight, I confess, a little alarming to Catholics—to us who have learned from the Church the indissolubility of the marriage bond, who look upon marriage not only as a civil contract, but "a sacrament." With reference to this subject, I answer that the system on which the new Constitution will be based is to be considered in the aspect

which it bears to all the provinces. We are not all Catholics, and the majority are Protestants. Again, if the control of matters connected with marriage and divorce had been assigned to the local governments, what would have been the fate of our co-religionists in Upper Canada, who are in a minority in that province? Add to this, we have not in Canada at present any divorce law, and we need not apprehend that the Federal Government will impose one upon us. Nothing indicates that the proportion of Catholic members in the Federal Legislature will not be about equal to what it is in the Parliament of United Canada. Moreover, everybody is aware that it was by the help of the Protestants, who think as we do on this subject, that we have hitherto escaped the passing of a divorce law. Divorce is not looked upon with a favorable eye by all Protestants; far from it, and we must hope that at no distant time that source of disorder and scandal of every species will be effaced from the parliamentary records of every Christian community. (Hear, hear.) We must bear in mind, also, that there are Catholics elsewhere besides in Lower and Upper Canada; they are to be found in all the Lower Provinces, and what would be their position if these questions were left to the local legislatures? The Catholics, therefore, of both Upper and Lower Canada, as well as those of the Lower Provinces, are directly interested in the removal of these questions from the local legislatures. It seems to me that every man who studies this question in a Catholic point of view, as it stands in the five provinces, will find that the Conference was perfectly right in not leaving the question of divorce to the control of the local governments. I shall not enter into all the details of the plan of Confederation, inasmuch as hereafter each of its clauses will be discussed. I shall reserve, however, the right of adding a few words. I think, therefore, Mr. SPEAKER, that every man who has the interests of his country at heart—every man who will take the pains to read history, the great teacher of kings and nations, will be convinced that situated as are the five provinces of British North America, separated, disunited, with no social, political or commercial ties to bind them together, but having tariffs calculated to injure each other, but no free interchange of commodities—without railways by which they might hold communication during the long winters, when the rivers are obstructed with

ice, and taking into consideration the exceptional position of Canada in respect of its near neighborhood to the United States, and the political troubles which have so long wounded it in its bosom—a Federal union of all the provinces is our only harbor of refuge, and the only means of securing to the Provinces of British North America sure and durable prosperity. (Hear, and cheers.) Now, Mr. SPEAKER, we have seen that in ancient days, in the middle ages, and in modern times, states, provinces and kingdoms desirous of growing in strength, wealth and prosperity—desirous of acquiring power internally, and making themselves formidable to rivals abroad—desirous of means to repel ambitious assailants and enterprising neighbors—combined together—formed confederations with a view to increase the general prosperity, and the means of a common defence and mutual protection. We have seen that it was the surest, the most rational, and the most generally adopted plan in all ages; and why should not we, profiting by the experience of others, do the same? How long has union been a cause of weakness? Is not England, united under one ruler, infinitely more powerful than in the days of the Heptarchy or Seven Kingdoms? Are not the forty states which compose the Germanic Confederation stronger, more powerful, united, than they would be if isolated and separate? Would each individual state, if alone, left to its own resources, without free trade with its neighbors, without social, political or commercial relations, be richer, more prosperous than it is now, joined, united and allied to the rest? And in the United Kingdom of Great Britain, where a kind of Federal union is found, is not each nationality, every sect and every religion fully and entirely protected and guarded from the attacks of bigotry and of political and religious intolerance? After the States had separated from England in 1775, would they have done better to remain in the position of thirteen colonies detached from each other, without social, commercial, or political relations, as the colonies of British North America now are, than to form a compact as they did? Is it not from that union that their strength has grown, that they have become so powerful, so rich, so independent of the rest of the world, and the admiration of modern times? So would they have continued to advance too, with giant strides, in the path of progress and improvement, if the demon of civil war had not arisen to break up a

union but lately so happy and so prosperous! Let us avail ourselves of the example of others, and of the auspicious circumstances which seem to have occurred expressly and opportunely for our benefit, and let us resolve to become a great empire. Is it not asserted that, if a union of the provinces should be effected, we should be, at the least, the fourth maritime power in the world? Are there not kingdoms—confederations—in Europe which would be numerically inferior to us? Belgium has no more than 4,500,000 of inhabitants; Denmark, including the Duchies, no more than 2,500,000; the Kingdom of Bavaria, 4,500,000; the Kingdom of Greece, 1,000,000; the States of the Church, 3,000,000; Portugal, 3,500,000; Sweden, 3,500,000; Norway, 1,500,000; the Helvetic Confederation, 2,500,000; while the proposed Confederation will soon contain 5,000,000; and yet these provinces are but in their infancy, we may say. Any one who has the slightest knowledge of the natural riches and the resources of the five provinces, and of the energy and love of labor which characterise the different races which people them, may safely predict a brilliant future for our new Confederacy. (Hear, hear.) Is there a single Canadian who does not know that Canada will always hold the first and most exalted position in the Confederacy? Lower Canada, especially, will be the centre of the industrial arts and commerce, the point towards which all the rich produce of the west, and the oil, fish and coal of the east, will naturally be brought; Lower Canada, especially, which is so rich in mines, ores, and minerals. Do we not know that certain great capitalists have recently formed companies on a vast scale, to work the rich gold and silver mines of the district of Beauce? Do not the geologists, who have explored that region, tell us that it contains copper, silver and gold, scattered in rich abundance over hundreds of square miles. (Cheers.) Canada possesses a territory of about 860,000 square miles—160,000,000 of acres of land, of which 40,000,000 are conceded; 11,000,000 are under cultivation. Canada possesses above 2,000 miles of railway, which intersect the province in all directions; it has 4,500 miles of telegraph line; it possesses, moreover, 250 miles of canal, which carried, in 1863, 3,000,000 tons of freight, and gave a revenue to the Provincial Government of nearly \$400,000. (Hear, hear.) There are hundreds of

rivers in Canada, three of which, with their tributaries, water a surface of 150,000 square miles. Five or six of the lakes cover a surface of 84,000 square miles. The mails are carried over 15,000 miles of road, in which distance there are 2,000 post-offices, which annually distribute 11,000,000 of letters, besides newspapers. (Hear, hear.) The mineral wealth of Canada is almost fabulous, and awaits only the introduction of English and American capital to astonish the world. (Hear, hear.) The Aton copper mine, in Lower Canada, is perhaps the richest existing. The copper mines of Lake Superior are already famous for their extent and the richness of the ore; and the iron mines of St. Maurice and Lake Superior are supposed to be inexhaustible. According to Sir WILLIAM LOGAN, our learned geologist, there are iron mines of great value in the seigniory of Vaudreuil and on the outskirts of the parish of St. Martha, in the county of Vaudreuil. The diggings in the auriferous river of the Chaudière and the Gilbert, in the Eastern Townships, have been very productive during the last two years. A new company has just been formed at New York, with a capital of five millions of dollars, to work on the Chaudière. The capital stock of the companies and private persons now engaged in this pursuit is reckoned by millions. The *Trade Returns* shew that the produce of the mine exported from Canada has been nearly nine hundred thousand dollars. The manufactures of Canada are extensive. Those of lumber occupy upwards of two thousand saw-mills, which turn out annually nearly eight million feet of timber. There are more than two hundred distilleries and breweries, which produced last year more than nine million gallons of spirituous or fermented liquors, yielding an excise duty of more than \$700,000. (Hear, hear.) These distilleries and breweries consume more than 1,500,000 bushels of grain and malt. The country contains at least 1,000 grist mills for the grinding of wheat and oats; 250 carriage factories, nearly 200 foundries, 200 carding mills, 130 cloth mills, and 500 tanneries. Other establishments of less account are innumerable. Canada produces annually between 25,000,000 and 30,000,000 bushels of wheat, 12,000,000 bushels of peas, 40,000,000 bushels of oats, more than 1,500,000 tons of hay, 13,000,000 bushels of buckwheat, 28,000,000 bushels of potatoes,

and 10,000,000 bushels of turnips. Canada consumes 30,000,000 pounds of beef, shears 5,500,000 pounds of wool, and makes from 42,000,000 to 45,000,000 pounds of butter. The cattle, milch cows, horses, sheep and pigs owned in Canada are above two millions in number. The fisheries yield to the value of two million dollars annually. It appears that Lower Canada alone owns 2,500 fishing vessels. The Magdalen Islands, which belong to Canada, send out to the fisheries 270 boats. The capital stock of the banks in Canada, which have a charter, amounts to \$33,000,000. Here is real wealth, and yet our country is still in its infancy, if I may be allowed to use the expression; and the third part of this beautiful country is still uninhabited; what will it be when inhabited, cleared and settled in every direction? From all quarters men will come—some to obtain a nook of land which they can really call their own; others to escape from the horrors of civil war and the ruinous taxes which bow them down to the earth. Here we have peace and tranquillity—good air—room enough—a superabundance of land—and the virgin forest wooing the axe of the woodman, to be converted into fertile farms; here, above all, we have the “birth-right of man,” liberty in all its purity. (Hear, hear.) It is time, Canadians, that we should withdraw from the political dilemma in which we are involved. If we reject the plan of Confederation, we fall back into a species of *status quo*; now, for a new country like ours, to remain stationary is to retrograde! Let us not forget that British North America contains other provinces besides these of ours, namely, British Columbia, Vancouver, &c., which will hereafter form a part of the Confederation; that those vast countries are in extent as large as all Europe; that the soil in many places is of marvellous fertility; that the day will come when the greater part of all those countries and provinces will be inhabited; that there will be a net-work of railway connecting the extremities of all those possessions, and lines of steamboats connecting us, not with the Mother Country only, but with the whole of Europe, and that at all seasons of the year. When we all, without exception, animated by the same spirit, struggling after the good, after the prosperity of our common country, shall see rising around us a vast empire under the protectorate of England, we shall then understand the political sagacity of those who, now steering the vessel

of State, have brought before us and carried through the scheme of Confederation proposed. There may be certain faults of detail in the system: I grant that there are. But does not every work of man bear the impress of imperfection? Is the celebrated *Code Napoléon* perfect? The most celebrated French lawyers do not think it so; and yet this production is a master-piece of legislation in many respects. Does not the Constitution of the United States contain faults? and yet it is said to be a model work of its kind. I am of opinion that the plan of Confederation, taken as a whole, is the best we could desire or hope for, adapted, as it had to be, to the well-understood interests of the five provinces. To consider it from a purely sectional point of view, would be to misunderstand the position which a statesman should occupy. If however, Mr. SPEAKER, the unreasoning opponents of the proposed measure were able to suggest any means of meeting eventualities, and point out a way by which, while rejecting the scheme proposed, we might find some practical mode of escape from our difficulties, I should then be disposed to listen to them, and to compare their scheme with that which is now before us; but those gentlemen think it sufficient to blame and criticise. The celebrated Mr. RAMEAU even (the author of *La France aux Colonies*), from his retirement in distant France, sends forth a cry of alarm at the dangers with which he thinks Confederation is pregnant, but not a word of good counsel or of a better remedy of his own. Others cry aloud from the house-tops that this scheme is not a "Federal union," but a Legislative one in every point! If it were so, Mr. SPEAKER, I should be the first—and I proclaim it here before the whole country—I should be the first to scout and reject the scheme with all the power which Providence has given me; but as it is, on the contrary, a Federal union, in the full force of the term, having a Central Government invested with all the power necessary to obviate and remedy the weakness which characterises Federal Government in the American union, giving, in a special manner, to each province the management of its own local affairs, and to its inhabitants full and unrestricted power to make its own laws, I cannot, for the interest of my constituents, for my country's interest, help approving of a measure which, while it respects the rights and

privileges of all, will have the effect of increasing the individual and collective strength of the five provinces, will secure to us the confidence of the Mother Country, and make of this section of British North America, under the powerful ægis of England, another *imperium in imperio*. (Cheers.) I return to those whose cry is, "But our nationality will be lost! Our language, our civil and religious institutions will disappear." O ye who cry so loudly, and who find such charms in the neighboring republic, do you think that if we fell into that whirl of divers nations and different religions composing the American Confederacy, which have no common traditions nor common history with us, French-Canadian nationality would long enjoy a separate existence, or that it would not speedily be lost amidst so many others? Answer if you can, and I will believe you. (Cheers.) Consider the fate of Louisiana, inhabited chiefly by French! Is not the English element in a majority in the Parliament of United Canada? And have I not, nevertheless, the honor to address you at this moment in French? in that beautiful language of our ancestors in which JACQUES CARTIER, in 1535, extolled the glories of our majestic St. Lawrence! (Cheers.) Would you know one of the reasons assigned against General FRÉMONT when he was a candidate for the Presidency of the United States a few years ago? "Do not vote for FRÉMONT," was the cry on the hustings and in the papers of the day; "FRÉMONT is a Frenchman"—"FRÉMONT is a Catholic"—and FRÉMONT lost his election accordingly. However, FRÉMONT was not a Catholic! but they said he was, and it was a crime sufficient in their eyes to disqualify him in his candidatureship for their confidence, notwithstanding that they proclaim "liberty of conscience!" (Hear, hear.) Do they reject a man in England because he is a Catholic? Does that fact debar him from enjoying the confidence of his Sovereign and his fellow-citizens? Certainly it does not, and there are instances to prove it. Have we not often seen, in Canada, Catholics representing counties essentially Protestant? Was not the county of Vaudreuil, a county in which Catholics are a majority, lately represented by an English Protestant? Why should the English, under the Confederation, seek to destroy French-Canadian nationality? What interest could they serve in doing so? In

1775, and in 1812, the French-Canadians, at the call of their clergy, rose as one man to defend the Crown of England. (Hear, hear.) What interest have the English to induce them to sweep away our religious institutions? In what school or college are youth educated with greater talent or greater success—where do they receive a more thorough classical education—than in our colleges? Where does a young man learn his duty to God, to himself, to his country and to his Sovereign better than in our Catholic colleges? (Cheers.) I passed ten years of my life, Mr. SPEAKER, in a Catholic college, that of Montreal, and if I did not profit by the instruction I received, mine is the fault; in that house, I heard none but the counsels of wisdom, saw only examples of virtue in the venerable priests who were intrusted with the care of my youth. (Cheers.) Where is better instruction in agriculture to be had—agriculture, the source of the prosperity of a country—than in two or three Catholic colleges in Lower Canada? Who has better appreciated the force of the maxim, “The soil is the country,” than the Catholic clergy? What are the model farms founded by the Government compared with the model farms of two or three of our colleges? (Hear, hear.) Is it the Catholic clergy themselves who would be endangered by the Confederation? There is not a single right-thinking Englishman in the land who will not stand up and testify to the virtues of our clergy and their usefulness in the country! Wherever there is an asylum to be built, or a house of refuge for the poor, the insane, the aged or the orphan, then and there you see the clergy foremost in the work, first to set the example, and often defraying all the cost! (Hear, hear.) If the Queen of England desires to see a faithful subject, on this side of the Atlantic, She will assuredly find him in the ranks of the clergy! If the country calls for a zealous citizen, animated by the noblest patriotism, the call will first be answered unmistakably by a priest—by one of those men who seek no other reward for their actions than the approbation of their own conscience—by one of those who perfectly comprehend the maxim that “the poetry of life is the fulfilment of duty”—by one of those wise but modest men, as humble as they are pious, who, standing ever constant at the post which Providence has assigned to them, instruct the young, encourage the good, seek to bring

back the sinner into the paths of virtue, obey the laws and teach that obedience to others, pray daily for the happiness and prosperity of “Our Gracious Sovereign” and of the Mother Country, visit the poor in garret and cellar, soothe the sufferings, moral and physical, of the sick and dying, and finally point out the road to heaven—they themselves leading the way! (Prolonged cheers.) What have such men to fear from Confederation? Nothing. No, Mr. SPEAKER, such men have nothing to fear! England loves and reveres our clergy, and sees in them loyal and faithful subjects of the Queen. (Cheers.) Would you see an instance of what the Catholic clergy can do when the country wants a man of courage? All know that the country is in a political dilemma, that the machine of government is at a stand, that the sound of a mighty tempest is heard from afar; that the fate of the country is traced out in feeble and wavering lines in an uncertain future, overshadowed with threatening clouds filling a void of conjecture and doubt; that the moment is come for the true friends of their country—for men of education—to declare their views on the course to be taken to save the country from the danger impending and the perils of actual events. Well, here too we have a member of the Catholic clergy boldly standing forth to give his opinion on the subject, and counsel us in this melancholy crisis! I will read to you an extract of the letter of the Catholic Archbishop CONNOLLY of Halifax, on the subject of Confederation:—

Instead of cursing, like the boys in the upturned boat and holding on until we are fairly on the brink of the cataract, we must at once begin to pray and strike out for the shore by all means, before we get too far down on the current. We must, at this most critical moment, invoke the Arbiter of nations for wisdom, and abandoning in time our perilous position, we must strike out boldly, and at some risk, for some rock on the nearest shore—some resting place of greater security. A cavalry raid visit from our Fenian friends through the plains of Canada and the fertile valleys of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, may cost more in a single week than Confederation for the next fifty years; and if we are to believe you, where is the security, even at the present moment, against such a disaster? Without the whole power of the Mother Country by land and sea, and the concentration in a single hand of all the strength of British America, our condition is seen at a glance. Whenever the present difficulties will terminate—and who can

tell the moment?—we shall be at the mercy of our neighbors; and victorious or otherwise, they will be eminently a military people, and with all their apparent indifference about annexing this country, and all the friendly feelings that may be talked of, they will have the power to strike when they please, and this is precisely the kernel and the only touch-point of the whole question. No nation ever had the power of conquest that did not use it, or abuse it, at the very first favorable opportunity. All that is said of the magnanimity and forbearance of mighty nations can be explained on the principle of sheer expediency, as the world knows. The whole face of Europe has been changed, and the dynasties of many hundred years have been swept away within our own time, on the principle of might alone—the oldest, the strongest, and as some would have it, the most sacred of titles. The thirteen original states of America, with all their professions of self-denial, have been all the time, by money power and by war, and by negotiation, extending their frontier until they more than quadrupled their territory within sixty years; and believe it who may, are they now of their own accord to come to a full stop? No; as long as they have the power, they must go onward: for it is the very nature of power to grip whatever is within its reach. It is not their hostile feelings, therefore, but it is their power, and only their power, I dread; and I now state it as my solemn conviction, that it becomes the duty of every British subject in these provinces to control that power, not by the insane policy of attacking or weakening them, but by strengthening ourselves—rising, with the whole of Britain at our back, to their level, and so be prepared for any emergency. There is no sensible or unprejudiced man in the community who does not see that vigorous and timely preparation is the only possible means of saving us from the horrors of a war such as the world has never seen. To be fully prepared is the only practical argument that can have weight with a powerful enemy, and make him pause beforehand and count the cost. And as the sort of preparation I speak of is utterly hopeless without the union of the provinces, so at a moment when public opinion is being formed on this vital point, as one deeply concerned, I feel it a duty to declare myself unequivocally in favor of Confederation as cheaply and as honorably obtained as possible—but Confederation at all hazards and at all reasonable sacrifices. After the most mature consideration, and all the arguments I have heard on both sides for the last month, these are my inmost convictions on the necessity and merits of a measure which alone, under Providence, can secure to us social order, peace, and rational liberty, and all the blessings we now enjoy under the mildest Government and the hallowed institutions of the freest and happiest country in the world.

This letter is dated in January, 1865. The Catholic Bishop of the Island of Newfoundland, Monseigneur MULLOCK, has also written

a magnificent letter in favor of Confederation. Moreover, Mr. SPEAKER, when the time comes, our Catholic clergy—our Canadian clergy—will make their voices heard in favor of the proposed measure, and will show the whole world that now, as formerly, they can keep pace with the times—that they can distinguish the true from the false, and that their paternal eyes watch with the tenderest solicitude over the destinies of their children. (Loud cheers.) Now, Mr. SPEAKER, let us cast a glance over the English colonies in Australia. They, like us, are desirous of taking steps to form a Confederation, to break from their state of isolation, stretching forth their arms to each other as beloved sisters, and making efforts to lay the foundation of a great empire on the distant shores of Oceania. (Hear, hear.) As to ourselves, let us show England that our hearts yearn to maintain our connection with her, and she will spend her last soldier and last shilling to keep and defend us against all the world, and to assist us to become a great and powerful nation. Back! back! those who think that England will cast us off, and leave us to our hard fate. Back! all those who, like BRIGHT, CORDEN, GOLDWIN SMITH, and others of that school, weary the ear with crying that England loses more than she gains by her colonies! They are confronted by the logic of facts. England, without her colonies, would be a power of the second class. Let us hear what Mr. LAING, late Minister of Finance for India, said, in answer to GOLDWIN SMITH and others:—

I would have you observe, said he, that our foreign possessions are by far our best customers. Taken together, they make up nearly a third of our import trade, and a half of our export trade. British India holds the first place on the list, and gives us nearly £50,000,000 sterling of imports, taking in return £20,000,000 of exports. In the present year these figures will be greatly exceeded, and the rate of progress is more distinctly marked: the imports having been, 10 years ago, £10,672,000 only, and the exports £9,920,000. We find in Australia still more astonishing results, if we consider the recent date of her establishment as a colony, and her limited population. Besides gold, she sends about £7,000,000 of imports, and takes from us £13,000,000 of exports. The North American colonies, with a population also British, give us £8,000,000 of imports, and take from us nearly £5,000,000 of exports. The small island of the Mauritius, which enjoys British Government and thrives with British capital, sends us nearly £2,000,000 worth per year, and takes in return £5,000,000. These figures clearly show the advantages derived to commerce

from colonies, and confute the false theories of those men who would persuade us to abandon our distant possessions as useless.

Observe, Mr. SPEAKER, that these enormous amounts are not in dollars, but pounds sterling: each pound being worth nearly five dollars of our money. This is information for those who think that colonies are of no importance to England; that they add nothing to her grandeur, her power, or her commerce! Those who know anything at all of England, know perfectly well that she is an essentially commercial nation—perhaps the most commercial nation in the world—that “that nation of shop-keepers,” as it was called by NAPOLEON I., has always found in its commerce the chief element of its strength; for with commerce comes money, from money men to carry on its wars. The ancient Romans knew how to conquer provinces, countries, kingdoms, because their genius was essentially warlike; but they did not know how to keep them, because they had not what chiefly distinguishes England—a genius for commerce. Accordingly, when the English make themselves masters of any territory, you immediately see a crowd of traders rush into it, build stores, find out the resources of the country, and next come a body of soldiers to second the authority of justice, and enforce respect for law and order. In a short space of time you see a nation, but lately barbarian, buried in sloth and inaction, shake off the slough of infancy, assume a different aspect, grow rich and prosperous, and in turn coöperate in adding to the greatness of the Mother Country. (Hear, hear.) Yes, Mr. SPEAKER, England is bound to keep us. Losing us, she would, at a future day, lose her West Indian possessions, and would enter on the first phase of an eclipse which she is too far-seeing not to anticipate and avoid. (Hear, hear.) England sees with pleasure the efforts which our Government is making to carry out the union of all the provinces, and looks upon our future union as a step in the right direction—the only practical means of increasing our resources and strengthening our power. One word, Mr. SPEAKER, on the appeal to the people. There are three classes of men in society: those who deceive, those who are deceived, and those who are neither deceivers nor deceived. I take my place advisedly among the last. I will not rank as a deceiver; and as I have promised my constituents that I

would lay before them, and explain the scheme of Confederation, with all its details, before giving my vote finally, I am at all times ready to do so. For the present, I shall vote purely and simply for the “resolutions,” because I am in favor of the principle of Confederation, and because, hereafter, when the Ministry shall have laid before us the plan for the local governments with its details, then will be the time to demand an appeal to the people, if my country requires it of me. To ask for it only with reference to the principle of Confederation, and to ask for it again when we shall have the plan and all the details relating to the local governments, would be an absurdity; for it would be a double appeal to the people on two parts of the same scheme of Confederation, and consequently two elections on the back of each other—a needless excess of expense and trouble, both for the country and the members. We must bear in mind that after the two elections constituting the double appeal to the people, we must have still more general elections to inaugurate the new Parliament, for the present session is the third of this Parliament. I would not be one of the deceived; and I should be so in a striking degree if I allowed myself to be cajoled by the gentle purrings of the Opposition, who make a show of agitation for the appeal to the people, only that they may have an opportunity, at any cost, of defeating the scheme of Confederation. I maintain, Mr. SPEAKER, that the Opposition have not the slightest wish to go to the country; and why? because if the Opposition had really and truly wished for an appeal to the people, they would at any time, within this last fortnight at least, have made a motion in this House expressive of their desire—as a preliminary—for such an appeal! The House has been debating this measure three or four weeks, but the Opposition have not shewn the least disposition to move for an appeal to the people; and, when it is too late, they will come forward with such a motion—(hear, hear)—and then, when they do not carry it, they would go crying throughout the land, in town and country, that if the people have had no voice in the business, it is no fault of theirs; that they moved heaven and earth—but such was the bull-headed obstinacy of the Ministry, it was not to be obtained; and the people will believe them; and we, who are the real, the best friends of the people, we shall be pointed at as the real

criminals! Poor people! why do you allow yourselves to be deceived? If the Ministers are desirous of pushing on the measure, it is because of the check which the Ministry of New Brunswick have just had, and because it is for us to use all diligence to show the Mother Country that we do not hang fire, but are ready to do our part to carry out the treaty or compromise agreed on by the delegates at the Conference held at Quebec. It is time we should do something to improve our position; for the intended revocation of the treaty of reciprocity, the probable abolition of the "transit" system, and other tokens of ill-feeling with which President LINCOLN'S Message of the present year is filled, are enough to warn us to prepare to meet the storm which is blowing up on the political horizon, that we ought immediately to look out for better shelter than we have at present. (Hear.) If, hereafter, an appeal to the people, relative to the plan and details of the local governments, becomes necessary, I am convinced that a majority of the counties of both Canadas will understand their true interests, will be able to distinguish their real friends from those who aim at deceiving them by flattering their prejudices, and that we shall be sent back to this place with full powers to vote the final adoption of the scheme of Confederation. (Cheers.) But if I, for one, am civilly told that I must stay at home, I shall have the satisfaction of saying that I have fallen like a man who preferred his duty to a fleeting popularity; and although it may be an easy matter for the fair and intelligent county of Vaudreuil to send to this House, as its representative, a member more competent in many respects than I am, I venture to affirm that it will be difficult to find any one who has more at heart than I have the interests, the happiness and the prosperity of his country! (Continued cheers.) I have abundant reason to believe that the people will comprehend the position of the country, will see that a measure of this kind is necessary—nay, indispensable, and that when once the union of the five provinces of British North America has been perfectly settled, we shall enter on a new era, an era of progress in all things—industrial, manufacturing and commercial, and shall begin to take a prominent place among the nations of this vast continent; the people will understand, finally, that the vessel of the state has fallen into the hands of able pilots, well qualified to take it into port, notwithstanding

the storms and rocks with which its course is beset. (Cheers.) I for one, Mr. SPEAKER, have full confidence in our future in the bosom of Confederation. The day is, I think, not far distant when the "Good Genius" who rules over the future destiny of the new Empire of British North America will cry aloud, with one foot on the shores of the Pacific while the other rests on that of the Atlantic—"All this is ours. This wealth, these fair fields, those pretty hamlets, those vast cities, in which thousands of people enjoy the fruits of their toil, and live without fear under the English flag, belong to us! See those factories, those works of all kinds, those canals and railways crossing each other in every direction, fostering trade throughout the length and breadth of this vast domain! We are now a numerous and a mighty people—our population has grown—Europe has contributed its contingent of brave and courageous hearts, who have been attracted hither by the hope of an amount of happiness and prosperity which their native country had denied them." Then too, this "Good Genius," turning his eyes in the direction of Great Britain, will say with truth—"Mother, behold your eldest-born, worthy of such a parent!" (Cheers.) And posterity, glorying in their ancestors, will exclaim—"Behold the fruits of the conscientious and patriotic labors of that chosen band of thirty-three, who sat in high conference at Quebec, in October, 1864." (Loud cheers.)

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—After hearing the eloquent and talented speech which the hon. member for Vaudreuil has just delivered, I have one emotion of regret: it is, that the venerable ancestor of that gentleman (the Hon. ALAIN CHARTIER DE LOTBINIÈRE), who was one of the first Speakers called to the Chair of the Legislative Assembly of Lower Canada, whose portrait adorns this House, has not, from the tomb, heard the accents—the well-considered, loyal and heart-felt expressions of his descendant. How justly would he have been proud of him! (Cheers.)

HON. MR. LAFRAMBOISE—Mr. SPEAKER, the honorable member for Vaudreuil asked, a moment ago, what we French-Canadians had to fear under Confederation? Well, I will tell him at once, or rather when his friends have done congratulating him. The honorable gentleman read us a couple of letters from bishops of the Lower Provinces in order to convince us that all must be for the best under Confederation for our Catholic

population; with the permission of this honorable House, I will read for his benefit the letter of a Lower Canadian priest, who, having the advantage of a somewhat closer view of things than the bishops of the Maritime Provinces, is in a better position to judge whether our special institutions and our nationality will be sufficiently guaranteed under the Federal system now about to be imposed upon us. (Hear, hear.) This letter appeared in the *Canadien* :—

To the Editor of the *Canadien*.

SIR,—If the Confederation of the provinces may be considered a thing decided upon, there is nevertheless no denying the fact that the minds of the people are filled with a fear and anxiety which nothing can remove. I have read the speeches of our representatives; I have heard their explanations; and far from being reassured, I am more uneasy than ever. The necessity of Confederation has indeed been demonstrated, but has there been any attempt to explain certain clauses of a dangerous character in a French-Canadian and Catholic point of view? Promises, eulogies, dazzling pictures of our future prospects, figures more or less successfully grouped, all these we have had *ad nauseam*; but what I have looked for in vain is a satisfactory explanation as to our future liberty of action under Confederation. With your permission, sir, I will state as briefly as possible my objections to the scheme of Confederation, and the features which cause it to be dreaded so much by almost all those who have studied it. I leave aside the question of divorce; the ecclesiastical authorities being silent upon the matter, I do not pretend to be more Catholic than the Pope. Let every one bear his own responsibility. When, at some future day, Catholic Lower Canada will be dishonored by the presence of a divorce court, every one will, no doubt hasten to wash his hands of the matter, and repudiate all responsibility for the circumstances in which we are placed. My objections to Confederation as proposed, are—first, the dangerous centralization it establishes; second, the enormous expense it entails. Centralization! Behold the great danger of modern governments. In place of endeavoring to confer on each of our provinces the greatest measure of liberty compatible with a central power, one would fancy that our Ministers had done their best to leave us but the very smallest measure possible. In endeavoring to avoid the excess of power vested in the states of the American Confederation, they have given us a scheme tolerably closely copied from the Swiss Confederation. They wished to avoid state independence, which caused the war between the North and the South, and they expose us to a new Sonderbund with all its disasters. Let us see what are the powers of the Central Government, and the rights of the provinces, and of Lower Canada in particular, under our Confederation. The Central Govern-

ment will be composed of—first, an elective Chamber, based on population; second, a Senate; third, an Executive Council, and Responsible Ministers, and a Governor. The Lower House will be composed of 194 members. Of these 194 sixty-five will be Lower Canadians, and fifty French-Canadians. In the House of Representatives we shall therefore be one to three, or, if we count as French-Canadians, 1 to 4. How many Lower Canadians or French-Canadians are we to have in the Executive Council? One, perhaps; two at most. Such is the measure of our influence in the Central Government. And this is the Government that is to appoint our senators after the first selection is made. It will appoint, or rather impose upon us, a governor. It will have the power of veto over all our local measures. It will also enjoy that power through the governor, its creature! Was there ever a more dangerous centralization? What liberty of action, then, is there left to our legislature? An Orangeman will perhaps be sent to govern us; and what can we say? Our senators will be selected, if it should please the central power, from the ranks of our enemies; to whom shall we apply for redress? All our most cherished local measures, our acts of incorporation, will be reserved or vetoed; and who will redress our grievances? But all these are mere imaginary dangers! Imaginary, forsooth! Heaven grant that they may be! But do we not know the Orangemen? Is not the example of Ireland before our eyes? But the Sonderbund war! Be quiet, we are told; men so well tried, so honorable as our leaders, would never propose the measure for our adoption if it could possibly be of a fatal character. I do not desire, in any way, to accuse our statesmen or to question their motives. But have our statesmen always avoided contradiction—dangerous measures? Is it prudent to trust solely to men, without scrutinizing their measures? What of the experience of the past? What of the maxim, "Measures, not men?" "Fear not," we are told again, "none of the dangers you fear can arise; the thing is impossible." Impossible! Why, then, leave a possibility of danger in the law? Why so much haste with a measure of such importance? The authors of the Constitution of the United States labored for months and years at the draft of their Confederation, and after eighty years it is found defective. Our statesmen elaborate a Constitution in a few days, in the midst of the noisy rejoicings of hospitality, and we are told that Constitution is perfect! "You must not touch it; you shall not amend it." But, we say, it contains dangerous clauses, it gives our enemies power to annihilate us. The answer is: "Be silent! It is the creation of our Ministers, our leaders! Trust in their honor, in their talents." Excellent reasons, no doubt! And yet, strange to say, people are still uneasy, still distrustful! But, are not the clergy, are not the people for Confederation? As to the clergy, no; they are not all for your Confederation as it is proposed. A great many of them, it is true, feel no uneasiness, and trust all to our statesmen;

but many of them, also, dread it, and would wish to see it amended. As to the people they know nothing about your scheme, and until the time comes when they shall undergo the ordeal of taxes and imposts, they will, I fancy, exhibit the utmost indifference. But let the Confederation be carried out, let the fabulous expenses be commenced connected with the defence of the country, the support of a militia, the creation of a marine, the construction of the Intercolonial Railway and other public works, and, as the proverb says, "Time will tell." Yes, we shall then perceive the disastrous results of this measure, but it will be a little too late. I now come to my second objection to the scheme of Confederation. With your permission I shall treat it on a future occasion.

A CITIZEN.

Quebec, March 6th, 1865.

Well, Mr. SPEAKER, if I am not mistaken, that reverent gentleman, a member of our clergy, seems to be somewhat less convinced than our Ministers and the honorable member for Vaudreuil of the safety of our religious interests, and of our nationality. Are not his expressions sufficiently energetic and significant. But let us now see whether the reverend gentleman has grounds for his alarm, and whether he is not somewhat carried away by his zeal and patriotic anxiety for the welfare of his fellow-countrymen. Let us see whether, on the contrary, he does not appreciate more correctly than our Lower Canada Ministers the position in which we shall be placed by Confederation. I think we shall be enabled to judge from an article which appeared in a late number of the organ of the Honorable President of the Council. The *Toronto Globe* of the 6th March inst.,—a paper which is now one of the principal organs of the present Government—publishes an article, written perhaps by the Honorable President of the Council himself, in which I find the following kindly expression applied to our honored clergy:—

We trust that those well-meaning but mistaken friends of the Common School system of Upper Canada, who have been censuring the educational agreement in the Quebec resolutions, will now see something of its value. Bishop LYNN's bold letter should be a warning to us all how utterly unsafe our schools are under the present Constitution. The Romish Church is ever aggressive—getting to-day concessions with which it professes to be entirely satisfied, only to come back and demand new ones at the first opportunity. (Under our present parliamentary system, it is never safe to say that the Romish bishops in Canada cannot, with a little labor, get all they may ask. Under Confederation, while gladly "crying quits" and leaving them what they now have and can keep in spite of us, we should be

placed in a position to refuse them anything more. But let our present Constitution last five years longer, and the chances are that the new demands of the hierarchy will be conceded.)

If the honorable gentleman is not satisfied now that the fears of the clergy are well founded, I really cannot see how he can possibly be convinced. (Hear, hear.) That honorable member gave us a splendid and perfectly just eulogium of the admirable merits and devotedness of our Lower Canadian clergy—an eulogium which expresses the thought of every man who has any feeling of admiration for deserving merit, wherever it may be found, and whatever may be his own nationality or religion—an eulogium which I endorse with my whole heart. (Hear, hear.) But, Mr. SPEAKER, I am not the less convinced that everything foreshadowed by the extract I have just read from the *Globe* is destined to occur one day, if we adopt the measure now before us. And what is the meaning of the petitions pouring in every day by thousands, why all these crosses affixed to these energetic and patriotic protests—crosses formed by rude hands guided by noble hearts? (Hear, hear.) I will tell you, Mr. SPEAKER, why there are so many crosses; it is because, previous to the union of the Canadas, the Legislative Council was composed of enemies of the Lower Canadians, who refused, for a great number of years, to make even the most paltry grants for our Lower Canada schools. Thanks to this tyrannical proscription, the schools were closed by hundreds, and the children of our people were unable to obtain the benefits of education, of which they would most certainly have availed themselves. Hence it is that the petitions pouring in upon us from all quarters, to protest against the oppression about to be established, are in great part signed with crosses—crosses certainly of equal value with the magnificent signatures of certain honorable members of this House, who have attempted to turn into ridicule the signatures of these petitions. At that period, Mr. SPEAKER, the Canadian clergy were, as they are to-day, the leaders of the education movement, and the British oligarchy did all in its power to contract the limits of their noble work—the education of the children of the soil. (Hear, hear.) But thanks to the constant and energetic protests of patriotic men—thanks to the struggles they maintained for many a long year—struggles which culminated at last in open rebellion against the authority of Great Britain—we gained the liberties we now enjoy. And with reference to the rebellion, I think

the Honorable Attorney General East must remember that he himself was one of those who raised the flag of freedom at St. Charles, and donned the cap of liberty. At that period, Mr. SPEAKER, the Honorable Attorney General East did not shrink from open rebellion against the Crown, in order to secure what he considered the legitimate liberties of his fellow-citizens; to-day he does not shrink from a baronetcy, the reward of the treason he is prepared to consummate against his same fellow-citizens. (Hear, hear.) I said a moment ago that French-Canadians had every reason to fear for the safety of their institutions under Confederation, and I will prove it by quoting a few passages from the celebrated report of Lord DURHAM—a report which has been used as a model by the Government in preparing their scheme of Confederation—in fact the latter is copied almost word for word from that able summary of the means to be adopted for the utter annihilation of French nationality in this country. (Hear, hear.) To those who may feel inclined to consider my fears unfounded, I have but one thing to say: you may rest assured that the English members will not allow themselves to be led by the few French-Canadian members of the Federal Government, and that they will strive conscientiously, and in some sort naturally, to carry out the work initiated by Lord DURHAM, and carried on up to this day with a degree of skill and ability which, though defeated in some instances, was none the less calculated to produce the results foreseen and desired by Great Britain. I will read to the House an extract from the report in question; for it is good to remind the representatives of Lower Canada of these facts:—

Never again will the British population tolerate the authority of a House of Assembly in which the French shall possess, or even approximate to a majority.

Such, Mr. SPEAKER, are the expressions used by Lord DURHAM in his despatch to the English Government; and I will show how faithfully the plan has been carried out. It was begun by a union of the two Canadas, and it is to be continued by a Confederation of all the Provinces of British North America, and consummated at last by a legislative union, under which the French race will be absorbed and annihilated for ever. (Hear, hear.) An honorable member who addressed the House during yesterday's sitting, told us that Confederation would be the beginning of the

end, and the destruction of the Lower Canadians. It would have been impossible to describe more truly the position in which we shall find ourselves placed under Confederation. (Hear, hear.) The honorable member for Vaudreuil (Mr. HARWOOD) said there were as many Catholics in London as there were in Rome itself, the centre of Catholicity. Well, what is the value of that assertion? Does it prove anything in favor of his argument? How many members are there in the English Parliament to represent the Catholics of Great Britain? If I am not mistaken, I think there are but two or three. Now I ask what influence can the Catholic population have in that Parliament, and what power have they to protect their institutions and their liberties? If the honorable member for Vaudreuil thinks he has brought forward an unanswerable argument, he is very much mistaken, for the argument turns entirely against him. (Hear, hear.) The honorable member for Vaudreuil also brought forward, in favor of Confederation, an argument which bears a certain appearance of plausibleness and weight. He said that if we adopt Confederation, Lower Canada will enjoy the rich coal mines of New Brunswick. Does the honorable member fancy that the coal is to be delivered to us free of all cost and charges, and without our having to give anything in exchange for it? (Hear, hear.) Really, Mr. SPEAKER, it seems to me that when only such arguments as these are available in support of a case, it would be quite as well to say nothing about it. It may be that the praises profusely bestowed by the Honorable Attorney General East on the honorable member for Vaudreuil are well deserved. It may be that the Honorable Attorney General thinks so; but for my part—I say it in all sincerity—I consider that the style of eloquence displayed here by the hon. member for Vaudreuil was better calculated to win the applause of a parish meeting; the hollow tinsel of that style of eloquence may take with a certain class of men, but I do not hesitate to assert that it is hardly the kind of speech suited to this House. What is required here is a speech calculated to bring conviction to the minds of those who listen. No doubt the hon. member for Vaudreuil turned many pretty and elegant phrases, but for all that, I cannot help thinking that the Honorable Attorney General's compliments were somewhat extravagant, and that he only spoke as he did in order to remove the im-

pression of the contempt he affects to entertain for his fellow-countrymen holding seats in this House, who hold opinions different from his, and for all the French speeches delivered on this side of the House since he brought down his Confederation scheme. After all, the Honorable Attorney General has a perfect right to pay compliments to any one he likes, and whenever he likes; and in making these remarks I do not complain of his having formed that opinion of the honorable member for Vaudreuil. The honorable member also told us that the Government had done everything in their power, and that they had examined the question of Confederation from the stand-point of the five parties to the contract. I think so too, and I do not hesitate to say that if our French-Canadian Ministers present at the Conference had examined the question from a Lower Canadian point of view—since they were charged with the protection of our interests—it is highly probable that many things unfavorable to those interests, which the scheme now presents, would have been removed. But the honorable member for Vaudreuil must know that the Lower Canadian Ministers at the Conference ought to have gone there to represent the interests of their fellow-countrymen, and to defend those interests if necessary, in the same way that the representatives of the other nationalities went there to represent those of their fellow-countrymen; and the event shows but too clearly how strenuously the latter worked for their own interests. The scheme of Confederation shows clearly that the English race have in this, as in every other instance, been favored, to the detriment of the French element. They obtained everything, or nearly everything, they desired.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the chair.

After the recess,

HON. MR. LAFRAMBOISE resumed his remarks as follows—Mr. SPEAKER, as a prelude to the remarks I proposed making against Confederation during the first part of this sitting, I answered some of the arguments brought forward by the honorable member for Vaudreuil, in support of the scheme as proposed for the consideration of this House. I shall now proceed to examine certain portions of the scheme, and show the absurdity of the arguments brought forward in support of it. It has been stated by honorable gentlemen opposite that Confederation is a compromise. Well, Mr. SPEAKER, what is the meaning of the word "compromise"?

It means an understanding arrived at by means of mutual concessions; and in the case now before us, I find concessions made only on one side and none whatever on the other. I find that the concessions have all been made by Lower Canada to Upper Canada: the concession of representation based upon population, the concession to the Federal Parliament of the right to legislate on marriage and divorce. Not a single concession to Lower Canada. All the Lower Canadian members of the Administration have, in their turn, told us that Upper Canada has made concessions to Lower Canada, but not one of those honorable gentlemen have pointed out a single instance of the kind. In looking over a pamphlet which has become celebrated for many reasons which I need not enumerate—I mean the pamphlet of the honorable member for Montmorency—I find that Upper Canada has made one concession to Lower Canada. The honorable gentleman says, with reference to the concession of representation based upon population:—

Every confederation is a compromise, and where would be the compromise if nothing were conceded by both sides? The compromise made by Lower Canada is representation based upon population in the Lower House, and the compromise on the part of Upper Canada is the concession of equality in the Upper House in exchange for representation based upon population in the Assembly. The same compromise occurs between the two Canadas and the Maritime Provinces, and it is based upon the same principle.

Thus, Mr. SPEAKER, the only concession the honorable member for Montmorency has succeeded in shewing in favor of Lower Canada, notwithstanding the eminent talents we all admit he possesses, and his well-known zeal for the Ministerial scheme, is that which I have just mentioned, and in my opinion it is no concession at all, since Lower Canada had and still has the right to claim an equal representation in both Houses of the Legislature. Let us now see what is the nature of the concessions made by Lower Canada to Upper Canada. In the first place, I find this, the most important of all, and which by itself is worth all the rest—I mean the concession of representation based upon population. No one has forgotten the animated discussions which occurred, both in this House and elsewhere, relative to this question. What means were not employed and what efforts were not made by the Conservative party in order to make political capital out of that question, and what success have not this same party,

who now concede representation based upon population, obtained in Lower Canada by loudly proclaiming that the Liberal party, or rather the "*Rouge* party," as they were pleased to style us, were ready to grant to the Honorable President of the Council representation based upon population? Well, Mr. SPEAKER, the accusation made against the Liberal party, of being prepared to grant to the Honorable President of the Council his cherished measure, I shall leave to that hon. gentleman himself the task of answering. We heard him declare in this House that he had offered the hon. member for Hochelaga to continue to work with him if he was willing to concede the principle of representation based upon population, and that that gentleman having refused to comply with the demand, he had accepted the alliance of the Hon. Attorney General East, who gave him all he asked. (Hear, hear.) But, Mr. SPEAKER, there is something still more important than that. A few days ago, the Hon. President of the Council, addressing the hon. members for Hochelaga and Chateaugay, said, "I had long considered that you were the best friends of Upper Canada, but I can see to-day that you are not, and that our real friends are the Hon. Attorney General for Lower Canada and his Lower Canada colleagues." (Hear, hear.) After having granted the favorite measure of the great Clear Gait chief, the Lower Canada delegates doubtless considered that that was not sufficient, since they also made another important concession to Upper Canada and to the Protestants of Lower Canada, by vesting in the Federal Government the power of legislating on marriage and divorce—(hear, hear)—two questions upon which the French-Canadians were united by the bonds of a common faith, and on which they could not tolerate any discussion; and the Ministers, therefore, ought not to have made those concessions, which are utterly opposed to the religious doctrines they themselves profess. I say that power has been given to the Federal Government to legislate on divorce and to legalize it, and I am not mistaken in saying it, for the principle is adopted by the fact of giving to the Federal Legislature the right of legislating on this question. This power ought to have been granted to the local legislatures, and not to the Federal Legislature, as has been done; and I shall prove it in this way: the other day, the Hon. Solicitor General

for Lower Canada (Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN) told us, that as regards Lower Canada, there was no necessity for granting to its legislature the power of legislating on divorce, because, said he, "the religious authorities are recognized; but it was necessary and proper to grant that power to Upper Canada." (Hear, hear.) Now, I ask, if Lower Canada did not require that power of legislating, why has it been given to the Federal Legislature, which will be composed in great majority of Protestants, who do not hold the same opinion that we do on these questions, when it is evident that that Legislature will probably grant bills of divorce to all persons who apply for them, without considering whether the parties are Catholics or Protestants? If divorce is condemned by the Catholic religion, I maintain that it is wrong to grant that power to a Legislature which will be composed in great part of Protestant members, ready to legislate on divorce, and to grant divorces to those who bring forward what they may consider reasonable grounds, sufficient to entitle them to obtain divorce, without considering whether the religious faith of the parties permits or does not permit divorce. If divorce be condemned by the Catholic Church—and all the world knows that it is so condemned in the most formal manner—the power of the Legislature in this matter ought to have been restricted, and not made general, as it is proposed to make it in the scheme of Confederation submitted to us. Mr. SPEAKER, I have shown, I think, that Lower Canada has gained nothing, but that she has conceded everything in this compromise; true, in order to cover these guilty concessions, we are told, "But the protection of our institutions and the maintenance of our laws are fully and amply guaranteed to us by the new Constitution." In the first place, under the Confederation, our institutions will not be protected—as it has vainly been attempted to demonstrate they will; but, even though it were the case, does not the Constitution under which we now live afford us infinitely better guarantees for all our dearest liberties? Let us examine, for a moment, what species of guarantee we have under the present system, and what guarantees we shall have under the Federal system. The guarantees which the French-Canadians have under the present system, consists in the fact that out of 65 members, they count at least 51 of their own origin and faith, and that they

possess in the country and in the Legislature so powerful an influence, that the existence of any and every government depends on their good-will, and that no legislation can be carried on without their consent; whereas, under the new Constitution, the General Legislature will be composed of 194 members, Lower Canada having 65, of whom 14 at least will be English and Protestants, leaving thus 51 French-Canadian or Catholic members. Now, even if these 51 members act together as one man, they will have to struggle against 143 members of a different origin and a different faith from themselves. Thus, Mr. SPEAKER, I am convinced that the guarantees we enjoy under our present Constitution—guarantees which are assured to us as long as we do not change our system of government—are infinitely superior to those offered to us by the new Constitution which it is sought to force upon the people. But we are told that the Federal Government will have the Catholic minority to deal with, and that the assistance of the latter will be absolutely necessary to carrying it on. Well, I ask, Mr. SPEAKER, what can a minority composed of 51 members do against a majority of 143; and what protection can it offer to our laws, our institutions and our language? No; it is evident that all these things which we hold so dear may, under the Federal system, disappear and be annihilated at any moment; they will be constantly at the mercy of our natural enemies. In order to secure Confederation, you have granted to Upper Canada representation based on population—a principle against which the people of Lower Canada have always voted as one man, and you have also granted everything that the Upper Canadian delegates desired to obtain for themselves and their co-religionists. It is quite natural that the English members in Lower Canada should be nearly all in favor of the scheme, since they have a sure guarantee in the veto power of the Federal Legislature. Thus the Local Legislature of Lower Canada cannot pass a single law without submitting it to the sanction of the Federal Legislature, which can, by its veto, amend, change or completely annul, if it thinks proper, any law or any measure so submitted to it. But what guarantee will the Federal Legislature offer to the French-Canadian majority of Lower Canada, and to the Catholic minority of Upper Canada? None whatever. How can the great Conservative party which

boasts so loudly of representing the interests of the Catholics of Lower Canada, which takes its stand as the natural protector of the religion and the faith of Catholics—(hear, hear)—very absurdly I must admit—how can that great party, I say, have forgotten, as it evidently has forgotten, that there are Catholics in Upper Canada who expected and are entitled to its protection? How will the Catholic minority in Upper Canada be protected in the Local Legislature of Upper Canada, composed of Englishmen and Protestants? Shall I tell you how, Mr. SPEAKER? Well, they will be protected by two members only, the hon. members for Cornwall and Glengarry (Hon. Mr. J. S. McDONALD and Mr. DONALD A. McDONALD). The great Conservative party, which styles itself the protector of Catholicism, has simply handed over the Catholic minority of Upper Canada to the tender mercies of their enemies. And to give an idea of the kind of protection they will enjoy under the new system, it is sufficient to state that a few days ago, Bishop LYNCH, of Toronto, was forced to address himself publicly, through the press, to the citizens of Toronto, to protest against the insults offered in broad daylight, in the public streets of that city and elsewhere, to revered Sisters of Charity, and to ask protection for the venerable ladies of that community; and then look at the fanatical and intolerant writings, such as those I read to this Honorable House before the recess, from an article in the *Globe* of the 6th March—a paper which represents the opinions of the present Government, and which is the organ and property of the Hon. President of the Executive Council (Hon. Mr. BROWN). Can it be said that we have nothing to fear, that the religious institutions of Upper Canada will be perfectly safe under the system sought to be introduced into the country? Does not the hon. member for Montmorency admit, in his famous pamphlet of 1865, that our religious institutions have many a time been insulted in this House? And has not the Bishop of Toronto just complained that Sisters of Charity have been insulted in the streets of the capital of Upper Canada, and that they have been turned into ridicule at masquerades and masked balls, frequented by the best society of that locality? And in order that every one may be convinced of the fact, I take the liberty of reading his letter, which is as follows:—

TO THE CITIZENS OF TORONTO.

The Sisters of Charity have been from time to time grossly insulted in this city. Men have rudely seized hold of them in the public streets whilst going on their errand of charity; they have been pelted with stones and snow-balls. They have been called the most opprobrious and insulting names; their costume has been contemptuously exhibited in masquerades on a skating rink. We, confiding in the honor and justice of the gentlemen of Toronto, most respectfully ask protection in the premises.

Your obedient servant,

† JOHN JOSEPH LYNCH,
Bishop of Toronto.

But even though many hon. members of this House doubted the truth of the statements made in that letter, is not the danger we shall incur, as Catholics, once we are placed at the mercy of our enemies, exemplified by facts which they cannot have forgotten? I mean the numberless injuries and insults offered by an honorable member of this House to everything Catholics hold dear. Have we forgotten the infamous charges uttered by one of the friends and warm supporters of the Hon. President of the Council (Hon. Mr. BROWN) on the floor of this House? Well, I ask you now—you, the great Conservative party, the natural protectors of our religion and of its admirable institutions—what have you done to secure protection for the Catholics of Upper Canada in the new Confederation? Nothing whatever! (Hear, hear.) But if Lower Canada has obtained no new concession, and if her position is no better under the new system than under the present one, why are we to have Confederation? I can answer the question, and, in fact, the answer is patent to every one: our Ministers had recourse to Confederation simply because it presented a pretext for clinging to office, and enjoying the sweets of power for a few years longer. That is the reason, and the one only reason, for their alliance with a man who despises them in his heart, and who joined them only because they advance his plans and ambitious designs. The Hon. Solicitor General for Lower Canada explained to us the other evening the intentions of the Government. It sounded very well, no doubt; but every one knows that the intentions of a government are not unchangeable, that they may change them, and that they have, in fact, already done so. At the time of the formation of the present Ministry, did not the Lower Canada Ministers tell their friends in this House, and

was it not repeated in every shape by their newspapers, "Don't be uneasy, Confederation will not be carried out." The Hon. Commissioner of Public Works (Hon. Mr. CHAPAIS) did not deny having stated to a priest of this district, "that he must be quiet; that there was nothing to fear; that Confederation would not be carried out; that the whole thing was done in order to entrap the great Clear Grit leader and to get rid of him for ever, and of the Lower Canada Liberal party." (Hear, hear.) It seems that our Lower Canadian Ministers did not take into account the pressure of the Upper Canada members, nor that of the delegates from the Maritime Provinces, who, by combining together, obtained all the concessions they desired from the infinitesimal Lower Canadian minority representing us at the Conference of Quebec. They were told that Confederation must be carried out under such and such conditions; and these brave patriots, in order to avoid losing their cherished ministerial places, did not hesitate to sacrifice their fellow-countrymen. They accepted all the conditions of the Protestant delegates, and now they are striving to induce the House, and particularly the Lower Canadian members of it, to ratify their shameful concessions. Unhappily for Lower Canada, I fear the House will vote for the destruction of French-Canadian nationality in this province. There is one important point which must not be lost sight of, namely, that the great majority of the Upper Canadian members are in favor of Confederation, because everything in it is entirely to their advantage; but I cannot conceive how a majority of Lower Canadian members can be in favor of the measure. True, many of these members are repudiated by their counties, and do not represent the opinions of the majority of their constituents on this question, and it is certain that many of those who will vote for this scheme will never have an opportunity of voting for the project, if an appeal be made to the people. (Hear, hear.) With reference to divorce, I say that if the doctrines of the Catholic religion tell us that it is wrong and criminal to grant it, and that Catholics cannot accept it, it was the duty of our Ministers at the Conference to do all in their power to restrict it. True, it was not possible to prevent it in Upper Canada and in the Maritime Provinces, but it might have been done as regards Lower Canada; and if it was deemed right to grant the power of

legislating on this question, it ought to have been given to the local governments. But divorce was granted in this way because England had established a special tribunal for this matter, and England desired that divorce should be granted in Lower Canada as well as in every other province of British North America. Our Lower Canadian Ministers have simply yielded to the British influence which has been omnipotent in the Convention. (Hear, hear.) They say "It is very true that the Catholic religion prohibits divorce, but vote in favor of its establishment; for if you do not, the *Rouge* party will return to power and destroy all your religious institutions, if you give them the control of the government of the country." Well, gentlemen upholders of religion, ought you not to use every means to prevent these dreadful *Rouges* from making use of the law, which you yourselves are about to establish, which will enable them to obtain divorce whenever they please, and thus to insult the dogmas and doctrines of the Catholic Church? The Hon. Sol. Gen. East (Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN) gave us, the other night, what he pretended were satisfactory explanations—satisfactory to him, perhaps—on the law of divorce. Well, Mr. SPEAKER, let us examine these wonderful explanations. That hon. gentleman told us that it was simply a law authorizing the declaration that a marriage contracted in any of the confederated provinces, in accordance with the laws of the province in which it was contracted, should be deemed to be valid in Lower Canada in case the husband and wife came to reside there. Well, I ask you, Mr. SPEAKER, if there was any necessity for making this provision in the new Constitution? Would not a marriage, under the present Constitution, contracted under the circumstances referred to by the Hon. Solicitor General for Lower Canada, be as valid as it would be under the Confederation? Certainly it would! Then what do the Government mean? I am well aware that the Catholic members from Lower Canada will not admit it, and I know that they refused to believe me when I made the assertion, but I do not hesitate to repeat it here, that it is the intention of the Convention to legalize civil marriages. The Lower Canadian section of the Ministry has not ventured to admit it, because they well knew that they would draw down upon themselves the disapprobation of the clergy of the country, and of all their fellow-countrymen. If the power con-

ferred on the Federal Legislature in relation to this matter means anything at all, it is that and nothing else, and all the explanations given by the Hon. Solicitor General for Lower Canada and his colleagues are utterly valueless, and cannot be accepted by the Catholic members. Whysay that divorce will be permitted? If the existing law authorizes divorce now, it was quite unnecessary to make a new law on the subject, and to make it an article of the new Constitution. The Government takes every means in its power to conceal the real intentions of the Conference on this important point of the scheme, but I am firmly convinced that their object is perfectly understood, and the future will prove whether or not I am mistaken when I assert that it is intended to make civil marriages legal in this country. One of the reasons—and the only one which I have been able to discover—for which the present Government has granted power to the Federal Legislature to decree divorce, is that the Protestants of Lower Canada would never, but for that provision, have given their support to the Confederation measure proposed by our Ministers. I am well aware that there are certain Protestant denominations whose doctrines forbid divorce, but I do not hesitate to say that the only reason of the concession is the one I have just stated. Besides, in the pamphlet of the hon. member for Montmorency, I find a very strong admission:—

Catholic opinion urged that a question of such social importance should be left to the local governments, but let it be understood that in leaving it as regards Lower Canada to a Protestant majority, we only maintain the present condition of that important question. By so referring it to the Federal Government, we avoid many causes of contention and many violent complaints which might eventually be listened to by the Mother Country, where divorce is legalized and operates as a social institution.

Who can say that the Protestants—who are in great majority in our present Parliament, and who will constitute the two-thirds of the Confederation—would ever have consented to localize legislation on the subject of divorce?

The hon. member for Montmorency knows just as well as I do that the Protestants of Lower Canada would not have liked it, and that to obtain their support, it has been said to them, "Oh yes, let us concede that too; we have yielded representation by population, let us also give them divorce and anything else they like."

HON. SOL. GEN. LANGEVIN—Hear! hear!

HON. MR. LAFRAMBOISE—The hon. member may exclaim "Hear, hear," as loudly and as often as he likes, but those who heard him deliver the (I will not say eloquent, because that would not be true) speech which he made in opposition to the first reading of the Benning Divorce Bill, and who now behold him imposing on Catholics, who do not desire it, the consequences of a principle which we then refused to apply to Protestants who sought for it—those I say are justified in believing and in saying that the Hon. Solicitor General for Lower Canada has either renounced his former opinions on divorce, inasmuch as he authorizes the Federal Legislature to legislate on this subject, and to grant divorces either to Protestants or Catholics, and either to Upper or Lower Canada, or he could not have been very sincere in his opposition to the Benning Bill. (Hear, hear.) There is one certain fact, and that is that the Protestants of Lower Canada have said to the Government, "Pass a measure which shall guarantee to us the stability and protection of our educational system and of our religious institutions, and we will support your scheme of Confederation; unless you do, we will never support you, because we do not wish to place ourselves at the mercy of a Local Legislature the three-fourths of the members of which will be Catholics." They were perfectly justifiable in acting as they did, although it is generally admitted that we Catholics have much more liberality than the Protestants—and this is to a certain extent proved by the fact that several of our Lower Canadian counties are represented by Protestants. I do not, however, Mr. SPEAKER, I do not wish to reproach the Protestant minority of Lower Canada for having protected its own interests. I admit that in doing this they have only done their duty; for who can say, after all, what ten years may bring forth? Ten years hence ideas may be changed upon this question, and if it be true, as stated by the *Toronto Globe*—and the Ministry cannot say that this journal does not speak the truth, as it is the organ of the present Government—if it be true that the Catholic clergy are an encroaching body, that they are never satisfied, and that they seek to take possession of all they see—if that be true, Mr. SPEAKER, who will say that in a few years the Lower Canadians will not be disposed to say to the Protestant

minority, "We insist that all the schools should be Catholic," as the majority in Upper Canada has said to the Catholic minority there, many and many a time, and as it will before long say again if Confederation takes place. (Hear, hear.) I need not say that I do not believe that the Catholics of this section will ever push intolerance to that extent; but on the other hand, I cannot but approve of the determination of the Protestant minority to protect themselves from all eventualities of this nature; and for the same reason, I say that we also ought to take every precaution, and that we ought not to suffer our dearest interests to be at the mercy of a Protestant majority in the Federal Legislature. (Hear, hear.) We are not justified in asking for any concessions which we are not ourselves prepared to yield. (Hear, hear.) Before the House rose at six o'clock, I stated, Mr. SPEAKER, that the plan of Confederation was, so to speak, traced word for word upon the famous report of Lord DURHAM. With the permission of the House, I will take the liberty of reading a few extracts from that report, in which the author, after having asserted a number of falsehoods in relation to our race, which I will not trouble the House with reading, declares that we ought to be merged into the English nationality. Observe how similar the ideas of the noble lord are to those which are expressed in the plan of Confederation. I cite for the second time the following paragraph:—

Never again will the British population tolerate the authority of a House of Assembly in which the French shall possess, or even approximate to, a majority.

Here, Mr. SPEAKER, we have a sentiment which shews that England has followed, step by step, the advice of Lord DURHAM. The hon. member for South Leeds said the other night that he hoped that we should soon attain to a legislative union. Well, a legislative union was also one of Lord DURHAM's dreams. I proceed to read another extract from his report:—

It will be acknowledged by every one who has observed the progress of Anglo-Saxon colonization in America, that sooner or later the English race was sure to predominate, even numerically, in Lower Canada, as they predominate already by their superior knowledge, energy, enterprise and wealth. The error, therefore, to which the present contest must be attributed, is the vain endeavor to preserve a French-Canadian nation-

ality in the midst of Anglo-American colonies and states.

A little further, Mr. SPEAKER, I read as follows:—

These general principles apply, however, only to those changes in the system of government which are required in order to rectify disorders common to all the North American colonies; but they do not, in any degree, go to remove those evils in the present state of Lower Canada, which require the most immediate remedy. The fatal feud of origin, which is the cause of the most extensive mischief, would be aggravated at the present moment by any change which should give the majority more power than they have hitherto possessed. A plan, by which it is proposed to insure the tranquil government of Lower Canada, must include in itself the means of putting an end to the agitation of national disputes in the Legislature by settling, at once and for ever, the national character of the province. I entertain no doubts as to the national character which must be given to Lower Canada—it must be that of the British Empire—that of the majority of the population of British America—that of the great race which must, in no long period of time, be predominant over the whole North American continent. Without effecting the change so rapidly or so roughly as to shock the feelings and trample on the welfare of the existing generation, it must henceforth be the first and steady purpose of the British Government to establish an English population, with English laws and language, in this province, and to trust its government to none but a decidedly English Legislature.

And further on I find what follows:—

It may be said that this is a hard measure to a conquered people; that the French were originally the whole, and still are the bulk, of the population of Lower Canada; that the English are new comers, who have no right to demand the extinction of the nationality of a people, among whom commercial enterprise has drawn them. It may be said that if the French are not so civilized, so energetic, or so money-making a race as that by which they are surrounded, they are an amiable, a virtuous and a contented people, possessing all the essentials of material comfort, and not to be despised or ill-used because they seek to enjoy what they have without emulating the spirit of accumulation which influences their neighbors. Their nationality is, after all, an inheritance, and they must not be too severely punished because they have dreamed of maintaining, on the distant banks of the St. Lawrence, and transmitting to their posterity the language, the manners and the institutions of that great nation that, for two centuries, gave the tone of thought to the European continent. If the disputes of the two races are irreconcilable, it may be urged that justice demands that the minority should be compelled

to acquiesce in the supremacy of the ancient and most numerous occupants of the province, and not pretend to force their own institutions and customs on the majority.

But before deciding which of the two races is now to be placed in the ascendant, it is but prudent to enquire which of them must ultimately prevail; for it is not wise to establish to-day that which must, after a hard struggle, be reversed to-morrow. The pretensions of the French-Canadians to the exclusive possession of Lower Canada would debar the yet larger English population of Upper Canada and the townships from access to the great natural channel of that trade which they alone have created and now carry on. The possession of the mouth of the St. Lawrence concerns not only those who happen to have made their settlements along the narrow line which borders it, but all who now dwell, or will hereafter dwell in the great basin of that river. For we must not look to the present alone. The question is, by what race is it likely that the wilderness which now covers the rich and ample regions surrounding the comparatively small and contracted districts in which the French-Canadians are located, is eventually to be converted into a settled and flourishing country? If this is to be done in the British dominions as in the rest of North America, by some speedier process than the ordinary growth of population, it must be by immigration from the English Isles or from the United States—the countries which supply the only settlers that have entered, or will enter, the Canadas in any large numbers. This immigration can neither be debarred from a passage through Lower Canada, nor even be prevented from settling in that province. The whole interior of the British dominions must, ere long, be filled with an English population, every year rapidly increasing its numerical superiority over the French. Is it just that the prosperity of this great majority, and of this vast tract of country, should be forever, or even for a while, impeded by the artificial bar which the backward laws and civilization of a part, and a part only, of Lower Canada, would place between them and the ocean? Is it to be supposed that such an English population will ever submit to such a sacrifice of its interests?

The French-Canadians, on the other hand, are but the remains of an ancient colonization, and are and ever must be, isolated in the midst of an Anglo-Saxon world.

And is this French-Canadian nationality one which, for the good merely of that people, we ought to strive to perpetuate, even if it were possible? I know of no national distinctions marking and continuing a more hopeless inferiority. The language, the laws, the character of the North American continent are English, and every race but the English (I apply this to all who speak the English language) appears there in a condition of inferiority. It is to elevate them from that inferiority that I desire to give to the Canadians our English character.

There can hardly be conceived a nationality

more destitute of all that can invigorate and elevate a people than that which is exhibited by the descendants of the French in Lower Canada, owing to their retaining their peculiar language and manners. They are a people with no history and no literature. The literature of England is written in a language which is not theirs, and the only literature which their language renders familiar to them is that of a nation from which they have been separated by eighty years of a foreign rule, and still more by those changes which the revolution and its consequences have wrought in the whole political, moral and social state of France.

Well, Mr. SPEAKER, Sir EDMUND HEAD, when he called us an inferior race, without our French-Canadian Ministers protesting in any way against this gross and foolish insult—drew his inspiration from the report from which I have just cited an extract, and which, from its first to its last page, breathes the most bitter hatred of all that bears the French name or stamp. A little further on Lord DURHAM continues as follows:—

In these circumstances I should be indeed surprised if the more reflecting part of the French-Canadians entertained at present any hope of continuing to preserve their nationality.

Probably, Mr. SPEAKER, Lord DURHAM was desirous of alluding to the members of the present Administration who to-day evince a disposition to sacrifice their nationality for the honors and titles which Lord DURHAM counselled the Imperial Government to bestow on those of our reflecting French-Canadians who would not refuse to take the gilded bait which Great Britain might dangle before their eyes. I continue my citations:—

Lower Canada must be governed now, as it must be hereafter, by an English population; and thus the policy which the necessities of the moment force upon us, is in accordance with that suggested by a comprehensive view of the future and permanent improvement of the province.

A little further on Lord DURHAM proceeds as follows:—

It is proposed either to place the legislative authority in a governor, with a council formed of the heads of the British party, or to contrive some scheme of representation by which a minority, with the forms of representation, is to deprive a majority of all voice in the management of its own affairs.

The plan of Confederation now submitted for our adoption is exactly that dreamt of by Lord DURHAM. Our Ministers have

copied it, so to speak, word for word. Lord DURHAM indicates all its essential points; and if I cite his report, it is with the view of proving that the real author of the Confederation, which it is sought to impose upon us, is, in fact, Lord DURHAM himself. (Hear, hear.) I quote again from his report:—

The only power that can be effectual at once in coercing the present disaffection and hereafter obliterating the nationality of the French-Canadians, is that of the numerical majority of a loyal and English population; and the only stable government will be one more popular than any that has hitherto existed in the North American colonies. The influence of perfectly equal and popular institutions in effacing distinctions of race without disorder or oppression, and with little more than the ordinary animosities of party in a free country, is memorably exemplified in the history of the State of Louisiana, the laws and population of which were French at the time of its cession to the American union. And the eminent success of the policy adopted with regard to that state points out to us the means by which a similar result can be effected in Lower Canada.

Lord DURHAM was perfectly correct in suggesting the adoption of this policy. He did not wish to put his foot on our necks, but he advised that we should be made to disappear little by little under English influence, and when we should be weak enough to be no longer dangerous, then that we should have the *coup de grâce*. As in Louisiana, our nationality was to disappear under the influence of foreign elements.

MR. SCOBLE—Will the hon. gentleman permit me to observe to him, that it is only justice to the memory of that great statesman to say, that he wrote his report having only in view a legislative union, and that circumstances have changed since that day? Now we are only discussing a Confederation, and consequently Lord DURHAM's views do not apply to it.

HON. MR. LAFRAMBOISE—I think that the plan conceived by Lord DURHAM was that of a legislative union and a Confederation of all the British North American Provinces. We are about to begin with Confederation, but we shall finish with a legislative union. Confederation, as has been well observed by that eminent statesman, is the first step to a legislative union. "Act with prudence," he says in his famous report to the British Government; "we must not crush the French race too suddenly

in these colonies; they might resist and give trouble, but make use of diplomacy, lavish honors and titles on their leading men, and perhaps you will succeed." I am convinced that we shall have a legislative union in a very few years if the plan of Confederation is adopted, and I am not the only one who says so, for the other night the hon. member for South Leeds stated in this House that in a short time we should have a legislative union and all its consequences. Well, Mr. SPEAKER, if we are threatened in this way, the hon. member for South Leeds ought not to be surprised that as a Lower Canadian I have something to say against the opinions expressed by Lord DURHAM in his report. I can perfectly understand that he could not possibly have the feelings of a Lower Canadian, and that he could not consequently feel as I can feel, the affront and the wrong which that statesman inflicted on my fellow-countrymen. (Hear, hear.) But neither, on the other hand, does he feel as I do that the plan of Confederation will bring the French-Canadian race to the social condition conceived and predicted by the noble lord whose report I have just cited. That hon. member, as an Englishman and a Protestant, is in favor of a legislative union, in preference to any other system of government. He would behold with pleasure but one race—and that the British race—inhabiting these colonies of Great Britain. I do not blame him for these sentiments, which are perfectly justifiable when held by an Englishman; but, on the other hand, I am thoroughly convinced that he will not deem it a strange thing that a French-Canadian should entertain entirely different views on these points. (Hear, hear.) Thus, Mr. SPEAKER, that great statesman, Lord DURHAM, the most dangerous enemy of French nationality, makes use of the following language in his famous report:—

If you are desirous of gaining over the political leaders of the Lower Canadians, act as follows:—Begin by giving them offices, titles and honors of every kind; flatter their vanity, give them a vast field in which to satisfy their ambition.

Lord DURHAM came into this country after the rebellion, and perceived that his predecessors in the government had been guilty of political errors which had alienated the French-Canadians from Great Britain, and he thought that he ought to leave behind him, to serve as a guide to his successors,

that famous report in which he has collected together all the means that diplomacy could furnish him with, to crush out a nationality which he saw with regret living happily and contentedly on the soil of its birth, and from which it drew its sustenance. Lord DURHAM, like the hon. member for South Leeds would have preferred a legislative union of all the British Provinces to the union of the two Canadas; but the British Government considered it more prudent to begin with this partial union, knowing well that later it would easily find the means of accomplishing a legislative union. England reasoned in this way: if we give the English race time to develop itself, we can easily, at some future period, impose a legislative union on the French-Canadians. Today the Canadian Government, accepting the views of Lord DURHAM, come down and ask us to take this first step towards annihilation, by accepting Confederation, which they present to us in the most brilliant and tempting guise. (Hear, hear.) For want of argument, they say such things as these to excuse the culpable step which they are ready to take—"What is the use of resisting? We must have sooner or later the Confederation now proposed to you, and ultimately a legislative union?" Well, Mr. SPEAKER, I think, for my part, that we might easily escape this last danger to our nationality, if all the Catholics and French-Canadians in this House were to league themselves together to defeat the measure before us, which denies to the latter that legitimate influence which they ought to have in the Federal Government. Why not concede to us the guarantees and concessions which we have given to our fellow-countrymen of other origins? The Lower Canadian Ministers, who have not insisted upon obtaining for us that protection, have rendered themselves highly culpable towards their fellow-countrymen. (Hear, hear.) Under the Federal union, Lower Canada can never have more than sixty-five members in the Federal Legislature, notwithstanding the explanations to the contrary made on this head by the Hon. Solicitor General East. All who have discussed the question in this House could not do otherwise than admit it. Well, notwithstanding this injustice, and notwithstanding any increase that our population may attain under the Federal régime, our representation will always remain at the same figure, and we shall pay our share of the public debt in the ratio of the number of our population.

Well, Mr. SPEAKER, is there not injustice in this provision? We have been told that we shall have the management of our public lands. I admit that this would be of great benefit to us, if we were in a position to assure those who might settle in our midst that they would have a voice in the councils of the nation. But no, Mr. SPEAKER; immigration to this country will always be impossible under the Confederation perparing for us, and it will be diverted towards the territories of Upper Canada, where the settlers can be represented in the Provincial Legislature, where the climate is more favorable and the soil more fertile. But from another point of view, can we consider advantageous to Lower Canada the possession and administration of its public domain under the circumstances in which we shall be placed by Confederation? Assuredly not, and for this reason: each province is to assume its public lands, with the debts due upon the lands. On the public lands situated in Upper Canada, and which she is to assume, there is a debt of six millions of dollars due to the province, whilst on those in Lower Canada there is only a debt of one million, consequently Upper Canada will obtain from Lower Canada a claim for five million of dollars in excess of that which she yields to Lower Canada. Here we have one of the few great advantages which have been pointed out to us since the beginning of the discussion; and I ask you, Mr. SPEAKER, whether it is advantageous to Lower Canada? On the contrary, while highly advantageous to Upper Canada, it is grossly unjust to Lower Canada. Is it not evident that the Confederation is entirely for the benefit of Upper Canada? And is not a sufficient proof of it to be found in the fact that we find in this House but two or three members from that section of the province who are opposed to the scheme? If all the members from Upper Canada, to what party soever they may belong, unite to-day to support the scheme of the Government, it is because they perfectly understand that everything has been conceded to them, and that they have obtained all that they wished for—all the concessions that they sought for, and for which they labored and struggled so energetically and so long. (Hear, hear.) That is perfectly well understood. But if influences hostile to Lower Canada, which worked against us during the preparation in England of the law respecting the change in the constitution

of the Legislative Council, had not caused the removal from the Union Act of the clause requiring the assent of two-thirds of the members of the Legislature to effect a change in the basis of our representation—if those influences had not worked to remove that safeguard of our interests, Upper Canada would never have been so persistent in striving to obtain representation based on population. She would have seen the impossibility of obtaining it, and the inutility of asking for it, and would, in consequence, have abandoned it. But from the moment when that clause was removed from the Union Act, it was competent to the Legislature to enact a change in the Constitution by a mere majority; and it may consequently be said that through that influence which worked against us, Upper Canada now obtains representation based on population. (Hear, hear.) The members from Upper Canada will observe that I do not maintain that the principle of representation based upon population is in itself an unjust principle; but I maintain that as they refused us the application of it when the population of Lower Canada was in a majority, it is unjust of them to demand it now because they are in a majority, and I cannot see by what right they wish to obtain it now. I say that if the application of that principle was unjust twenty years ago, it is also unjust to-day; and that if it is just to-day, it was equally just twenty years ago. (Hear, hear.) A member considered it very extraordinary that the *Rouge* party—let us call it by that name, since it is the one by which the Liberal party is designated in this country, and we have no reason to take exception to it—since the *Rouge* party in Canada have washed away from that name all the stains with which the *Rouge* party in France had covered it, and that here the banner of that party is spotless—(hear, hear)—a member, I say, considered it extraordinary, and ridiculed the idea that the *Rouge* party should have constituted themselves the protectors and defenders of the religion, the nationality and the institutions of Lower Canada, during the discussion of the scheme of Confederation. But when we see at the head of the movement, hostile to that Confederation, a man like Mr. CHERRIER of Montreal, who will certainly very favorably bear comparison with all the members of the Conservative party of Lower Canada in respect of devotion, honor, national feeling and ability—when we see, I repeat, a man

like Mr. CHERRIER at the head of the movement hostile to Confederation, I say that it is wrong to cast ridicule on that movement, and to make a pretence of believing that the members of the Liberal party, or of the *Rouge* party, have no religious, national or patriotic feelings. I say that the Conservative party were greatly in the wrong in endeavoring to ridicule Mr. CHERRIER, because he is a man who is too well known as a man of probity and of religious sentiments—and the same cannot be said of several of those who have attacked him; and I am convinced that that gentleman sincerely believes that the nationality, the institutions and the religion of Lower Canada are in danger. (Hear, hear.) Besides, admitting, as the Ministerial party pretend, that the *Rouge* party were not authorized to speak for the clergy and to defend our religious and national rights, it does not follow that all that the members on this side of the House stated on this subject is not strictly true; and if it had been possible to reply to it, it would have been better to meet it by arguments of a serious character than by personal attacks, the latter means being only employed as a blind. And those who exclaim so loudly to-day against the Liberal party, and who pretend to see in that party nothing but disloyalty and treason, did not always hold the monarchical and loyal ideas which they profess to-day; they were not always such ardent supporters of monarchical government as they are now. (Hear, hear.) Thus, all the world knows right well that the Hon. Attorney General for Lower Canada (Hon. Mr. CARTIER) was at the head of the party which stirred up the troubles of 1837-38.

MR. J. B. E. DORION—No, no! he was at the tail of it! (Laughter.)

HON. MR. LAFRAMBOISE—I do not know whether he was at the head or at the tail of it; but at any rate, he was in it. He was at St. Denis a few minutes before the battle. (Laughter.) I do not know whether he remained there; but I know that it is reported that he was deputed by the rebel camp to go and fetch provisions, although they could not then have been in any great need of provisions, for the moment at least. (Laughter.) At any rate, he was in the rebel camp. But he has now corrected all his democratic errors; he has renounced all ideas of that nature, and has substituted monarchical ideas for them; he is now in favor of a great monarchical power on this continent, and would be prepared to accept

the position of Royal Prince if it should be offered to him. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) The Hon. Solicitor General for Lower Canada (Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN) explained to us why he had so assumed monarchical ideas, when he told us that he would receive his reward. (Hear, hear.) After having assumed monarchical ideas, he is ready to assume their livery. (Hear.) But why should he be rewarded, as the Hon. Solicitor General has said he will be? He will be so, that gentleman says, because the Hon. Attorney General brought about the passing of a measure for the abolition of the seigniorial tenure—because the *censitaires* and the seigniors brought their title-deeds to him, and he returned them a measure which was satisfactory both to the seigniors and to the *censitaires*. Now, I am really surprised that the Hon. Solicitor General, who, in the position which he occupies, ought to be acquainted with the history of the laws of this country, is not aware that it was the Honorable Mr. Justice DRUMMOND who prepared and brought about the passing of the law for the abolition of the seigniorial tenure, and not the Hon. Attorney General for Lower Canada at all. (Hear, hear.) That is, therefore, no reason why he should deserve a reward. The Hon. Solicitor General also said that the Hon. Attorney General was entitled to the gratitude of his country, because he had brought about the passing of the law for judiciary decentralisation, and had thereby conduced to the interests of suitors, advocates, judges, and every one in general. The Honorable Solicitor General is free to admire the laws of his chief, the Hon. Attorney General; but I may say, that if ever an Attorney General made crude, incomprehensible and impracticable laws, it was undoubtedly the present Hon. Attorney General for Lower Canada. He has never been able to make a single law which it has not been absolutely necessary to amend and touch up every session, and the worst in this respect is his judicature law. "But," says the Hon. Solicitor General, "he has passed a registration law." Well, his registration law contains similar defects, and proves his complete inability to prepare a passable law. And to so great a degree is this the case, that it has been impossible to put it in practice, and it has been necessary to amend it during five consecutive sessions, without that course having very greatly improved it. (Hear, hear.) Those two laws, then, do not entitle him to

a reward. The Hon. Solicitor General also says that the Hon. Attorney General deserves a reward for having introduced the French law of Lower Canada into the townships. But here again he awards him praise and reward which are not his due, for it was Hon. Judge LORANGER who made that law, and had it passed and enacted by the House. For this law, then, also he is not deserving of reward. (Hear.) These are the three reasons for which the Hon. Solicitor General says that the Hon. Attorney General is entitled to a reward; but I consider that he hardly deserves any, as it was not he who brought about the passing of the first and the last of those laws, and the other two are so ill-made that he deserves anything but a reward for having conferred them upon the country. (Hear, hear.) Yet I must say that he deserves a reward, but from whom, and why? Ah! he deserves a reward from England for having done exactly what Lord DURHAM advised the doing of in relation to the Canadians, in his famous report on the means to be taken to cause us to disappear; he deserves a reward for having caused the setting aside of the French laws and the substitution for them of English laws; he deserves a reward for having done the will of England in every respect; and, lastly, he deserves a reward for having devised the present scheme of Confederation, and caused it to be accepted by a majority of this House. (Hear, hear.) While on this subject, and to show how he has deserved and received rewards, it will be well to read a passage from Lord DURHAM's report, in which he points out the means to be adopted to corrupt the leaders and to get the mastery of the Lower Canadian people. The following is the passage to which I allude:—

While I believe that the establishment of a comprehensive system of government, and of an effectual union between the different provinces, would produce this important effect on the general feelings of its inhabitants, I am inclined to attach very great importance to the influence which it would have in giving greater scope and satisfaction to the legitimate ambition of the most active and prominent persons to be found in them. As long as personal ambition is inherent in human nature, and as long as the morality of every free and civilized community encourages its aspirations, it is one great business of a wise government to provide for its legitimate development. If, as is commonly asserted, the disorders of these colonies have, in great measure, been fomented by the influence of designing and ambitious individuals, this evil will be best remedied by allowing such a scope for the desires of such men as shall

direct their ambition into the legitimate chance of furthering, and not of thwarting their government. By creating high prizes in a general and responsible government, we shall immediately afford the means of pacifying the turbulent ambitions, and of employing in worthy and noble occupations the talents which are now only exerted to foment disorder.

Lord DURHAM well knew what he was about when he recommended the bestowal of places and honors on the ambitious individuals who made a disturbance, and the Hon. Attorney General for Lower Canada made a great disturbance and stir in 1836 and 1837; he was present at the meeting of the five counties, when he donned the cap of liberty. (Hear, hear.) Lord DURHAM says, "Give places to the principal men, and you will see how they will sacrifice their countrymen and submit to England." And indeed it is that course which has met with the greatest success; and it has been seen that all those who impeded the movement in Lower Canada against the union, and all those who exclaimed, "Hold your tongues; the union has saved us!" have been rewarded. Some have been knighted; on others, honors, places and power have been conferred; and the Hon. Attorney General for Lower Canada will receive his reward, as they did, and will be made a baronet, if he can succeed in carrying his measure of Confederation—a measure which England so ardently desires. (Hear, hear.) For my part, I do not envy him his reward; but I cannot witness with satisfaction the efforts he makes to obtain it by means of a measure of Confederation which I believe to be fatal to the interests of Lower Canada. I am determined, therefore, to do everything in my power to prevent the realization of his hopes. (Cheers.)

MR. J. B. E. DORION—Before I proceed to examine the question which engages our attention, Mr. SPEAKER, I wish to premise that in any expression of my sentiments, I speak on behalf of no political party, but for myself only. In discussing a proposition which so intimately affects the destiny of Canada, and all that we value most, I would rise above personal and party considerations, in order that I may look at it from a vantage point removed from party influences. Why, Mr. SPEAKER, are we engaged this evening in discussing a Confederation of the Provinces of British North America? Because we had, last year, a Ministerial crisis, from which arose a proposal for the union of the two political parties who divided public opinion.

The MACDONALD-TACHÉ Ministry, who represented the Conservative party in the country, had just been defeated in the Legislative Assembly; they were obliged to resign. It will be recollected that the Government were beaten on a question of mal-administration of the public business. I allude to the advance of \$100,000 made to the Grand Trunk Railway without authority of Parliament, for which act several members of the Cabinet were responsible. Could you inform me, Mr. SPEAKER, what has become of the \$100,000 question? Alas! it disappeared in the Ministerial crisis, and left us the extraordinary Coalition which now governs us, composed of men who for ten years treated each other as men devoid of political principle! (Hear, hear.) The Conservative party clung so tenaciously to power, that they were not appalled by the position to which they had brought the country. Any union or coalition between two political parties, of opposite principles, proves an abandonment of principle by one or the other. All coalitions are vicious in their very foundation: they have always been held as proofs of political profligacy, in England as everywhere else; and they are the more dangerous that they are generally strong. To the present Coalition we are indebted for the scheme of the Confederation of the British Provinces in a tangible form. Had that Coalition never been formed, we should never have heard of the Quebec Conference, nor of the resolutions adopted at that meeting in October last, and now submitted to our consideration. Now, who authorized the holding of that Conference? What right had that body to arrogate to itself the power of proposing a radical change in our political condition? How was Canada represented there? Three-fourths of the Canadian delegates were men under the ban of parliamentary condemnation. How was the voting carried on at that Convention? Was it not by provinces? Have not the four little provinces below had twice as many votes on each question as the two large provinces of Canada? These questions all occur naturally. If to each of them a categorical answer were rendered, we should be able to throw some light on the way in which the interests of the country have been neglected, overridden, and sacrificed. If we only think that to the last question no other answer could be rendered than an affirmative, there is no room for wonder that the Lower Provinces had all the advantage in the arrangements concluded at the Conference. Notwithstanding that the compromise was in

their favor, the great number of the provinces concerned now repudiate its provisions, according to information which reaches us every day. They seem to be afraid of us; and notwithstanding the offers of money made to them, they will have nothing to do with a union. Our reputation for extravagance must be very bad to frighten them to that degree; and, no doubt, when they saw us spend in the course of a month or two, for receptions, in traveling and in feasting, sums equalling in amount the whole of revenue of Prince Edward Island, they must have gone back with a sorry idea of our way of managing public business. (Hear, hear.) I do not mean to repeat what has been said during the debate; but before proceeding, I may be allowed to draw a contrast between our manner of acting and that of our neighbors in the United States when constitutional changes are in question. In the United States—that country which people take so much pains to represent as the hotbed of all political, social, moral and physical horrors—they do not play with the written constitutions of the several states, any more than with that of the American union. There, whenever a constitution is to be amended, generally, it requires a vote of two-thirds of each of the two Houses. If it is the Constitution of the United States which is to be amended, the measure must also be sanctioned by a majority in each of the legislatures of the several states. If the amendment relates to a local constitution, besides a two-thirds vote of the two Houses, the amendment must be ratified by a convention of delegates from the different parties in the state, selected specially for the occasion. The United States are now occupied with the consideration of an amendment of their Constitution, the object of which is the abolition of slavery. The amendment has been adopted by the Congress and by the Senate of the American union, and must be ratified by a majority of the local legislatures, before it forms a part of the Constitution. It will even be necessary to take into the account the states which are now in rebellion. We see at once the guarantees they are provided with, that no radical change shall be adopted without the consent of the people, who are allowed sufficient time to weigh all the considerations which may operate in favor of any projected change. This is the method of proceeding among our sagacious neighbors in matters of importance; and, as a thing of course, they have established a political status which leaves far behind it all that human

wisdom had previously devised to secure the peace and prosperity of the nations of the New World. But in our dear Canada, with all the English precedents of which so much account is made, we do not require such precautions. It is quite enough that men should have been found guilty of misapplication of the public money, that they shall have abused each other as political robbers for ten years, to bring about a coalition of the combatants, to make them hug each other till all feeling of personal dignity is lost, and all regard for principle is forgotten. It is enough, I say, that we have a scandalous union—a state of political profligacy—like that perpetrated in 1864, to believe in our right to do what we please. (Hear, hear.) With a majority of thirty or forty votes, we hesitate at nothing. The Constitution, which hampers the curvetings and prancings of our leading chiefs too much, and rather curbs their personal ambition—which circumscribes in short the range of their speculative operations, is found to be inconvenient. It is assailed with relentless blows; it is to be thrown down without asking the leave of those most concerned; and in its place is to be set up a new order of things under which there is to be no more regard for political principles than for the rights and wants of the people. A simple parliamentary majority of one will be sufficient with us to overthrow the entire political order of things, and we have no appeal from so important a decision, save an appeal to an authority three thousand miles off, which may add something to the scheme to make it less acceptable to us than it already is. (Hear, hear.) The people may hereafter condemn their representatives, but the mischief will be done! This is all the consolation we shall have. Is not the contrast between our stupid method of doing things, and the prudent rational proceeding of our neighbors, a very striking one? And truly they are our superiors in all political respects. Now, let me justify my opposition to the projected change. I am opposed to the scheme of Confederation, because the first resolution is nonsense and repugnant to truth; it is not a Federal union which is offered to us, but a Legislative union in disguise. Federalism is completely eliminated from this scheme, which centres everything in the General Government. Federalism means the union of certain states, which retain their full sovereignty in everything that immediately concerns them, but submitting to the General Government questions of peace, of war, of foreign relations, foreign trade, cus-

toms and postal service. Is that what is proposed to us? Not at all. In the scheme we are now examining, all is strength and power, in the Federal Government; all is weakness, insignificance, annihilation in the Local Government! I am opposed to the scheme of Confederation, because, far from removing the difficulties complained of between Upper Canada and Lower Canada, it must, if adopted, simply multiply them tenfold. There will be a constant conflict of authorities, particularly as to questions submitted to the double action of the local and general legislatures. I am opposed to the scheme of Confederation, because the Constitution in which it is to be embodied will be faulty in its very basis. We are told that the representation is to be based upon population in one House, and that the principle of equality is to prevail in the other; and to-day that principle is violated as regards Newfoundland, as it will be, no doubt, to-morrow in favor of British Columbia and Vancouver Island, should those colonies think proper to enter into our proposed Confederation. What is to prevent the smaller provinces forming a league together, and thus getting the upper hand of the larger but less numerous provinces, on purely local questions? That is one of the great defects of the Ministerial scheme, in my opinion. But, moreover, the autonomy of Lower Canada is menaced and placed at the mercy of a parliament of one hundred and ninety-four members, of whom forty-seven, or at most forty-eight only, will represent the views of the majority of its people. I am opposed to the scheme of Confederation, because it takes away from the people of this country political rights which they have won by many years of struggles; among others that of electing its representatives in the Legislative Council, as it does its representatives in the Assembly. Since 1856, we have enjoyed an elective Council. For more than half a century that reform had been asked for. Our claims were urged in the press, in public meetings, in petitions to Parliament and to the home Government, and in the form of direct motions in the House. The Legislative Council, as constituted previous to the Act of 1856, had become highly unpopular; it had also fallen into a state of utter insignificance. By infusing into it the popular element by means of periodical elections, it was galvanised into life and became quite another body in the estimation of the people. The electoral system completely restored its prestige, entitled it to

the respect of the people, and gave it an importance it did not previously possess. Since the Council has been made elective, not a single complaint has appeared against its new constitution, in the press, or in the form of public meetings, petitions or motions in the House. Has it produced any evil effects in the administration of the affairs of the country? Has the Government suffered from it? Has the Mother Country found any bad results from it? Has the country been the worse for it? And in what respect? Answer, you who desire to deprive the people of the right to elect that House, though they have not asked you to do so, and though you yourselves hold your seats by their will? The elective Legislative Council represents better the character, the wants and the aspirations of our Canadian society, than the Council appointed for life ever did. With regard to the talent of the country, it has represented it as well as it was represented under the old system. With regard to its moderation and its conservative spirit, experience has shewn that it possessed these two qualities to a degree surpassing the expectation of all parties. I do not hesitate, therefore, to say that the change was a change for the better in every respect; that it satisfied and tranquillized public opinion, and that it secured to the country a more direct control over public affairs. Lower Canada has tested both systems of nomination, that by the Crown and that by the people, and it does not ask to return to the former. We had a life-nominated Council for half a century in Canada. Every one knows that the acts of that very Council drove the people of Lower Canada into rebellion in 1837! One of the great arguments advanced in support of the proposed scheme is that the electoral divisions are very extensive, and that the rich alone, by means of their wealth, can obtain a seat in that House. It costs so much now-a-days, it is said, to carry an election! If that argument were of any value as regards the Legislative Council, it should have equal weight as regards the House of Assembly. To be consistent, you should have asked also for the appointment of the members of the Assembly, in place of having them elected by the people! But that is not the true reason. And besides, let those who do not wish to spend money remain at home, if the people refuse to elect them without being paid. Let corruption cease; adopt vote by ballot, which will destroy corruption, and there will be no need of

inventing imaginary grievances in order to restrict the liberties of the people. This Tory scheme will throw us back fifty years. It is nothing else than a plot! (Hear, hear.) I am opposed to this scheme of Confederation, because we are offered local parliaments which will be simply nonentities, with a mere semblance of power on questions of minor importance. When we shall have seen the Local Parliament in operation with its restricted powers (restricted except as regards expenditure, extravagance, and the power of taxing real property), it will soon be found, as it is in fact destined to become, a mere taxing machine. Nothing more, nothing less! The expenditure of Lower Canada for justice, education, asylums, hospitals, courts, prisons, interest on the debt, &c., &c., added to the expense of a Local Government and Parliament, will exceed \$2,000,000. The revenue will fall far short of that amount. Direct taxation would be a necessary consequence of the establishment of the new system, without any compensation for the fresh burthen which the people must bear. I have said enough to shew the difference between the American federal system and that proposed for our adoption. In the American union each state is sovereign over all that immediately concerns it. Here, everything would be submitted to the General Parliament. Lower Canada is opposed to free trade in money, and desires to limit the rate of interest; and yet this she could not do, inasmuch as that very ordinary question would be under the control of the General Parliament. Whether the principle be a sound one or not, it is admitted that nine-tenths of our people desire that the rate of interest should be fixed. Each state of the American union regulates questions of this kind as it chooses, without the intervention of neighboring states, or of the Washington Government. Thus, the rate of interest varies in a great many of the states, and in others it is not fixed. In Vermont the rate is six per cent.; in New York, seven per cent.; in Ohio, ten per cent.; in Illinois, thirty per cent.; and in the other states, trade in money is free. These are facts which prove that the real Federal system resembles in no sense that which we are asked to adopt. (Hear, hear.) I might give a host of facts of this kind in support of my position; but I shall confine myself to one. It is well known that the people of Lower Canada are almost unanimous in repudiating the principle of divorce. Nevertheless, under Confederation the Parliament of Lower Canada is not to have the right of regulating

that question according to its wishes; but the Federal Parliament, sitting at Ottawa, will be empowered to force upon us principles utterly opposed to our own, and even to establish a Court of Divorce at Quebec. Under the Federal system, nothing so unjust, nothing so revolting to the feelings of the people could occur. In the American union there are some states in which divorce is permitted, and others in which it is not—another proof that sovereignty may be vested in each state, without detriment to the union. (Hear, hear.) I am opposed to the scheme of Confederation, because the courts of justice of Lower Canada will be under the control of the General Government. We should have courts of justice in Lower Canada, but the judges who would sit in them would be appointed by the Government of the Confederation. It would be the same in the other provinces; but Lower Canada, with her laws, which are peculiar to her, ought especially to resist the interference of the General Government in the administration of justice. It will be said that the Conference endeavored to cause their intentions to be suspected, and it has already been urged that this arrangement is a stroke of the lawyers, who would prefer to see the nomination of the judges vested in the General Government, because they would receive higher salaries, rather than see them appointed by the local governments, who would be obliged to have recourse to direct taxation in order to pay their salaries. But setting aside this idea, I assert that the appointment of the judges in each province by the General Government appears to me an uncalled-for interference, an anomaly which cannot be too strongly opposed. (Hear, hear.) I am opposed to the scheme of Confederation, because the local governors would only be tools in the hands of the General Government, who would interfere in the local matters by the continual pressure they would bring to bear on them whenever they desired to change the opinions of the local parliaments, elected by the people in each province, on any question which they might have to discuss. Why have the local governments, with the insignificant powers which it is proposed to confer upon them—why, I say, have they not been allowed to elect their respective governors? Would there be any more harm in this than results from the elections of mayors in our large towns? There was once a time when even the wardens were appointed by the Government. Has the election of mayors and wardens been produ-

tive of evil or discontent throughout the country? I am opposed to the scheme of Confederation, because by means of the right of *veto* vested in the Governor by the 51st resolution, local legislation will be nothing but a farce. They may try to make us believe that this power would be but rarely exercised, and that it differs in nowise from that exercised by the present Governor when he reserves bills for the Royal assent; but all the country knows that it would not be so. From the moment that you bring the exercise of the right of *veto* more nearly within the reach of interested parties, you increase the number of opportunities for the exercise of the right—you open the door to intrigues. As, for instance, a party will oppose the passing of a law, and not succeeding in his opposition in Parliament, he will approach the Ministers and the Governor General, intriguing to obtain as a favor that the law may be disallowed. Take an example. I suppose your Confederation to be established; that a bill is passed for the protection of settlers, such as we have seen pass the House six times in ten years without becoming law, on account of the opposition to it in the Legislative Council by the councillors from Upper Canada; what would happen? The few interested parties who were opposed to the measure would rush to the Governor General to induce him to disallow the law. By an appeal to the right of property, to the respect due to acquired rights, and to other sophistries, they would override the will of the people on a measure which is just in itself, and which is sought for and approved of by all legal men of Lower Canada in the present House. The people of Lower Canada will be prevented from obtaining a law similar to those now existing in thirteen different states of the American union, and which would in no way affect the principles of the existing law in Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) This is one instance out of a thousand, and will serve to illustrate the effect of this right of *veto*. I am opposed to the scheme of Confederation, because I cannot see why, on the one hand, it has been agreed to give all the public lands to the Government of each province, and on the other hand that the Government should purchase the lands in the Island of Newfoundland. The General Government gives up the fertile lands of Upper and Lower Canada, but it purchases the barren lands of Newfoundland at the enormous price of \$150,000 per annum, a sum representing a capital of \$2,500,000. Is not this a grand

speculation for the country? The Government at Ottawa will not possess a single inch of land in Canada, New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, but they will have a Land Department for the management of their superb possessions in Newfoundland? Is it imagined that if the public lands of that island had been of any value, they would have been given up to the General Government for any amount? No, the fact is that these lands are utterly useless for cultivation, that the whole island does not produce hay enough for the town of St. Johns, and that every year large quantities of it are imported. I know a farmer in Three Rivers who has sent cargoes of hay to Newfoundland, and who is now only waiting for the navigation to open to send more—and these are the lands which it is proposed to buy for a fabulous price, in order to induce that province to come into the Confederation. (Hear.) But there is also another matter for consideration with respect to this arrangement regarding the public lands. I am of opinion that it is more advantageous to the progress of colonization of our wild lands that they should remain in the hands of the present Government, rather than come into the possession of a local government, which might, perhaps, be obliged to maintain itself by direct taxation; for in that case the very uttermost farthing due on these lands will have to be collected. In a country like Lower Canada, with its rigorous climate, colonization must be aided and encouraged if reasonable progress is demanded. In that view the Government have made free grants, and have remitted many claims for interest on the public lands. Had they not done so, the population in certain sections would have been forced to leave the country. Remissions and free grants will disappear with the appearance of direct taxation. I am opposed to the scheme of Confederation, because it is most unjustly proposed to enrich the Lower Provinces with annuities and donations, to persuade and induce them to enter into a union which will be injurious to all the contracting parties. I am opposed to the scheme of Confederation, because the division of the public debts of the several provinces has been made in an unjust way, and because no portion of these debts ought to have been imposed on the local governments, which, in the event of the union, ought to have begun anew without being burthened with debt. I am opposed to the Confederation, because I foresee difficulties without number in relation to the concurrent powers on several points conferred on the general and local governments. Col-

lisions on these points will always be settled in favor of the stronger party, to the advantage of the General Government, and to the detriment of the often just claims of the different provinces. I am opposed to Confederation, because the premium offered to New Brunswick is of a most extraordinary character. It has been agreed to pay her \$63,000 per annum for ten years. The sum to pay this will have to be borrowed every year. Interest will have to be paid upon it, so that at the expiration of ten years the Confederation will have paid to New Brunswick:

Capital.....	\$630,000.00
Interest on capital.....	105,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$735,000.00

And what will it have received in exchange? Nothing whatever! For the sum agreed to be paid to Newfoundland there is at least a semblance of direct compensation in the cession which it makes of its barren lands. But in the case of New Brunswick, there is nothing to be got from her for these \$735,000, on which interest will have to be paid long after the ten years have expired. (Hear, hear.) And that is not all; we are to pay interest to New Brunswick, at the rate of five per cent., on \$1,250,000, for the difference between her debt and that of Canada in proportion to their respective populations. (Hear, hear.) I am opposed to the scheme of Confederation, because it has been agreed to construct the Halifax Railway without a notion of what it will cost, and at a time when we have already as much to pay as our resources can bear, without plunging into ruinous and unproductive enterprises of this kind. There is no exaggeration in the statement that at least \$20,000,000 will be required for the execution of that enterprise. Of what use will it be? Doubly useless in a military and in a commercial point of view. We are not in a position to undertake it for the mere pleasure of having a road which will place us in direct communication with the sea over English territory. What would the Intercolonial Railway be worth in a commercial point of view? In summer we have the St. Lawrence, which affords means of communication much more economical in their nature than any railway. In winter, without taking into account the difficulties caused by the vast quantity of snow which falls between Quebec and Halifax, is it supposed that there will be many travellers who will adopt that route, six hundred miles in length, to reach the seaboard at

Halifax, when they may reach Portland by a railway not more than one-third as long as the proposed road? Does any suppose that a person having flour to export will send it to Halifax, when he can despatch it by Portland? There is no sentiment in trade; it takes the road which it finds to be the shortest and the most profitable, and all your Confederation will not change this immutable law of trade in all countries. (Hear, hear.) But, it is said, this road will be of great use in time of war as a military route. Have those who talk in this way ever thought of the trifling distance that separates that road from American territory in certain places? Have they ever thought how easy it would be, in a single night, to destroy enough of it to make it unserviceable for months together? Have they ever thought how many soldiers would be required to protect it and keep it in operation? The experience of the present American war teaches us that to keep a railway in operation, nearly as many soldiers are required as there are lineal feet to protect. (Hear, hear.) I am opposed to the scheme of Confederation, because it is proposed to ensure, to guarantee the fulfilment of all engagements which shall have been entered into with the Imperial Government by all the provinces up to the time of union on the subject of the defence of the country, without the nature and extent of those engagements being known. There is perhaps no question in all the resolutions of the Conference of higher importance than this. Yet it is wished to make us ratify all these engagements with our eyes shut. What do we know about the engagements which the Governments of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island may have entered into on the subject of their respective defences? What do we know even of the engagements entered into by our own Government with the English Government in relation to the same question? Nothing; we can know nothing of them. We are told that the correspondence on the subject of the defences cannot be submitted to Parliament under existing circumstances. Why then should we blindly vote on questions of such grave importance? I am opposed to Confederation, because it is wished to make us enter into a financial arrangement which it is frightful to consider, and one which is most diametrically opposed to the interests of Canada. Let us see what is proposed in this respect. The Confederation would have us to pay—

For land in the Island of Newfoundland.....	\$ 2,500,000
Indemnity to New Brunswick	735,840
For the Halifax Railway.....	20,000,000
Difference in the debt of the provinces:	
Nova Scotia.....	3,000,000
Newfoundland.....	2,300,000
New Brunswick.....	1,250,000
Prince Edward Island.....	1,840,000
For fortifications in the six provinces.....	25,000,000
For the North-West road.....	5,000,000
For military expenditure.....	3,000,000

\$66,625,840

Add the public debt of	
Canada.....	\$73,000,000
Other unliquidated liabilities of Canada...	5,000,000
Debt of Nova Scotia...	8,000,000
Debt of New Brunswick	7,000,000
Debt of Prince Edward Island.....	244,673
Debt of Newfoundland	946,000

94,190,673

\$160,816,513

Here we have a pretty balance-sheet, not one item of which is exaggerated, and which is offered to us by Confederation. All this is exclusive of the enormous expense of the general and local governments. Some of the sums just mentioned will not be payable at once, but nearly all of them will be so before five years have elapsed; sums as considerable will be payable at once, it may be said, if we enter in the account the expenses of the Confederation and its unforeseen enterprises. At the last census, all the provinces only contained 3,294,056 souls. Supposing them to contain 3,500,000 at the time of the union, the debt, with the foregoing liabilities, would amount to \$45 for each man, woman and child, and of that debt we should have to pay the interest. (Hear, hear.) I am opposed to Confederation, because I cannot see the use or the necessity of it in a commercial point of view. Countries yielding different products may gain considerably by uniting. What do the Lower Colonies produce? Do they not live in a climate similar to ours? Do they not produce similar grain to that grown in Canada? What trade could there be between two farmers who produced nothing but oats? Neither one nor the other would want for them. They might stand and stare at each other with their oats before them, without ever being able to trade together; they would require a third person—a purchaser. In such a position are we with regard to the adjacent

colonies. Should we go for ice to the Lower Colonies? I think there is enough of it in Canada, especially at Quebec, and will be so long as sufficient spirit of enterprise is not displayed to export it to hot climates. They talk to us of fish—but those we have in our own waters—and of coal as a very great affair.

Mr. T. C. WALLBRIDGE—The Lower Provinces have reserved the right of placing an export duty on their coal.

Mr. J. B. E. DORION—My honorable friend reminds me that we shall not be able to obtain coal from the provinces which will form part of the Confederation, without paying them a tax. Is not that admirable? We are to constitute a single people, a single country, but there will be taxes to pay for trading with each other in certain articles. (Hear, hear.) I should understand the commercial advantages which we should gain if the English Provinces were situated in different climates, yielding every kind of produce, which should be freely exchanged. That which built up the commercial prosperity of the United States is their geographical position—their immense territory, in which is to be found every climate imaginable, from the north producing ice, to the south producing the most delicious fruits. An inhabitant of Maine may load a vessel with ice, proceed to New Orleans and barter his cargo of ice for rice, sugar, tobacco, &c., with which he may return home without paying a single farthing of customs duties. It is this free and continual exchange of their various products from Maine to California which has placed the United States in the first rank of commercial nations in so short a time. (Hear, hear.) Let us not, therefore, be lulled with fancies of the great commercial advantages we shall derive from a Confederation of the provinces. We have wood, they produce it; we produce potash, and so do they. All that they would require would be a little flour, and that Upper Canada can supply to them now without paying any tax for doing so. Again, our trade with them cannot be very considerable, because there are natural obstacles in the way to prevent its being so. Situated in the same degree as ourselves in respect of climate, they produce what we produce, and what we want they want—a foreign market wherein to dispose of their surplus products. Besides, the commercial advantages may all be obtained by a mere commercial union, apart from a political union. England concluded a commercial treaty with the United States, by means of which we trade freely with them in all products of the soil and of the fisheries.

What objection could there be to the establishment of a system of free trade between the colonies, which are all subject to the same authority? They would then enjoy all the advantages that could result, without entering into a political union, the depths of which we are not able to fathom. (Hear, hear.) I am opposed to Confederation, because instead of giving us strength to defend ourselves, it will prove to be a source of incalculable weakness. How can it be believed that by adding 700 miles to our long frontier, we shall strengthen ourselves against the enemy, when the territory to be added does not yet contain inhabitants enough to defend it? Is it supposed that if we had a war with the Americans, they would not attack the English Provinces at all points? They would attack Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, as well as the two Canadas. A country without depth, like that which it is proposed to form here, has not its like under the sun. It would be vulnerable at all points along its frontier of 1,600 to 1,800 miles. In geographical form it would resemble an eel. Its length would be everything, its breadth nothing. Nothing would be easier than to cut it into little pieces, and none of the parts so sliced off could send help to the others. The more of such country as the provinces which it is wished to unite to us that we have, the weaker shall we be, and the greater will be our difficulties in relation to military defence. (Hear, hear.) I am opposed to the scheme of Confederation, because I consider that it is the result of a conspiracy against popular rights in Canada, and that the hope is to impel the people into a course fatal to their real interests, by causing to shine before their eyes all sorts of wonders which would be accomplished in the end to the prosperity of the country, if that country would only accept the new form of Government which it is proposed to force upon it. (Hear.) I am opposed to the scheme of Confederation, because it is proposed to perpetuate, on a still greater scale, a state of things which is not suitable to the populations of America when they attain to years of discretion—a state of things which evidently was not intended for a country in which there are no castes, no privileged classes and no hereditary aristocracy—in which all are equal, socially and politically, by force of circumstances. I am opposed to the scheme of Confederation, because I am desirous that we should be as untrammelled as possible in

the selection of the future form of Government for Canada, when we shall emerge from the colonial condition. I am free to admit that I do not participate in the illusions of certain persons in respect to the magnificent destinies of the empire to be founded by us in North America, and that I am far from believing that it would be to our advantage. I am opposed to the scheme of Confederation, because I deny that this House has power to change the political constitution of the country, as it is now proposed to do, without appealing to the people and obtaining their views on a matter of such importance. These are the principal reasons which induce me to oppose the scheme brought down by the Government. But these are not all; I have yet many other considerations to urge. The gate of the future destinies of the country was opened when this scheme was laid before us, and I too am desirous of penetrating within its portals. I have said that the new organization which it is wished to establish here does not suit either our resources or our wants. It would appear that we cannot attain in Canada a reasonable limit as regards the administration of public affairs. Our system is not found to be extravagant enough, and it is wished to substitute for it one still more costly. Our neighbors have established an economical political system, which is much more advantageous to them than ours would be to any country. We pay here much more than is paid in the United States, although that people is infinitely richer than we are. If we prepare a list of the salaries paid to the governors of the states in the union, with a view of comparing it with the list of salaries which we pay here to our principal public employes, we shall be surprised at the difference which will be found to exist to our disadvantage. Here is a table of the salaries of the governors, together with the population of each state:—

States.	Population.	Salaries.
1. Maine.....	628,276	\$1500
2. New Hampshire ...	226,073	1000
3. Vermont.....	315,098	1000
4. Massachusetts.....	1,231,066	3500
5. Rhode Island.....	174,620	1000
6. Connecticut.....	460,147	1100
7. New York.....	3,880,735	4000
8. New Jersey.....	672,035	3000
9. Pennsylvania.....	2,906,115	4000
10. Delaware.....	112,216	1333½
11. Maryland.....	687,049	3600
12. West Virginia.....	393,234	2000
13. East Virginia.....	1,261,397	3000

States.	Population.	Salaries.
14. Kentucky.....	1,155,684	2500
15. Ohio.....	2,339,502	1800
16. Michigan.....	749,113	1000
17. Indiana.....	1,350,428	3000
18. Illinois.....	1,711,951	1500
19. Missouri.....	1,182,012	3000
20. Iowa.....	674,942	2000
21. Wisconsin.....	775,881	2000
22. Minnesota.....	173,855	1500
23. Kansas.....	107,206	2000
24. California.....	379,994	7000
25. Oregon.....	52,465	1500

There are also ten other states which were in rebellion at the beginning of the year 1864, the date of the table which I have given. It will be seen that Vermont pays only \$1,000 a year to an elective governor. That is less than we pay here to the mayors of our great cities. The State of New York, which is by itself more rich and populous than the whole of Canada, only pays \$4,000 a year to her Governor. I will not compare this salary with that of our Governor, amounting to \$32,000; but by comparing it with that of our judges of the second-class, it will be found that the latter receive higher salaries than the Governor of the State of New York. (Hear, hear.) The State of Ohio, more rich and more populous than Canada, only pays \$1,800 to her Governor. If the salaries are comparatively small in the United States, it is because it was understood there that good administration of public affairs might be obtained by the practice of a wise economy, without that display of luxury which is ruining us here. Another comparison, on a smaller scale, might be made between the State of New York and Canada, in respect of another matter. It is this:—The State of New York possesses magnificent canals, which cost her an enormous price; but the revenue produced by them has paid their cost, whilst here our canals, which also cost us very dear, do not even pay the interest of the debt which was contracted for their construction, and that is a point of difference by no means of small magnitude. The State of New York contracted a further debt for the enlargement of her canals after the revenue produced by them had paid off that which had been contracted for their construction; and the revenue which they yield is sufficient not only to pay the interest of that debt, but also to create a sinking fund which will allow of its liquidation in five years from the present day. Last year the State of

New York received from her canals the sum of \$5,118,501.35; the expenses of management amounted to \$111,503.78, and those of repairs to \$659,378.74, forming a total of \$770,882.52, which left a net revenue of \$4,347,618.83, after paying all expenses of management and costs of maintenance. (Hear, hear.) Do you know what was done with that surplus? It was applied as follows:—

Sinking Fund under 1 Art. 7...	\$1,700,000
do do 2 Art. 7...	350,000
do do 3 Art. 2...	1,116,242
To the Treasury towards paying the expenses of the state....	200,000
	<u>\$3,366,242</u>

Leaving a balance of \$981,376.17 after having met all engagements in relation to the Sinking Fund, and paid a sum of \$200,000 towards the cost of the government of the state. Here, when a school or sinking fund is created, it is expended, or borrowing has to be had recourse to in order to meet it. Let us then compare the management of our canals with that of the canals of New York. Here the tolls on certain of our canals are abolished with the view of favoring trade, instead of a reasonable revenue being levied from those great works! (Hear, hear.) The total debt of the State of New York on the 30th September, 1863, was as follows:—

Consolidated debt.....	\$6,506,654 37
Canal debt.....	23,268,310 25
Total recorded....	<u>\$29,774,964 62</u>

In the course of the same year, \$3,116,242 was paid into the sinking fund, and there remained still five and a half millions in hand produced by the canals, so that in less than ten years the canal debt and the special debt of the state will be entirely paid off. Shall we be able to say as much of our own debt in ten years time? (Hear, hear.) I repeat then, that the financial system of our neighbours is greatly superior to ours, and that they pay reasonable salaries to their public officers, while such payments here are on an extravagant scale. If I speak of all this, it is because I am opposed to the scheme, and because it is wished to establish a monarchy, a new kingdom on this continent, and because a desire is manifested to have a court, a nobility, a viceroy, tinsel, and so on. I am alarmed at the position in which it is wished to place us, for from extravagance it

is proposed, with all these absurd and ridiculous schemes, to pass to folly. (Hear, hear.) The commercial crisis through which we passed in 1846, when England repealed the import duty on foreign grain brought to her markets, will be remembered. Before that period our grain and other produce were protected on the English markets in being admitted free of duty, while that from the Black Sea and the United States was subject to a duty which was high enough to afford great protection in favor of ours. This new policy in relation to the colonies was productive of disastrous consequences to Canadian trade. The exportation of grain to England was completely put a stop to. There was no longer an outlet for that produce. To get to the United States markets twenty per cent. had to be paid. Well, the long and terrible crisis which followed the abolition of this protection of our produce, and which raged during the years 1847, '48, '49, may be remembered. Beginning in 1847 there was a disastrous commercial crisis in Canada. Failures followed each other with rapidity, and difficulty was everywhere felt. Matters had not greatly improved in 1848. It was evident that a fresh outlet for the agricultural produce of Canada must be found in order to ensure to her satisfactory relief. Discontent manifested itself, and agitation became apparent. Arguments and negotiations were had with the political men of England, but without any satisfactory result being attained. It was then thought that a solution of the commercial difficulties of the country was to be found in political changes. Hence followed the annexation movement of 1849. The obtention of a political change of this character would at once open to Canada all the markets of the United States, and would, without any doubt, have ensured the material prosperity of the country. The annexation movement met with considerable sympathy in the Northern States of the American union, but in the South it excited alarm. Fear was entertained of the influence which would have been conferred upon the North, by the accession of territory of such considerable extent as the two Canadas, at first, and subsequently of all the English Provinces. The Government of the United States was in the hands of political men from the South. To avert the danger which threatened their influence, that Government shewed themselves favorable to a commercial agreement with the

English Government. Both were interested in a commercial connection which left us nothing to envy in the lot of our neighbors. In the Canadian Parliament the question of commercial reciprocity with the United States was taken up. The Imperial Government approved of the steps taken by the Canadian Government, which tended to place their agriculturists on a footing of equality with the Americans on their markets. On the 16th March, 1855, the Reciprocity treaty entered into by the United States and England, came into force, after having been ratified by the Canadian Parliament. Lengthy debates took place in the American Congress upon the question, but southern influence carried the measure through. The Reciprocity treaty was to continue for ten years, from the 16th March, 1855, without its being possible to repeal it; but if one or the other of the contracting parties should think fit, after the expiration of the ten years, they might demand the abrogation of the treaty, by giving the other party one year's notice. The question of the repeal of that treaty has, therefore, for two or three years, been agitated in the American Congress with some warmth, by those who found their interests to suffer by it. The opponents of the Reciprocity treaty succeeded in Congress for two reasons: first, on account of a feeling of indignation raised up against Canada, by a part of our press, which displayed hostility to the Northern States; and second, because the rebellious Southern States were not represented in the American Government. On the 16th March next, the President is to give that notice, and on the 16th March, 1866, the markets of the United States will be closed to us. (Hear, hear.) We have seen that at the time the American Government, which was then in the hands of politicians from the Southern States, was not favorable to the annexation of Canada to the United States, because those statesmen dreaded the influence which two new free states in the union would bring to bear in relation to slavery. The ten years of the treaty consequently terminate on the 16th March in the present year, and thanks to the behavior of a very large portion of the Canadian press in relation to the Government of the United States, since the beginning of the war which now desolates the American Republic, the notice of the final abrogation of that treaty within a year is to be given to us. It will have

existed for eleven years, and its abrogation will certainly be a great misfortune to our country. It may be said that the treaty is as advantageous to the United States as it is to ourselves, and that its abrogation will do as much harm to them as to us; but the ill they will undergo in consequence will not remedy our evil, and will not prevent the United States markets from being closed to us, and our being subsequently compelled to pay a considerable duty for the privilege of carrying our produce thither, such as our oats, our horses, our horned cattle, our sheep, our wool, our butter, &c. The 16th March, 1865, will be a day of mourning for Canada, but the 16th March, 1866, will be a day of much deeper mourning, for it will mark the commencement of a commercial crisis such as we have never perhaps undergone, and the disastrous results of which to the future of the country are beyond calculation. (Hear, hear.) In order to understand the whole importance of this treaty to the prosperity of the country, it is necessary to know what passes in the country parts, as I myself am in a position to know through my constant relations with those parts. All the oats produced in the country from Trois Pistoles to the upper extremity of the province are exported to the United States, where they find a ready market, because they are wanted there. This year persons went as far as Three Rivers for them by way of the Arthabaska Railway. This branch of trade is now very considerable; but the very moment we have to pay an export duty of 25 per cent. upon our produce on entering the United States, we shall have a commercial crisis which will derange all business operations throughout the land. When the Reciprocity treaty is declared at an end, our oats will be worth no more than 1s. or 1s. 8d., as in former times, instead of 1s. 8d. or 2s., as at present; and it is clear to all that the farmer can derive no profit from growing them at that price. Formerly, before the treaty was made, the farmer could make something by selling his oats at that price, because food was cheaper and taxes less than they now are. The latter were no more than 2½ per cent. and 5 per cent., whereas they are now 20 per cent., and will be increased rather than diminished, under Confederation, as certain members of this House have alleged. (Hear, hear.) I am thoroughly acquainted with all that passes in the country parts; and when I think of the consequences of the repeal

of the Reciprocity treaty, I say again, I am alarmed. What is going on at this present moment? We all know that for several years past there have been bad harvests; that of last year was not good, not in Lower Canada only, but also in Upper Canada; and since New Year's day, half the country people in Lower Canada have been buying the flour necessary for their subsistence. All they spend in the purchase of flour, from this time till the harvest is gathered in, is capital which ought to be applied to the payment of their numerous debts. It is capital withdrawn from the working and improvement of their lands. Trade already feels the effects of it. The imports are more limited; a good deal of last year's stock of goods in the cities remains unsold. The public revenue will be considerably affected by it, and the surplus of 1864 will in 1865 become a deficit. It is not necessary to be a prophet to sugar so much. (Hear, hear.) I say, then, that we are on the brink of a commercial crisis, and it is not such a scheme as that before us that will enable us to avoid it, when we need rather to practise the strictest economy in our public expenditure. There is a great movement in progress from Lower Canada to the United States, notwithstanding the war; that is to say, people are obliged to leave Canada for the United States in order to earn money to pay debts which they have been compelled to contract for the necessaries of life. In many country places people are shutting up their houses and setting off to the States; if any proof of this assertion is necessary, visit Acton—Acton which has become a small city since the discovery of the copper mines now worked there. Well, Mr. SPEAKER, half the houses in Acton are now shut up, although as lately as last year the village presented every appearance of the highest prosperity. This year the inhabitants are driven to leave home and country to support their families. (Hear, hear.) I say that a movement of self-banishment like that which is now going on in the winter season, is alarming; for when half the country people are obliged to buy their flour as they now are, it proves that they must continue to buy it until next autumn, after the harvest is gathered in; and as many of them have not the means of waiting till then, they must leave the country to try to supply the wants of their families, by applying for work to our neighbors. (Hear, hear.) This movement is in progress among the rural popula-

tion as well as among the mechanics, in the new townships as well as in the old. After the commencement of the war, a considerable number of Canadians, who had returned home to escape from its evils, brought with them a small capital; but seeing the situation of affairs in this country, and having spent what they had, they are going back to the United States, preferring rather to take their chance of the conscription for the army than to eke out a miserable existence here. I repeat, then, Mr. SPEAKER, that a great many houses are shut up in the new settlements. I can specify them by the numbers of the range and lot in the counties which I represent. An unseen but very extensive influence is at work in all the country south of the St. Lawrence, above Nicolet and as far as the frontier. I shall explain it to you. In all that part of the country, a great many young men go to the United States to look for employment. These children of the people find there a wider field for their enterprising minds; in fact, they are forced to leave Canada in order to earn money. When once they are established in the United States, they correspond with their relatives whom they have left behind them. In all their letters they describe the treatment they receive, and boast of their position, the footing they are on in their social relations with the Americans, the good wages which they receive, and the state of prosperity at which they soon arrive. Not only do they correspond, they visit Canada to see their families from time to time. On these occasions, Mr. SPEAKER, their communications are made with greater freedom; they relate all that they have seen, and heard, and all they have learned. Be sure of this, Mr. SPEAKER, these communications, these intimacies between Canadians established in the States and their home friends, have greater effect to produce favorable feelings towards the Americans in our country than all the newspapers in the world. It is a portion of the heart of the country removed into a strange land by the force of circumstances. The accounts they hear from their friends prove to them that the Americans are not such horrible monsters as they are said to be in certain quarters; and that their political institutions are far superior to ours; that every man is on a footing of equality with his neighbor, and that he possesses political rights of which he cannot be deprived. This influence of which I am speaking is very great, and certainly it is

not to be counteracted, nor the feeling of sympathy for the people and the institutions of the United States to be repressed in the minds of those who confess it, by such changes as those now proposed to be made. (Hear, hear.) I say that the people of Lower Canada are alarmed at the scheme of Confederation, and the unknown changes which are on foot. I do not say that this feeling prevails in the district of Quebec, for in that locality everybody seems to be fast asleep; but it exists, beyond doubt, and very warmly, in that of Montreal, and even as far as Three Rivers, on both sides of the river. Nothing tends more to alienate the people from their government, and render them disaffected to England, than the attempts now made to impose on them a new Constitution without consulting them; for we must recollect that we are no longer in the same social state as in 1812; we no longer think in the same manner, and people would be greatly in error who should believe that the same feelings prevail which then prevailed. (Hear, hear.) I will not say that the people are disloyal; far be it from me to express such an ideal—they are as loyal as those who accuse them of disloyalty, but they are inclined to form free opinions on the acts of their government and their own interests, and there is a great difference between being loyal to Great Britain and fighting for a system of government and a principle imposed on us and accepted regretfully. I maintain, then, that the people are affrighted at the expense proposed to be made to organize what is called the defences of the country, and naturally ask each other whether it is right to call upon them to bear a share of the burthen of such defences, in the event of a war between our neighbors and England, a war in which they could neither say anything to avoid it, nor in its progress take any other part than that of shedding their blood and paying their money. They ask, moreover, whether it would not be better to remain in our present condition—whether it would not be better, even, to be smaller than to seek greatness—to try to compete with our neighbors in order that we may be the sooner crushed. They say, moreover, that a struggle between us and the United States would be a struggle between a dwarf and a giant; for no man in his senses will say that we could stand out against them. It is pretended that in case of a war with them, we should

have assistance from England. That is very well; but to any body who recollects the Crimean war, it will be very evident, that when England shall have sent us 30,000 soldiers, she will have given to the extreme limits of her power, and that she must resort to Spain, and France, and Germany and the whole continent of Europe to find soldiers. When we have 1,600 miles of frontier to defend, where should we be with our 30,000 English troops? It would not be nineteen men to a mile. (Hear, hear.) No, we are not to imagine that a war with the United States now would be like that of 1812, and that a company of 60 men would put the American army to flight, as in the palmy days of Chateaugay! (Hear, hear.) At this time, the army and navy of the United States are the strongest in the world, and the resources of the country inexhaustible. In four years they have built 600 vessels of war; and the number of their soldiers is told by hundreds of thousands. Now, peace will be made between the North and South, although it may happen not to please our politicians, who are friends to slavery, and have always despised and depreciated the Government of the United States; for the South cannot hold out long now that it has lost all the towns and cities through which it could receive assistance from abroad. The American Constitution will come out triumphant from the trial which it is now undergoing. It will come out purified and refined, and stronger than ever in the affections of the people who live under it. It was not against the form of Republican Government that the rebellion was undertaken in the United States, seeing that the Rebel States adopted exactly the same system when they declared their independence. They too have a President, a Senate, Representatives, a Government and a Legislature for every state, just the same as under the American Republic. (Hear, hear.) When peace is made between the North and South, should we be able to resist the combined forces of both sections of the United States of America? Should we be able to make a stand against their ships of war, which would overspread the ocean and the lakes—their guns which throw balls of several hundred pounds' weight a distance of eight or ten miles—from one end of a parish to the other? The State of New York, with its four millions of souls, can turn out more soldiers than all the colonies of England together; and there are still thirty-four rich and populous states

besides, to help in case of war. (Hear, hear.) No, we are not to imagine that a war at this time would be a war of 1812, and the people know it perfectly well. If a Confederation like this which is now proposed is imposed upon the people without consulting them, and even against their will—if they are forced to bear a burthen much heavier than they now bear—and if the treaty of reciprocity is not continued—if a commercial crisis should ensue, and if war should break out between England and the United States, you must not suppose that the people will fight as they fought in 1812, when you have driven them to discontent, and rendered their position harder than it now is. You may toll off the population into regiments, and they will not rebel, because they are loyal and submissive, but their hearts will not be in the cause, and they will assuredly not fight with the same spirit as they would shew if they were defending a constitution and a state of things of their own choosing. They will not fight with the same courage as the southern rebels have shewn, for they were fighting to defend institutions—bad ones it is true, but which they were attached to, and which they were desirous of preserving. (Hear, hear.) In the event of a war with the United States, and being under a Confederation, the people would be called upon to defend a state of things which they dislike—a Constitution imposed upon them, to which they would not be attached—a Constitution in which they would have no interest. The war might result from a difficulty originating in China! They would be compelled to fight against a people whom they look upon not as enemies, but as friends, with whom they keep up daily relations; and, I repeat it, it would not be possible for them to fight as they did in the last war. (Hear, hear.) But I return to the Reciprocity treaty, and I say that we shall feel its great value once it has been repealed. It is like a bridge over a river between two parishes; so long as the bridge stands, every one takes advantage of it without a thought of its utility, but let the bridge be carried away or destroyed, and every one feels what an advantage it was, and the people realize the loss they have suffered, when they are once more compelled to resort to the old system of flats and boats every time they require to cross the river. (Hear, hear.) And if the Reciprocity treaty be repealed, it will be due to the conduct of several mem-

bers of the Ministry, and to the papers that support them, and which they support in return; it will be due to the conduct of Tory politicians and journalists in Canada, who, since the beginning of the war, have constantly done everything in their power to irritate our neighbors and to embroil us with them, by displaying misplaced sympathy. (Hear, hear.) For my part, Mr. SPEAKER, I know that the people of Canada do not ask for annexation to the United States, for they are in the enjoyment of peace and contentment as things now stand. The people do not desire any change; but if you wish to establish a new order of things, if you desire to create a new nationality, I fancy we have the right to say what we consider suited to us; and if you desire to establish a new kingdom on this continent, we surely are entitled to examine what it is to be, and the basis upon which it is to be erected. I say it would be a misfortune for us if we attempted to establish a system founded upon a political principle contrary to that of the United States—on the monarchical principle. If we must inaugurate a policy, let it not be a policy calculated to give umbrage, a policy of distrust and provocation. Let it rather be a policy of conciliation and peace. Let it not be a policy of armies, of useless walls and fortifications—a policy of ruin and desolation! What would be the use of all these fortifications, all these walls, if they load us with an unbearable burthen of taxation, restrict our commerce, paralyse our industry, shut us up within our own narrow limits, with our vast products cut off from a profitable market? (Hear, hear.) Do you fancy that the people would then care much whether the flag floating over them bore a cross or a stripe? The people are satisfied to remain as they are; they do not wish for anything better now; but if you desire to change their political relations, they have the right to examine your scheme in all its phases. They have the right to ask themselves whether what you offer them is not a permanent state of war for themselves and their children. (Hear, hear.) The Constitution of the United States is certainly far superior to that proposed to us, and far better suited to our habits and the state of society amongst us. This scheme of Confederation, this scheme of an independent monarchy, can lead but to extravagance, ruin and anarchy! You may deery as much as you choose the democratic system, and laud the

monarchical system—the people will ever estimate them both at their proper value, and will ever know that which will suit them best. And when the farmers of Upper Canada are compelled to sell their wheat, after sending it to Montreal, ten cents a bushel lower than they now sell it at home, in consequence of the repeal of the Reciprocity treaty, there will be a general demand throughout the whole of Upper Canada, as well as of Lower Canada, for a change other than Confederation. And as to this point, here is what was said by a gentleman who, but a few months ago, held a seat on the Ministerial benches—I refer to the Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN. He said:—

The continuation of the Reciprocity treaty with the United States is favorable, not only to the farmers of Canada, and to all other classes through them, but also to the English Government; for, without the existence of that treaty, the Canadians are in a position to be greatly benefited, in an industrial and commercial sense, by the annexation of Canada to the United States, unless other industrial or intercolonial arrangements should take place.

Annexation is far preferable, in an industrial point of view, to our "free trade in raw products," which is unaccompanied by protection for home industry.

"Those who speak the truth to the people in times of crises like the present, are really the most loyal men," adds Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN; and he is right; therefore, it is that I take it upon myself to speak thus frankly and to tell the truth to the people. (Hear, hear.) "But," it will be said, "annexation is national suicide, and the people will never consent to it! Look at Louisiana, which has lost itself in the American union!" The people of Lower Canada will reply, that Louisiana contained but 80,000 whites when it was sold to the United States for \$14,000,000, and that Lower Canada counts more than 1,000,000 of inhabitants; that there is, therefore, no comparison between the position of Louisiana at that time and that we now occupy. Besides, those 80,000 whites in Louisiana were not all French; for thirty years previous to 1800, Louisiana had belonged to the Spaniards. No one can deny that. It was in 1803 that it was ceded by France to the United States, and yet its French population has not been absorbed and has not disappeared. (Hear, hear.) Since it was ceded to the United States, Louisiana has always governed itself as it liked, and in its own way. It is true that the official use of the French language

has been abolished in its Legislature, but why and by whom? It was abolished by the people of the country themselves, to mark their dissatisfaction at having been sold by France. But notwithstanding that fact, and the great influx of foreign population, the original population have remained French, their laws are published in French, the judges speak French, pleading is carried on before the tribunals in French, numerous journals are published in French; in a word, the country has remained as thoroughly French as it was under the domination of France. (Hear, hear.) To those who tell our people that annexation would annihilate them as a people, and destroy their nationality and their religion, they will reply that there is no danger of their being transported like the inhabitants of Acadia, and that Lower Canada would be as independent as any of the other states of the union; that they would, therefore, manage their own affairs, and protect their interests as they thought proper, without fear of intervention on the part of the General Government or of the other states; for they would possess, like all the other states, full and entire sovereignty in all matters specially relating to their own interests. They would be obliged to submit to the Federal Government only as regards matters of general interest, such as postal matters, the tariff, foreign relations, defence against enemies, &c., &c. With regard to local matters, they would be perfectly sovereign in their own country, and they could make all the laws they thought proper, provided such laws were not hostile to the other states. Thus, as regards the question of divorce, they might legislate so that divorce could not be effected within their limits. At present some of the states have divorce laws, while others have not; divorce is not permitted everywhere. (Hear, hear.) In the same way as regards the militia; the people will tell you that they might do like Vermont, which has formed part of the American union since its foundation, and which never adopted a militia law until January, 1864, because the political organization of the United States never rendered it necessary for the American people to maintain armies in each state in time of peace, and each state is perfectly free as regards the organization of its militia, provided it furnishes the number of soldiers assigned to its population, in time of war. (Hear, hear.) They do not ruin themselves in time of peace to organize the militia. ▲

great obstacle to the political progress of our country arises from the vast number of persons who arrive amongst us each year from the British Islands; they are here, bodily, it is true, but their minds wander over the sea between the two hemispheres, and they act as though they were in England, in Scotland, or in Ireland, without considering our position, our social and political relations; and they think they need only cry out "Loyalty, loyalty!" to make the people rush to arms; but I repeat again, that if it be attempted to force the people into a change such as is now proposed, the people of the rural districts will become hostile to those who force it upon them, and they will not fight in defence of such a Constitution, as they would fight in defence of a principle they approved of, and of a political position with which they were satisfied. (Hear, hear.) I have but one word more to say on this subject, and it is this: it is all very well to say that the debt of the United States is enormous; that will not frighten the people, for, notwithstanding the war between the North and the South, if we consider the wealth and resources of the United States, that debt will not be by any means so formidable a matter to deal with as we have been told. In January last, the receipts of the United States Treasury amounted to \$31,000,000—one million a day; and notwithstanding that fact, despite the heavy taxes paid, and paid willingly, by the American people, commercial prosperity is far greater in that country than it is here, as those who now visit the country cannot fail to notice. On the first of December last, the close of the fiscal year, the debt of the United States was \$1,740,690,480. With a population of 32,000,000 this debt does not, therefore, exceed \$56 per head. I have already shewn that under Confederation, our debt would be \$40 per head in Canada. Comparing our resources with those of the American union, we were much more deeply indebted than they were at the period of the last annual report of the Treasury. It is easier for them to collect two dollars than for us to collect one. But with their immense resources, their boundless commerce, their ever-increasing manufactures, if the war were to end to-morrow, the United States would pay off their debt in a few years, if the government continued to levy the same amount of taxes that they now do. A revenue of a million a day, \$365,000,000 per annum, \$3,650,000,000 in ten years!—

double the amount of the national debt at the beginning of the year, notwithstanding the terrible four years' war! If the Government were to reduce the present imposts by one-half, the debt would be paid off in ten years; whereas in ten years from now our own debt, which is proportionably considerable, will have doubled itself, or, it may be, increased in a much greater ratio, if we are to judge by present appearances. (Hear, hear.) I repeat, I do not ask for the annexation of Canada to the United States, nor do the people desire it; but I assert that changes such as those proposed in our social and political condition, are the surest means of bringing it about, because they are of a nature to create serious discontent, and a constant conflict between us and our neighbors; and the people, far from being satisfied with that, will be but ill-inclined to defend such a state of things. I beg, in conclusion, to call the attention of hon. members to the fact, that while it is proposed to change our Constitution, the Government refuse to give us any details or explanations as to the proposed changes; and I assert that it is our duty not to vote for these changes blindly. With reference to what I have said, I have not said it without well weighing the bearing of my words; I am ready to abide the consequences that may follow. I am in a position to speak frankly, and I have done so; for I am not here to represent my own personal interests, nor the interests of any individual. I have spoken the language of facts, I have spoken as the people would speak throughout all the rural districts on the south side of the St. Lawrence, if they were frankly told how matters stand, and if the consequences of the violent changes sought to be effected in our political condition were explained to them. (Cheers.)

MR. DENIS—MR. SPEAKER, for a few days past we have heard very extraordinary speeches from the honorable members of the Opposition, occupying seats on the other side of the House. Those honorable gentlemen have taken the interests of the country in hand, and undertaken to set them right by such speeches as we have just heard from the honorable member for Drummond and Arthabaska (MR. J. B. E. DORION).

HON. MR. HOLTON—Don't crush him.

MR. DENIS—I do not wish to crush any one; but I must say conscientiously what I think of the extraordinary speech which he has just delivered. The honorable members of the Opposition have, since the commencement

of this debate, held one course—they have constantly appealed to the prejudices of a class who, for the protection of their interests, uniformly depend on those who represent them here, and who, in order to make sure of their allegiance and perpetuate it, work secretly and in the dark to obtain the signatures of unsuspecting parties to petitions which they send round the country, and use afterwards to ensnare the confidence of members of this House. (Hear, hear.) Fortunately, they have hitherto had but little success in their undertakings, and have made but small progress in their attempts to injure us. These gentlemen make a loud outcry against the resolutions introduced by the Government; but if they are as bad as they say they are, why do they not themselves prepare some remedy for the troubles and difficulties of the country, instead of limiting their exertions to cries and reproaches? But no. It is always the same thing with them. "Great cry, and little wool." (Hear, hear.) The Opposition have always had but one object in view, and that was, not the good of the country, but the attainment of power. This has been the aim of all their actions, and when they did actually, by an accident, acquire power, their conduct was far worse than that of which they accused their predecessors in office. Their intention is to frighten the people, as they did on the militia question, by enlisting prejudices of all kinds against the measure now under discussion—trying every petty subterfuge and shabby artifice to bring back the honorable member for Hochelaga (Hon. Mr. A. A. DORION) to power. But it will not work—their little game will have no luck. To be sure, we cannot deny the honorable member for Drummond and Arthabaska, for his part, the credit of knowing how to work upon the people, or rather how to agitate them, while they, good souls, trust blindly to the integrity of the men who represent them here. It was in this spirit of truth that he stated in his strictures on the Militia Bill introduced by the CARTIER-MACDONALD Government that it was a measure which would entail a tax of \$20 a head on every *habitant*, and it is in the same spirit that he now tells them Confederation will entail one of \$40 a head. One assertion is as true as the other—neither of them is worth much. How can the honorable member venture on such assertions, since he knows nothing of the details of the measure—that is, the measures of detail which are to come after? He can only talk on supposition, and his hypothesis

is false and unfounded. He declares, for instance, that the intention of the Government, in moving for Confederation, is to introduce monarchy into America, and to create princes, viceroys, and an aristocracy, and make the Honorable Attorney General for Lower Canada (Hon. Mr. CARTIER) Governor of Lower Canada. Such ideas could never enter any head but those of men who are incapable of self-government, and who are good for nothing but to become demagogues. In good truth, they mean nothing but to agitate—to make trouble and sow discontent throughout the land, with relation to the great question which has for months been the subject of discussion. For this end, they get up little petitions, to be signed in the concessions, saying to the women,—"If you would not lose your husband, sign. He is sure to be drafted for the Confederation. Sign, if you would not have your children deprived of their religion!" (Hear, and laughter.) It is by such means that they gain their little advantages. I have just been informed that these men, who have always cried out that the clergy ought not to interfere in politics, are doing all they can to enlist the clergy and swell the cry against Confederation, by proclaiming that the Church is in danger. But the clergy know them too well, and will let them shout. When I hear these hon. gentlemen of the Opposition pretend that the clergy are on their side, because two priests have written against Confederation in the newspapers, I cannot help laughing. They are now, forsooth, the saviours of religion and of the clergy, loving and respecting them above all things. They spoke another language when they insulted religion and the clergy in their journals; when they declared, in their *Institut Canadien*, that priests ought to be forbidden to talk politics, and not to be allowed to vote at elections. Let them recollect the famous parody on excommunication, published in the *Pays*, which never existed save in the narrow and diabolical mind which rules the *Siecle*. But now all this is to be forgotten; now they say,—"Give up your leaders—the traitors who intend to sell the country, betray your religion, and drag your nationality through the mire—and come, follow us!" You smile, because you know that all these protestations which you are making in favor of religion, of the clergy, and our nationality, are a fine piece of acting. The people know this, and will not believe you; they will remain true to their leaders and to those tried friends who have always served them well and faith-

fully. Those who are now in power have on their side the people and the ecclesiastical authorities, whom you would use as a stalking horse in your campaign against Confederation. All your efforts, all your tricks, will not succeed in shaking the confidence of the people in their representatives. You talk of public meetings, of the people's opinion, petitions, &c., but why did you not call these meetings when the members were at home in their counties, when they might have met you face to face? You waited, like cowards, till they had come here to attend their duties in this House, and set hiring agents to work to get up those meetings, expecting an easy victory. We know perfectly well, for we have proofs, that agents well paid by a political committee at Montreal, were sent to all the parishes to get up meetings against Confederation, at which they made use of the most contradictory arguments, varied as occasion required, to suit their object, which was to induce the people to declare against the scheme, and sign petitions accordingly. (Hear, hear.) These petitions bear the names of children, and, in fact, of sucklings, as was proved the other day by the honorable member for Boucherville. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) And if that much is certain, we are justified in thinking that those agents must have done something still worse, with which we are not acquainted, for the purpose of prejudicing the people against the Government scheme. Now, I say that in view of all this—in view of all this underhand trickery and hypocrisy of the Opposition—all French-Canadians should unite together in support of a just, frank and straightforward measure, such as that now submitted to this House. Was it not stated, long before the meeting of Parliament, that the measure should receive a calm and fair consideration? And yet since the beginning of the discussion we have had nothing but appeals to prejudice made by the adversaries of the measure, in place of discussing it on its merits, as they ought to have done. The honorable member for Richelieu (Mr. PERRAULT) has distinguished himself in the way of appealing to national and religious prejudices, and in order to attain his object he cited facts long past—drawn, in fact, from ancient history. We all know the facts he mentioned; but why cite them as he did in such a body as this? It is neither politic nor right. Our duty as members of this House is to make laws for the well-being and prosperity of the country and of all

classes of the population, and not to excite the hatred and prejudices of one section of the community against another section. (Hear, hear.) Then, again, what was the gist of the speech just made by the honorable member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. J. B. E. DORION)—who certainly, I must admit, possesses oratorical ability, as well as other gifts? It was just simply a comparison between our Government and that of the United States, and of course he gave the preference to the latter. The honorable member is never weary of looking to Washington with one eye. (Hear, hear.) Why does not the honorable member tell us frankly at once that he desires the annexation of Canada to the United States? For, if we are to believe his statements, the American Government is an extraordinary government, a model government, a government unequalled in the world! But no; instead of giving us the benefit of his real thoughts, he stops short at insinuations, and comparisons of the expenditure attending the two forms of government, in order to leave an impression on the minds of the people. (Hear, hear.) Another hon. member of this House, who is not in the habit of appealing to the religious or national prejudices of the people—the hon. member for Bagot (Hon. Mr. LAFRANÇOISE)—has thought proper, this evening, to join in the outcry of the Opposition on this subject. He cited an event which has just occurred at Toronto, and which everybody regrets, and used it as an argument against the scheme of Confederation submitted to us by the Government. Why drag that fact into the discussion of a great question, and at a solemn moment like this? I do think that it was hardly becoming in an honorable ex-minister of the Crown to say to this House,—“Two sisters of charity have been insulted in the streets of Toronto; ergo, sisters of charity will not be tolerated under Confederation; the clergy will be persecuted, and religion annihilated.” But this style of argument is resorted to somewhat too tardily. These protestations of devotedness to religion and to the clergy come too late to be believed by the people of Lower Canada, or to make any impression on them. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member for Richelieu also indulged in insinuations against the Honorable President of the Council (Hon. Mr. BROWN), and stated that he was still as great a fanatic as ever against our religion and our clergy. Certainly, the Honorable President of the Council was wrong in speaking as he formerly did,

when he was in the ranks of the Opposition ; but how much more culpable was it not in the *Rouges* to support him at that very time? The members of the Opposition reproach us to-day with supporting the Hon. President of the Council, and blame us for things we have not done. We blamed the Hon. President of the Council for attacking our clergy and insulting what we respect most. We opposed him with all our strength, but at that very time the Opposition supported him, and approved of everything he said. The people know that perfectly well ; they know and appreciate thoroughly the difference between our motives and yours, in opposing the hon. member for South Oxford, and you cannot deceive them. The people will say to you,—“ Give us a proof of what you can do ; and if you are better than those you attack, we will accept your leadership.” What crime are we charged with to-day by the Opposition? After numberless fierce struggles, and two general elections, it had become impossible for any party to govern the country. The people were weary of the whole thing, and wished for a change. It was then that a coalition took place between the two parties who formed the majority in either section of the province. The Opposition should not condemn that alliance ; on the contrary, they ought to continue to give their support to the honorable member for South Oxford (Hon. Mr. BROWN), since he has formed an alliance with the Hon. Attorney General for Lower Canada, in order to find some means of carrying on the Government, and of removing the difficulties by which we are surrounded. It has been stated that the delegates to the Quebec Conference were not empowered to prepare a scheme such as that now before us ; but can it be said that the Government had not the right to do so? The Ministry have prepared a scheme which they now submit to us, and the question is not as to whether they were or were not empowered to prepare it, but whether the scheme is a good one, whether it is deserving of the approval of the people, and for the best interests of the province. This it is for us to say, and it is all we have to say ; but it is not right to accuse hon. Ministers, who have endeavored to discharge their duty and to relieve the country from its difficulties—it is not right to reproach them, after they have labored day and night at their task, and to tell them they had no right to do what they have done. We had a right to expect a serious discussion of the Government scheme ;

but no, we have had nothing of the kind ; we have had nothing but personal attacks, appeals to prejudice, and underhand attempts out of doors against the scheme. We have had a crop of suppositions and insinuations against this man and that man. It is “supposed” that the Honorable Attorney General for Lower Canada desires to become a governor ; another is accused of desiring to be made a judge of a Federal court, and every hon. member of this House favorable to the Government scheme is accused of aiming at making money, obtaining a place or honors, by betraying and selling the cause of the people. This is certainly most unjust, and every one of these suppositions is utterly unwarranted. Those who indulge in them have not a shadow of proof to bring forward in support of their assertions, and they would, therefore, be much better employed in a calm and deliberate discussion of the measure itself. (Hear, hear.) Other hon. members, with a view of opposing the Government scheme and depreciating it in the opinion of the people, have made use of the name of an honored citizen, now living in the retirement of private life. The honorable member for Bagot (Hon. Mr. LAFRAMBOISE) told us that Mr. C. S. CHERRIER, of Montreal, was strongly opposed to the scheme of Confederation, and that his opinion should have great weight, because he is a “devout” man. Now, I should like to know, Mr. SPEAKER, what connection there can possibly exist between religious devotion and a discussion such as this? I was really sorry to hear such language fall from the honorable member for Bagot, for he is not in the habit of making use of arguments of that kind. It is utterly astounding to see the party who wanted to shut up the priests in their vestries, and deny them the right to hold any political opinions, using Mr. CHERRIER's devotion as a weapon wherewith to combat Confederation. (Hear, hear.) But what is the origin of the great agitation promoted by the hon. member for Hochelaga (Hon. Mr. DORION), since the alliance of the Conservative party with the Hon. President of the Council? Has he forgotten that he himself carried out implicitly the behests of that hon. gentleman all the time they worked together? And if not, how can he possibly make it a crime in others to work with him? Was he not aware that his own Government—the Government of the hon. member for Cornwall (Hon. J. S. MACDONALD)—existed only at his will ; that the

Hon. President of the Council chastised that Government for its most trifling backslidings; and that whenever he threatened, the Government quickly mended its ways? To-day you speak of the vast expenditure of the province; but you formed part of a Ministry which promised wonders to the country, and what did it do after all? The facts are there; and surely it ill-becomes you to speak of extravagant expenditure. Hon. gentlemen exclaim—" \$40 per head!" They do not, it is true, tell us that the high price of molasses is due to CARTIER and J. A. MACDONALD—(laughter)—but they everywhere assert that these gentlemen want to ruin the people, increase the taxes, and plunge the country into an ocean of debt. And yet honorable gentlemen opposite have themselves been in power, and notwithstanding all their previous denunciations of taxation and extravagant expenditure, they were forced to admit the necessity of customs duties, and to work out responsible government; they found it necessary to retract all they had said in former speeches, when they themselves held the reins of power.

- But they did not remain in office long enough to get rid of the old leaven completely, and now that they are out of power once more, we find them taking up their former ories. We have the honorable members for Chateauguay and Hochelaga, who once had a Confederation scheme of their own, opposing the scheme of the Government, simply because it did not originate with themselves, and opposing the adoption of any measure for the defence of the country. These honorable gentlemen stated, through their organ *Le Pays*, that if England desires to retain Canada, she should pay for its defences. This is not said so openly now, but the great wealth of the United States, the immense number of their guns, ships of war and armies, are used as arguments to shew the uselessness of any attempt on our part to defend ourselves in case of attack, and also to lead the people to the conclusion that it is better for the country not to expend anything for defence. When the CARTIER-MACDONALD Government was defeated on a question of loyalty towards the Imperial Government, the whole Opposition voted against the principle of organizing the militia for our defence. The leaders of the Opposition then voted unflinchingly against a Militia law; but three or four days after, when they had succeeded in taking the place of those whom they had defeated, they themselves voted, without scruple or hesitation, \$600,000 for the organisation of the militia.

They appointed instructors throughout the whole country, for they had learned that as British subjects they had duties towards the Imperial Government. To-day they are acting as they then acted, and they desire once more to play a double game. They do not want Confederation, but they admit that there is need of a remedy for our sectional difficulties, of the existence of which there can be no question. Yet they refuse to say what remedy they propose for our difficulties. They keep it all to themselves, shut up in their own minds, as they did with the celebrated budget of the honorable member for Chateauguay, which was to be the cure for all our financial difficulties, but which never saw the light. Eighteen months of incubation did not suffice to bring forth the bantling. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) If the Government should not succeed in inducing all the provinces to accept the scheme, they, at all events, will have kept their word and kept the faith which is due to a treaty solemnly contrasted between the Provinces of British North America. The hon. member for Chateauguay (Hon. Mr. HOLTON) has told us that he had received a telegraphic despatch, by which he had positive information that the people of the Lower Provinces had rejected Confederation, and that they had pronounced against it in New Brunswick. But what does all that amount to? Ought we on that account also to reject the scheme of the Government? Are we not bound to this scheme by the word of our Ministers? No, we hold to this great scheme of Confederation, and we want no little schemes such as are proposed by the honorable gentlemen on the other side of the House—schemes by which they would appoint little judges and divide Canada into little districts. The Opposition, it is true, have created a certain amount of distrust in this scheme among the people, by harping on direct taxation, and declaring that Canada will be obliged to tax herself in order to purchase and defend the territory of the Lower Provinces. They hope by these means to gain the confidence of the people, and to return to power; but even if they succeeded, they would be obliged to do later what they have already done, what they now condemn, and what the men now in power are desirous of doing in the interest of the people; they would be obliged to organize the defences of the country, as the Government propose to do, and as the Imperial Government desire. At the present moment we have to choose one of two alternatives—either we must annex

ourselves to the United States, or we must respect the wishes of England and accept Confederation with the Maritime Provinces. If we do not desire either Confederation or annexation, we must remain as we are and continue to struggle with Upper Canada; and in the meantime the people will remain behind their plough, business will be at a stand-still, and the debt will be increased by millions. (Hear, hear.) For several days past, Mr. SPEAKER, we have listened to pompous speeches made by honorable members of the Opposition, appealing incessantly to the religious and national prejudices of the population of Lower Canada, with the view of defeating the Government scheme. These honorable gentlemen draw pictures which are really heartrending. They tell the Protestants that under Confederation they will lose all their rights in Lower Canada in respect of the education of their children; and, on the other hand, they tell the Catholics that their religion is in danger, because the Federal Government will have the right of *veto* in respect of all the measures of the Local Government. But this right of *veto* must of necessity exist somewhere, in order that the minority may be protected from any injustice which the majority might attempt to do them. We cannot hope to have the majority in the Federal Parliament, when we French Lower Canadians and Catholics have never had it under the existing union. And yet we cannot but congratulate ourselves upon the relations which have always existed between us and our fellow-countrymen of other origins and religions. The Benning Divorce Bill affords a proof that we are in a minority in the present Legislature, for the Protestants all voted in favor of that measure, and the Catholics against it, and the bill was passed. The Catholics, then, are wrong when they exclaim that we ought to unite and carry out our own religious views and secure the triumph of French-Canadian nationality; doing so will only have the effect of exciting the Protestants and the British-Canadians to do the same thing, and then we should fall into a state of anarchy. One night last week, about midnight, an honorable member of this House, an ex-Minister, the honorable member for Cornwall (Honorable J. S. MACDONALD) forgot his position so far as to seek to excite religious jealousies and hatreds; but I am happy to see that he has not succeeded in his attempt, and that Catholics and Protestants have treated his fanatical appeals with contempt, and have made no response. After

having heard this, can any one believe in the reality of all these anticipations of danger paraded in the newspapers, in the House, and throughout the country? No, it is impossible to believe in it, and not to perceive that it is all hypocrisy, with the view of exciting the prejudices of the people. (Hear, hear.) It has been also said that the use of our language was in danger, and that the French laws would disappear when Confederation was accomplished. But is it not a well-known fact that we owe the protection of our French laws to the Hon. Attorney General for Lower Canada (Hon. Mr. CARTIER), and is not the *Code Civil*, which he has just laid before us, a sufficient answer to all that can be asserted on this head? The French laws will be maintained and respected in Lower Canada, and this we owe to the Hon. Attorney General (Hon. Mr. CARTIER). We shall have a statute to assimilate the law of evidence in commercial matters in Lower Canada; but the French laws will not be abolished. If there is a man in the whole country who possesses real legal judgment, and who is perfectly acquainted with the laws and statutes of Lower Canada, it is certainly the Hon. Attorney General for Lower Canada, Mr. GEORGE ETIENNE CARTIER. No one will deny this, and there is not a man who can compete with him in this respect. Why come here and tell us that our language is about to disappear, and that its use is to be abolished in the Federal Legislature? Is it because lies must be told in order to oppose the scheme of the Government, and real reasons for opposition cannot be found? A drowning man catches at a straw, and that is what the Opposition are doing to-day. But they ought to be just, and to admit that we shall have our code, which will guarantee to us the maintenance of our laws in Lower Canada, just as the Imperial Act will guarantee to us the use of our language. Why, too, should personal recrimination be indulged in in this discussion? "CARTIER," they say, "does this because he wants to be Governor."

MR. GEOFFRION—Hear, hear.

MR. DENIS—The honorable member for Verchères, who cries "Hear, hear," is a man of too much talent and good sense to approve of such language, and especially to make use of such arguments. He ought to leave that to the honorable member for Richelieu (Mr. PERRAULT), who openly tells us in this House that the majority is venal and servile. Such language as this ought not to be made

use of here, out of respect for ourselves and for the French-Canadians in this House. It is a great mistake on the part of a beardless youth, with no more experience than the honorable member for Richelieu, particularly when he is addressing men of the experience and capacity of the Honorable Attorney General for Lower Canada. All parties agree in saying that the Hon. Attorney General East is capable, honest, and of the highest integrity; but all do not approve of his policy, and that is perfectly legitimate. But that is no reason for attacking his private character, and putting in his mouth opinions which he has never uttered. They say he is honest and upright, and yet we read in the newspapers that he is willing to sell his country, his religion and his nationality for a title or an appointment as Governor. This is very unfair. (Hear, hear.) The members of the Opposition demand an appeal to the people upon the question of Confederation. But if it were granted, you would see, Mr. SPEAKER, to what lengths they would go. These demands for an appeal to the people are only made with the view of serving the purposes of a *clique*, who would say to those who desired to discuss frankly the question before the country—"Hold your tongues and vote against the Government!" This is what they have already attempted to do by means of meetings which they have caused to be held in different counties; but I must say that in mine they did not succeed in their designs. They sent three agents there, under different pretexts, who tried by every possible means to induce the people to pronounce against the Ministerial scheme; but they did not succeed; and yet I am the humblest member of this honorable House. But as I happened just at that time to be attending to the duties of my profession at the court of the district of Beauharnois, I observed that these agents had been sent by the Montreal committee, and I was enabled to defeat their little plans and their little games. They tried to make little speeches, and hold little meetings, but as I was on the spot they gained nothing by it. But all this serves to indicate the means that have been employed by the partisans of the Opposition to excite the people against the measure of Confederation. I do not want to be too hard upon them, because they naturally were desirous of obtaining a triumph for their party, and they employed these means as they might have employed others, although they do not care a rush for the holy cause of nationality or religion.

(Hear, hear.) I remember very well what used to be said and what used to be done in the *Institut Canadien* of Montreal, and I observe with satisfaction that the present conduct of the honorable members of the other side of the House who belonged to that *Institut* is a direct protest against what they did in the *Institut*, in which we have had *Swisses* coming and preaching religious toleration. Then it used to be said—"We must advance with the times," and they used to read the *Pucelle*. (Hear, hear.) Now, the Government does not propose to establish the annual parliaments, that the hon. member for Hochelaga used to cry out for, but they are engaged in settling the difficulties of the country. They call upon every man of talent to aid them in this task, or to invent a better remedy for these difficulties, and to submit it to the country. But if those who oppose the Government measure are contented with mere opposition, without proposing any better measure in its stead, what will the people say to them if they present themselves to their constituents, to ask them to pronounce between them and the Government? They will say—"What have you done; what have you to offer to compare with what the Ministers have done and offered to us?" They will ask them for their measure, but they will keep it hidden away with that famous budget of the honorable member for Chateauguay, which has not yet been hatched after eighteen months' incubation. (Hear, hear.) We know perfectly well that the Government measure is not perfect, and that it has defects, as all plans made by men must have. For my part I admit it most willingly; but it must be remembered that it is a compromise, and this the gentlemen of the Opposition take good care not to allow for or to state. In public they say that the French-Canadians are going to be overwhelmed by the English element in the Confederation, and that they will lose their language. But do they not know that in Upper Canada the French language has been preserved as pure and unalloyed as in Lower Canada, wherever there is the smallest nucleus of French inhabitants? The members on the other side propose giving us lessons in the art of preserving our language and our nationality—they, annexationists at heart and in their actions, who are always looking to Washington. I do not say that it is a crime to be an annexationist, but at least let them frankly admit what they are. Thus the honorable member for Chateauguay (Hon. Mr. HOLTON) is more of a Yankee than any one. He told us

to-day he did not like great undertakings, but it seems to me that certain great undertakings in which he has had a hand, have not had the effect of emptying his purse. (Hear, hear.) Why should the country be prevented from advancing in the way of progress; why prevent the construction of means of communication, which will have the effect of keeping our French-Canadians in the country? You seem to forget your words and deeds of yesterday. When he occupied a seat on the Treasury benches, the honorable member for Chateauguay was constantly rising to tell us that we were a factious Opposition, a dreadful Opposition, because we did not allow the Government to do just what they liked. But he does not think his own opposition to-day factious, he who has risen fifty-five times in the course of this debate, and who cuts up every question like fresh butter. He says to-day that the Government wishes to choke off discussion and to prevent the members of the Opposition from speaking, and yet he has spoken fifty-five times! The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. JOLY) told us, the other day, that the people are in a condition of torpor, and that they must be awakened. If they are in a condition of torpor anywhere, they are certainly not so in Lower Canada; but if they were, they would undoubtedly be awakened by all the fine speeches delivered by honorable members on the other side of the House, and on observing the great resistance which they offer to divorce and their fervent energy in maintaining family ties unbroken. Those gentlemen loudly proclaim to us that we ought not to vote for divorce; but it is quite unnecessary for them to tell us so—all Catholics are perfectly well aware that it is their duty to vote against divorce. We know that the laws of Parliament cannot prevail over those of the Church. And we are not voting for divorce in voting for the scheme of Confederation; and the declamations of hon. members on the other side of the House, on this subject, cannot carry conviction into the minds of any one. Nobody asks us to enact a law to allow civil magistrates to celebrate marriages, and all that is said by the Opposition in relation to this question only amounts to a tempest in a tea-pot. At any rate we may congratulate ourselves upon the conversion of hon. members, and now they need only tell the truth for the future, and their past sins will be forgiven them. However, although they constitute themselves the protectors of our religion and nationality, it is evident that the people do not yet very firmly believe in

their conversion, and that they have not yet attained the confidence of the country; for otherwise the plan of the Government is sufficiently new and sufficiently little understood to allow of their having a chance of returning to power. (Hear.) The people, in view of all their fine declarations, will probably think that they are going to ally themselves with our friends; but if they do not do so, it will then be perceived that they are not sincere, and then so much the worse for them. In the meantime the people will consider the scheme which is submitted to us, and will judge it upon its merits, without allowing themselves to be led away by appeals to prejudices and insinuations made by honorable members on the other side of the House. I shall, at a later period, speak upon the question itself, but I will not follow the example of the honorable member for Richelieu, who gave us a long speech with the help of GARNEAU'S *History of Canada*, which he read out nearly from one end to the other. Nor will I utter threats either, and no one of us will say, "If matters do not go on in this way, or in that, you will see." In a country like ours, we do not say "you will see!" To do so is to try to create useless excitement among the people, and all honest men should reprove such conduct. Besides, who is the man who has influence enough to raise the people at the present moment? Certainly not our worthy fellow-citizen, Mr. CHERRIER, for he is too peaceable, too devout, and too good a Catholic to tell the Canadian people to rise and fight against the scheme of the Government by force of arms. No, he will rather tell them to respect authority, and claim their rights if they consider themselves injured, because he is aware that it is better to respect one's father than to fight against him. As to Hon. Mr. PAPINEAU, that distinguished man has undergone mortification enough in his public life, and feels enough regret for his friends and fellow-countrymen who perished at St. Denis and elsewhere, to prevent his wishing to recommence playing that game. The honorable member for Bagot reproached the Hon. Attorney General for Lower Canada with having been present at St. Denis, and with having returned from thence. Would he have preferred to have seen him lying amid the dead and mingling his ashes with those of the victims who perished there?

HON. MR. LAFRAMBOISE—Oh! there was no danger.

MR. DENIS—You reproach him with

having done this when he was young, and yet you say that you would do the same if you were powerful enough to undertake it. That is no argument, and that is not what we ought to do. We ought to say to England that it is our wish to remain under the shadow of her noble flag; that we stand in fear of our neighbors, and are desirous of knowing what she can do to help us. It is in this way that our Ministers should approach the Imperial Government, and if the negotiations do not terminate in a satisfactory manner, then it will be time to separate and to seek another state of existence. The debate has taken too personal a turn, and we have listened to accusations and insinuations against this person and that person; but as the Opposition has nothing better to suggest to us than what is proposed to us by the present Government, they cannot hope that members on this side of the House will support them with the sole object of defeating the Administration. Gentlemen on the Opposition benches call for the details, but their leaders may be called upon to say what they suggest to bring the country forth from the difficulties in which it is plunged. What they desire is the *status quo*. But let them propose something practical to us; let them say what they want and what they can do. Instead of this we hear from them nothing but recriminations and perpetual fault-finding. They ask why the Government does not now state how the local governments are to be organised; but the reply to this question made by the Hon. Attorney General for Lower Canada, was very just, when he told them that the Government wished first to know whether we were favorable to Confederation, and that then they would bring forward the details. This is perfectly fair, and we must not mix up the cards. (Hear, hear.) I do not wish to speak at greater length at present; but I must allude, however, to the continual assertion of the honorable member for Hochelaga (Hon. Mr. DORION) with respect to the enormous national debt which Confederation will entail. Why does he not take account of the reasons which induce the Lower Provinces to refuse Confederation? Is it because those reasons are fatal to his arguments? In fact the Lower Provinces declare that our Ministers wished to obtain too much for Canada, that the burthens to be laid upon them are too heavy, and that an alliance with us would ruin them; whilst honorable members on

the other side of the House declare that they will none of this alliance, because we grant too much to the Lower Provinces. Those provinces say that Confederation will not be advantageous to them, because they will be compelled to pay for the canals, the railways and other improvements in Canada, and because they would derive no advantage from an alliance with us. Besides, those provinces are now in the hands of agents of the United States, whose great object is to prevent the success of Confederation, because it would be fatal to their trade with the provinces. That is why they labored, and labored successfully, to prevent the election of the partisans of Confederation in New Brunswick, just as they would do all in their power to prevent our elections here, if an appeal to the people should be had on the question, for they would work in the interest of the United States. (Opposition laughter.) I see the honorable member for Drummond and Arthabaska laughing—

MR. J. B. E. DORION—I am laughing at the silly stuff you have been talking to us for the last hour.

MR. DENIS—If there is a man in this House who has talked silly stuff and holds narrow ideas, that man is undoubtedly the honorable member for Drummond and Arthabaska—he who has never done anything but stir up and foment the prejudices of race—he who writes little letters to get petitions against Confederation signed in his county by all the women and children in it. Although I have not, like the honorable member, at my command a little newspaper like the *Défricheur*, which never cleared (*défriché*) anything except when the honorable member for Hochelaga was Attorney General for Lower Canada, and then the honorable member knew very well how to make clearings among Government jobs and advertisements—I am quite able to reply to the honorable member. It is truly laughable to hear a man like him talk of the “silly stuff” of others, when we think of his newspaper articles in which he said:—“Pay! wretched people—molasses and tea are dear”—and what he said about the Seigneurial bill and the Municipal bill—two measures which have called forth the admiration of the whole world—and about the Reciprocity treaty, which was, by his shewing, to do all sorts of harm to the country, but which has done all sorts of

good. Ah ! it is the same school all over. The instant a man holds a different opinion from those gentlemen, he is good for nothing, and all that he says is silly stuff. Truly, these are the foolish virgins who have no oil in their lamps.

MR. J. B. E. DORION—You are charming!

MR. DENIS—The honorable member told us, a short time since, that we were passing from extravagance to folly; with one stroke of the pen he sweeps away all the apices of the country, and declares that they are merely heaps of fools and simpletons; but I forgive him, for I believe that he is not *compos mentis*. As to those who set themselves up here as the defenders of religion, we shall, before believing them, wait for an expression of opinion on the part of those to whom is intrusted the duty of speaking on the subject; and as to the protection of our nationality, we shall hearken to the men to whom the people have delegated the duty of watching over and protecting it, and we shall not follow the leading of men like those who are opposed to the plan of Confederation. (Ministerial cheers, and ironical Opposition laughter.)

MR. POULIOT said—Mr. SPEAKER, it was my intention, before recording my vote on the resolutions which are now before the House, to make some remarks respecting them at much greater length than I shall now do; for now we find that this new being, which was to be brought forth in order to save the country, has already perished while still in embryo, from the violent blow which it has received in New Brunswick; and if we still turn our attention to it, our doing so is certainly only in order to relieve the womb of its mother, whom it greatly inconveniences, and who would ultimately have been destroyed by it. There is, therefore, nothing left for us to do, Mr. SPEAKER, but to join in the *libera* and to chant *requiescat in pace*—(laughter)—and that, I think, the whole of Lower Canada will sing with a great deal of pleasure, giving, at the same time, thanks to that Providence which, we love to think, watches with special care over our beloved Canada, for having preserved us from being plunged into the abyss, on the verge of which we were standing, and to charge the honorable gentlemen who sit on the other side of this House to go to England and deliver its funeral oration. (Hear, hear.) Yet, though such is the case, Mr. SPEAKER, the excep-

tional position in which the county which I have the honor to represent here, and the position which an effort has been made to describe me as occupying in this House, by the assertion that I do not represent the opinions of my constituents in relation to this great question, compel me, before voting, to hold up to view the special situation of my county and to shew that in voting as I propose to do, I shall be doing no more than carrying out and executing the wishes of the electors whom I represent. I should wish that several of the members who are going to vote on the opposite side may be able to shew as good grounds in support of their votes. (Hear, hear.) It is true that a meeting, called by myself in my double capacity as warden of the county and member representing it, was held in my county, and that at that meeting there was some disturbance which prevented an expression of opinion in relation to Confederation; but, Mr. SPEAKER, it is well to know that that meeting was held only two days before the balloting for the militia, and that in consequence great agitation had been got up among the young men, who are not even electors, in order to divert the attention of the meeting from the subject, to discuss which it had been called together; and it is acknowledged, Mr. SPEAKER, that it is always easy to find a certain number of people, in any county whatever, who will be ever ready to create a disturbance if only they are provided with what is needful, and such is what took place on the occasion in question. Since then, however, several of the principal parishes have pronounced upon Confederation, as will be seen by the following resolutions, which I shall take the liberty of reading to the House:—

At a special meeting of the municipal council of the parish of St. Arsène, in the county of Témiscouata, duly called by special and public notice, and held in the said parish of St. Arsène, in the public hall, on Monday, the thirteenth day of the month of February, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-five, in conformity with the provisions of the Municipal Act of Lower Canada of 1860, and at which meeting were present: J. PRIME ROY, Esquire, Mayor, and Messieurs FRANÇOIS DUBÉ, J. BTE. PELLETIER, HECTOR ROY, GERMAIN TERRIAULT, JOSEPH ROY and CLOVIS BERUBÉ, members of the said Council and constituting a quorum; the said J. PRIME ROY, Esquire, presiding as Mayor; and at which meeting was also present a large number of the principal inhabitants and electors of the said parish, Councillor FRANÇOIS DUBÉ moved, seconded by Councillor HECTOR ROY:—

That it be resolved that this Council being of opinion that the scheme of Confederation of the British North American Provinces now before the Legislature, would be disadvantageous to Lower Canada, considers it their duty to request J. BRE. POULIOT, Esquire, member for the county, to do all in his power to prevent the adoption of the scheme in question, or at least to obtain the postponement of that adoption until after an appeal to the people shall have been had, in such way as the Legislature shall think most expedient.—Unanimously adopted.

Mr. CLOVIS ROY moved, seconded by Mr. Jos. ROY:—

That a copy of the foregoing resolution be at once transmitted to the said J. BRE. POULIOT, Esquire.—Unanimously adopted.

(Signed) J. PRIME ROY, Mayor.
ELIN MAILLOUX, S. T.

I have also other resolutions, identical in character, adopted in several other parishes in the county, but I shall abstain from reading them. (Hear, hear.) Now, Mr. SPEAKER, in order to explain clearly to honorable members the peculiar position in which the county which I have the honor to represent is placed, I have to inform them that whatever line is adopted for the Intercolonial Railway, if it should be built—and I hope that it will be built without Confederation—it must, in any case, pass through the whole of the county—an extent of more than fifty miles—and subsequently be carried through a great extent of virgin forest, to which the inhabitants of my county are the most nearly situated. The advantages reaped by the localities, Mr. SPEAKER, in which works of such magnitude are being carried out, both as regards their construction and their subsequent maintenance, and the other advantages accruing to settlements from the building of a railway, are well known. All this has been perfectly well understood by the inhabitants of my county; that is to say, that in respect of material interests, Confederation might be beneficial to us—an opinion which I also hold myself; but they have also, however, understood that as it is with individuals, so it is with nations—that the richest are not always the happiest. And believing that the French-Canadian nationality would be endangered if Confederation should be carried out, they did not hesitate for an instant to pronounce against the scheme, and charged me, as their representative, to oppose it here in their name; so that in acting as I am doing, Mr. SPEAKER, I am merely carrying out their wishes. (Hear,

hear.) I must say, Mr. SPEAKER, that I greatly regret that several of the gentlemen with whom I have worked and with whom I still work, should have so strongly based their objections to Confederation on the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. To listen to those gentlemen, one would really believe that Canada ends here at Quebec, or that the part which is situated below is not worth occupation. I invite those gentlemen to examine with a little more attention the map of the province as far as its lower extremity—the Bay of Chaleurs and Gaspé, and they will perceive that it contains a tolerably vast territory and good land adapted for colonization—a fact of which they may also convince themselves by glancing at the colonization reports. They will perceive, I say, that if the Intercolonial Railway were made by the line called Major ROBINSON'S line, but not by New Brunswick, as recommended by the resolutions submitted to us, we should, before many years had elapsed, see an immense population settled on that territory, which is capable of containing more than 100,000 souls; and several of the gentlemen who oppose the construction of that road, and who reside in counties in which there is no room for the surplus population, might induce that surplus population to go and settle on the territory in question, and would have no reason to regret having done so. (Hear, hear.) And, Mr. SPEAKER, besides the advantages which that road would bring to the trade of Canada in general, it would, if made to communicate with the Gulf of St. Lawrence by way of Ristigouche, have the immediate effect of imparting an impulse to the working of our fisheries, which are capable of giving employment to several thousand more persons than are now engaged in them. The effect of this would be to keep our young men at home, and even to bring them back from the United States, where many of them now are. I, therefore, invite the gentlemen who are opposed to the railway in question to join with us in hurrying the construction of it, for it will be one of the best means of restoring equality of population between the two provinces, and of stifling the cry which is so deafening to us Lower Canadians—the cry for representation by population. I willingly admit, Mr. SPEAKER, that public opinion below Quebec appeared at first to be favorable to Confederation, or at least that there was a disposition to submit to it, be-

cause the public had been made to believe that government was no longer possible, and that Confederation was the only means of settling our difficulties; but I believe that that opinion has greatly changed since the Ministerial explanations have been made public; for every one expected, and it was everywhere asserted, that amendments would be made, and that we should be informed as to the nature of the local governments, and as to the debt of Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) With these few remarks, Mr. SPEAKER, I shall conclude by saying that I shall vote against the resolutions in order to carry out and to comply with the wishes of my constituents. (Cheers.)

MR. J. J. ROSS—I propose, Mr. SPEAKER, that the speech of the honorable member should be printed in pamphlet form, apart from the official debates, and that several thousand copies should be struck off to be distributed freely throughout the country. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

MR. BIGGAR—As the resolutions on the Confederation of the Provinces are looked to with a very great deal of interest by the country, I think it necessary to make a few remarks in explanation of the vote which I intend to give. But before doing so, I think it necessary for me to state, as briefly as possible, the position that I hold toward the present Government, as also the two governments that have preceded them. In my canvass in 1861, I most distinctly and unhesitatingly stated to my constituents that I had no confidence in the CARTIER-MACDONALD Government, who were then in power, as I considered that they had managed the finances of the country very badly, and had, by their extravagance, brought us to the eve of bankruptcy; and that if I were elected to the House as their representative, I should feel it my duty to vote want of confidence in that Government, if such a vote was proposed. In 1862 the Militia Bill was introduced by that Administration. Believing that some legislation was necessary in that direction, and admitting the principle of the bill, I voted with the Government on it. Some of my political friends, with whom I was then acting, found fault with me for the course I then took and the vote I then gave; but I am happy to say that they have since been induced to take the same view of the matter that I did at that time, and they would now be willing to go a little farther in the same direction than I would perhaps feel it prudent to go with our

great public debt. It is gratifying to me, however, to find that the course I took on that occasion has been approved of now by them. That Government was defeated on that vote; and when the new Government was formed, known as the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Administration, I was not satisfied with their policy. I had promised my constituents that I would support representation by population, and vote against separate schools; and as that Government proposed to make representation by population a close question, and to bring in a Separate School Bill, I felt that I should have to vote against them when representation by population would be moved as an amendment to the Address. I accordingly voted for the amendment; and when Mr. SCOTT'S Separate School Bill was introduced, I felt it my duty to vote against it, in accordance with the pledges I had made to my constituents. That Government was defeated, and a new Government was formed, in which I advised you, Mr. SPEAKER, and my friend the late Hon. Postmaster General, to take office. I stated to you, Mr. SPEAKER, and to the Hon. Mr. MOWAT, that I would not advise you, as my friends, to take office, unless I would feel it to be my duty to support you; and that if the question of representation by population was again moved as an amendment to the Speech from the Throne, I would vote against the amendment, and that I would go before my constituents, as a general election was approaching, and state what I had done, and if they did not sustain me in what I had done, I was quite willing to remain at home. I believe that Government did right in resigning when they found they could not carry on the business of the country in a satisfactory manner; and when the TACHÉ-MACDONALD Administration was formed, I decided to give them a test-vote, but I was willing that they should proceed without any opposition from me, if they could control a majority of the House; but when the reconstruction took place, I felt that I could not be a party to a government of that kind—that the demoralizing influence of a coalition such as that Government contained would counteract all the good they could ever do, and that the alliance was an unhappy one. (Hear, hear.) I was not willing, after having voted a want of confidence in them on the 14th of June last, for having misappropriated one hundred thousand dollars of the funds of the province, to come down to the House eight days after and say

that I would support them, now that they had promised to give the Hon. GEORGE BROWN, on behalf of himself and two other members of the Liberal party, the selection of three seats in the Cabinet, when they had done no act to merit my confidence, but simply state that they would grant constitutional changes, which they might or might never do. I was not prepared, however, to give them any factious opposition, but was willing to support any good measures that they might bring forward. That Government met delegates from the Maritime Provinces, at a Conference in this city, and agreed upon the resolutions that are now submitted to this House. In them I find principles which do not harmonize with my pledges to the people, and without an appeal to the people I cannot support the measure now before the House. (Hear, hear.) I will not here say anything of the merits of the resolutions, but simply state that they embrace principles which I cannot support on account of the promises that I have made to my constituents. The people of my county have been led by the *Globe* to believe that the Intercolonial Railway would be a very dangerous affair for the country, and that it would not be useful either as a military or commercial undertaking. Looking at it from a military point of view, it is well known that part of the proposed line would run within twenty-six miles of the American frontier, and that communication could be cut off at any moment by an American army; and that as a commercial undertaking it could never compete with the water route during the season of navigation; and in the winter it would be comparatively useless on account of the depth of snow. They have been told that it would never pay for the grease that would go on the axles. (Hear, hear.) When I went before them and stated that I would support the MACDONALD-DORION Government, they said that Government should be looked upon with suspicion, as they had granted ten thousand dollars for the survey of the Intercolonial Railway; but I told them that the best guarantee that they could have that that work would not be proceeded with, was that the Hon. Mr. DORION was in the Cabinet, and that he had previously resigned his seat as Provincial Secretary in the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Administration, rather than agree to the construction of that railway. Another question that I found a little embarrassing was that of separate schools. The present Hon. Solicitor General

for Canada West came into my riding and very ingeniously told the people that I was responsible for the Separate School Bill having been forced upon them, inasmuch as I had supported the general policy of the Government that had carried the bill, although I had voted with the hon. gentleman against the bill in all its stages from the beginning to the end. They were satisfied, however, when I told them that I was prepared to vote to rescind the amendments to the Separate School Bill as introduced by Mr. SCOTT. Now, as these resolutions propose to perpetuate separate schools in Upper Canada for all time to come, I feel that they would conflict with the pledges that I have made to the people, and that I cannot support them. (Hear, hear.) I was a little surprised to find the Honorable President of the Council get up and say that he did not fear any of the evil results that might proceed from the present Separate School Bill. Was that the language of the hon. gentleman in 1862? Was that the way the subject had been treated in the columns of the *Globe* when the bill was being discussed in 1862 and 1863? Every member of this House will remember how the thirteen members, even spoken of in the *Globe* in 1862, for having had the courage to vote against the second reading of Mr. SCOTT'S Separate School Bill—when 95 members of the House were willing to vote for the second reading—and in 1863 when the bill was being passed into law by the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Government—how the members were warned to be true to their pledges, no matter what might become of the Government. Even Dr. RYERSON, the Superintendent of Education for Upper Canada, who had devoted twenty years of the best of his life in perfecting a system of education, was denounced in the columns of the *Globe* as a deserter of the best interests of education in Upper Canada, for having consented to the amendments as proposed in Mr. SCOTT'S Separate School Bill. I cannot help referring to another remark made by the Hon. President of the Council. He said—"Let any one vote against these resolutions and dare to go before the people." Is he not prepared to allow others the same freedom of thought which he enjoys himself? (Hear, hear.) I can only say that I for one will not be coerced into anything of that kind. (Hear, hear.) I am not responsible to the Hon. President of the Council for my votes. I am responsible to the people that sent me here, and to a higher power, and I

am not going to be coerced into giving a vote which I cannot approve. (Hear, hear.) I cannot say whether I will ever be called upon again to represent the county that I now have the honor to represent; whether I do or do not, it is a matter of no consequence to me; but I do say that I will not, under any circumstances, be coerced by the honorable gentleman. He should not forget, however, that his influence in Northumberland is not what he might have anticipated, and that when he thought proper to come down from Toronto, in April last, to oppose the Hon. Solicitor General, when he was contesting the West Riding with a very respectable farmer, that notwithstanding the very powerful speeches of the Hon. President of the Council, the Hon. Solicitor General was returned for that riding by a very large majority. I suppose that, had the Hon. President of the Council anticipated that he was, within two months, to have had a seat in the same Cabinet with the Hon. Solicitor General, he would have acted differently. I myself had a very strong invitation to go up to the West Riding to oppose the Hon. Solicitor General, but I was willing to act upon the principle of returning good for evil. I was quite willing to allow the electors of West Northumberland to choose for themselves whom they would elect for their representative in Parliament; and in regard to the Hon. Solicitor General, I must say that, as far as I can learn, he has discharged the duties of his office with satisfaction to the Government and the people that he represents, and with credit to himself. It is not my intention to give the Government any factious opposition. I will cheerfully support any good measures for the benefit of the country which they may bring forward for our adoption; but I wish the Government to understand, as I do not wish to occupy any doubtful position in this House, I am no supporter of theirs, and if a vote of want of confidence is at any time proposed, I am prepared to vote against them (Hear, hear.)

MR. JACKSON—I think it right to say a few words on this question before the vote is taken; but at this late hour, I will not detain the House very long. The subject has been discussed from various points of view. In the early part of the debate, one gentleman, the hon. member for Hochelaga (Hon. Mr. DORION), objected to the scheme mainly on the ground that it approximated too closely to a legislative union, and that it

would interfere with the privileges which the parties to the union exercise in their respective localities; and if I remember rightly, he said that the plan of the Government would have the effect of interfering with the language and religion of Lower Canadians. It occurred to me at the time he was making his speech, that he was taking untenable ground, and I felt grateful then, and I do so now, that that hon. gentleman is not in a position to exercise more power, at this crisis, than an ordinary member of the Legislature. I admire the ability of that honorable gentleman, and I consider it unfortunate that at this important juncture he did not rise above narrow and limited sectional views, and take more statesmanlike ground. (Hear, hear.) Then the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. M. C. CAMERON) objected to Confederation from a different point of view, but he arrived at his conclusions from arguments of an entirely different character. Strange to say, he did not regard this with satisfaction, while a legislative union would meet with his approval. He professed to believe that the Maritime Provinces would combine with Lower Canada, and form a union detrimental to the interests of Upper Canada, placing the people there in a worse position than that which they at present occupy with an equality of representation. As he made that remark, I asked him what difference it could make then, whether we had a Federal or a Legislative union, which he professes to admire, as it would have charge of all the important general interests. His answer convinced me that there was nothing to support his argument. It seemed to me that he took too much for granted in assuming that there would be a union between Lower Canada and the Maritime Provinces as against Upper Canada. It is hardly to be conceived that gentlemen called together for the performance of certain high purposes would attempt to do an injury to one part of the country over another. (Hear, hear.) If such a sectional alliance was possible, it would be much more likely that the union would be formed with Upper Canada, inasmuch as that part of the proposed Confederacy has a much larger aggregate business than any or either of the other separate sections. But I will not dwell upon this, as it appears to me to carry with it its own refutation. This principal reason for opposing this scheme is, I think, founded on the fact that the hon. gentlemen now united together in

the Government do not possess his confidence. He referred to their antecedents, and spoke of their being opposed to each other before, and said that it was impossible for them to unite now for any good object. I think, sir, it will scarcely be denied that in looking back upon the antecedents of our public men, there is hardly one of any note who has not, during some portion of his life, found himself in such a position as to render it necessary for him to abandon views which he had previously maintained, and that no government has been successful which has not been founded upon mutual concessions. It is necessary that public men on both sides should unite in great emergencies in order to promote the general welfare. We know very well that those who are open to conviction very frequently change their course, and it is no disgrace to any one that under the influence of increased knowledge he has shaped his conduct in accordance with the degree of light which has surrounded him. The honorable gentleman knows very well that we must judge the actions of individuals not merely by their motives—for these we cannot often penetrate—but by the character and results of their actions. And so we must look upon the scheme now before us as it really is. We must examine it for ourselves, and unless we see clear evidence to the contrary, we ought to give its promoters credit for honesty and sincerity. I have no sympathy with those who willingly attribute the actions of public men to the influence of unworthy motives, when they may fairly claim to originate in the higher qualities of the mind and heart. It is the duty, I think, of all right-minded men to give this Government the credit of acting from high-minded motives. But supposing, for the sake of argument, that these honorable gentlemen had united for dividing among themselves offices of profit and emolument. It is fortunate that the germs of evil seldom attain to their complete development. Professions of patriotism do not always betoken the absence of selfishness. He has read history to little purpose who has not discovered that political dishonesty has frequently been not only harmless, but has been practically the minister of public good. The hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. M. C. CAMERON) stated the other day, that under Confederation Upper Canada would contribute an unequally large proportion of the amount necessary to sustain the machinery of the

Confederacy. He had a large array of figures before him; but as I took no notes of these figures, I am not prepared to dispute their correctness. But he forgot this, which is a matter of great importance to be considered, that under Confederation there will be a uniformity in the tariffs of the several provinces, and if the tariff of Canada is reduced so as to bring it into conformity with those of the Maritime Provinces, the disproportion will disappear. An hon. gentleman who afterwards addressed the House, and who, I regret, is absent from the House by reason of indisposition—the hon. member for Brome (Mr. DUNKIN)—I understood to say that nations and constitutions and governments owed their origin to that creative power to which all are indebted for existence and the means of perpetuating it. The idea is well expressed in the words of a celebrated writer:—"There is a Divinity that shapes our ends, rough hew them as we may." He (Mr. DUNKIN) then went on to question the honesty of the purpose of those gentlemen, Hon. Messrs. ROSS, GALT and CARTIER, who signed the despatch of 1858, which resulted in the Conference of last September. He described all the intermediate stages as "accidents," and then found fault with every item of the confederal arrangement. The hon. gentleman, on his own principles, should not criticise too severely the action of the Government. They might be only instruments in the hands of the Supreme Architect. The reasonable method would be to examine the arrangements or agreements of the Conference, and if the scheme is found to be based upon just and equitable principles, it must recommend itself to favorable consideration, and the inevitable conclusion is that it ought to be adopted. I confess I admire the arrangement, which has no doubt been arrived at after much care and deliberation. The commercial and financial parts of the scheme seem to me to be as just as, under the circumstances, they possibly could be. It is a very ordinary accomplishment to be able to find fault. It is much easier to destroy than to build up. We know that those so disposed might take up the best schemes ever devised by human ingenuity, and draw improper conclusions therefrom. In fact there is no form of government in the world but what, if badly administered, would be productive of evil. On the other hand, a scheme somewhat defective in itself, if placed in the hands of good and patriotic men, might be made to

conduce to the advantage of the country—"That which is best administered is best." Mr. SPEAKER, no scheme can be entirely perfect. Indeed, it is scarcely desirable it should be so. There should be room for the exercise of political virtue, and scope for the exercise of that executive responsibility which attaches to our system of government. There is a great deal of discretion left to our public men, and they are expected to use their powers for the general weal and welfare. I am disposed to place confidence in the Government, and believe that they will, so far as their ability goes, work out this scheme to a desirable result, and in this I hope and trust they will succeed. The hon. member for Lennox and Addington (Mr. CARTWRIGHT), in his speech to-day, which, like all his other speeches, was of the most admirable kind, made some profound observations. He had thought deeply upon the subject of which he was treating. He remarked that the Government were merely giving effect to a foregone conclusion. He, no doubt, recognized that the public sentiment and public opinion had attained a certain state—had arrived at such a point, that the Government were compelled to go with the stream, and endeavor to consummate that which the people had already brought into such a condition of forwardness. And I thought, sir, that this was the proper and philosophical view to take of the matter. It is true, to my mind at all events—and I think that those who have made themselves acquainted with political history, and the political history of England in particular, must come to the conclusion that those governments act most wisely who take advantage of existing circumstances, and adapt legislation to the real wants and exigencies of the country. The question is not at all times what is best in the abstract, but what is most useful and advantageous to the people. My idea of a statesman is that he should be influenced to a large extent by motives of expediency. Abstract propositions can seldom be reduced to practice. It is foolish for gentlemen placed in the position of the Government to go against the popular stream, and they best manifest their prudence, their ability, and their adaptation to the discharge of their important duties, who make use of passing events for directing the vessel of state into a secure harbour. The honorable member for Missisquoi (Mr. O'HALLORAN) said the

other night that there was too much legislation—that the country was governed to death, and I admit that to a certain extent there is some propriety in his remarks; but they did not apply to the present subject. I presume we are not here for the purpose of discussing the past acts of the Government, but for the purpose of considering the scheme now before us, and it will be an evidence of our good sense and wisdom—it will show, too, our seriousness—if we give it our calm and impartial consideration without reference to extraneous matters. (Hear, hear) I think, sir, we are now passing out of the season of political childhood, and that we are being called upon, in the course of events, to enter upon the duties and responsibilities incidental to the period of youth. We are required to practise and inure ourselves to the discharge of important duties, which require discretion and self-reliance. And as it is in nature, so it is in communities—there are various stages of progress through which we must pass before we can arrive at the position of manhood. There are only two kinds of animals that attain to eminence—things that fly and things that creep. Things which fly are never secure—they are frequently brought down; whilst things which creep proceed firmly and cautiously, if slowly, and by degrees arrive at the topmost point. And so people who pass at a bound from a state of political childhood to a state of political manhood, violate the order and arrangement observed in nature. We have seen instances where people have disregarded the various stages of political existence; but in so doing they have deprived themselves of the advantages of that experience which is necessary to a vigorous manhood, and which previous training alone can secure. I trust we shall not make this mistake, but that we shall observe the order and gradations of nature, and pass through the various political stages of being, from childhood upwards, in such a way that we may learn to discharge the duties of our position in a spirit of self-reliance; that we shall have been taught how to make the best of our circumstances, and prove that the training we have received during our pupilage has been such as to fit us for a vigorous and prosperous future. (Hear.) I think that this view of the subject is one of some importance—so much so, that it has been said the logical conclusion of it would be our independence.

Well, I do not think there is anything disloyal, that there is anything improper, in supposing that the time may come when this British North American territory shall be the abode of a great and independent people. I do not wish to live to see it. But I know very well that when the time comes, there will be no interference on the part of Great Britain with that which seems to be a condition of the inevitable order of things; that the country with which we are now connected and allied—and it is not only a political alliance, but a social alliance, an attachment of affection and esteem—would not at all feel jealous if in the course of events the people inhabiting British North America should be prosperous enough and numerous enough to aspire to independence. (Hear, hear.) Mr. SPEAKER, the circumstances which have brought about the contemplated measure—and I trust it will be a successful one—are such as have forced themselves on the consideration of the Government. I have already alluded to one of these circumstances, and that is the fact that we are passing from the stage of childhood to a higher and more responsible position—that the Government of this country has for some time been in a state of transition, and that this is the only relief which the circumstances present to us, the only way in which an amelioration can be found. During a number of years, and especially since I have taken an active part in politics—in the course of my various election contests—I have invariably stated, that while I looked upon representation by population as a remedy for the political inequalities which existed as between the two sections of the province, a Federal union of the British North American Provinces seemed to me to be the only proper and legitimate conclusion to be ultimately arrived at. Therefore, in advocating this scheme and in giving my vote for it, as I shall do when the matter is brought to that stage which will enable a vote to be taken, I am only doing that which I have for a number of years looked forward to, and which I believe the exigencies of the country necessitate. (Hear.) There are other circumstances besides that to which I have alluded, which render me favorable to the adoption of the resolutions now before the House. The war in the United States, and the, at one time, apparently imminent disintegration of that republic, strongly directed our attention to the necessity and desirability of uniting

with our neighbors for defensive purposes. I do not say that the desire for a union of the provinces grew out of the war in the United States, nor am I going to give any opinion in reference to that war. We all regret its existence, and will all be grateful when it is brought to a close, and the blessings of peace shall again visit our continent. I hope that the commercial relations as between us and the United States will be continued; that we shall have the freest intercourse with that people, and that the passport system being removed, the time is not far distant when our relations with them shall be as friendly and as cordial as they have heretofore been. (Hear, hear.) The threatened repeal of the Reciprocity treaty is another thing that has led to the strong feeling that has been aroused in favor of this scheme. We hope by this union to obtain a large number of customers for our products, intercourse with whom will not be subject to those interruptions that characterize trade with foreign nations. We shall have a large territory under our own government, trade with which and through which will secure to us mutual advantages. Having made these remarks, I would pass on to observe that the expressed desire on the part of the leading men, both of the Government and of the Opposition, in all the provinces, for a close connection, is another strong reason why we should at once take the necessary steps for enabling the union to be carried out. It is a most remarkable and most favorable circumstance that the best men, the ablest men, the wisest men and the most patriotic men in all the provinces—men whose integrity and abilities have raised them to the highest places in the regards of the people, and whose wisdom in the management of public affairs has sustained them for a long period in those high and honorable positions—met together and agreed upon a scheme of union without any dissension. This agreement in forming a basis of a Constitution, and a foundation to what may become a great nation, I look upon as a most favorable omen indeed. I look upon this union of sentiment as another strong reason for our taking the necessary steps to carry out the union so happily inaugurated, as also a strong evidence of the propriety and wisdom which characterized the course of the hon. gentlemen who composed the respective delegations. The gentlemen representing the Lower Provinces gave

evidence of ability of a very high order, and I am sure the country will regret that any of the gentlemen who so well adorned the Conference, and who occupied such honorable positions in the government of their provinces, should have lost those positions through attachment to the scheme, for I had learned to look up to those men with a great deal of interest and hope for the future. (Hear, hear.) They are men of such a superior order, that they would grace any legislature in which they might be called upon to take part, and I trust they may be soon again placed in the positions of power and trust from which they have been so unhappily ejected. (Hear, hear.) There are other reasons to which I might refer, that are pressing the subject upon our attention. I will first, however, briefly refer to one important point connected with the subject, about which a good deal has been said by those who have spoken against the resolutions, and it is a matter that will be made the utmost of among the electors of Upper Canada. I mean the question of referring the scheme to a vote of the people, at a general election or some other way, to ascertain what their views are upon it before taking final action in this House. Previous to the opening of the present session, I took occasion to visit several townships in the county I have the honor to represent. I laid the whole matter as fully before them as I could well do, and I did not meet with a single individual who did not recognize it as the duty of the present House of Parliament to carry the measure into effect as speedily as possible, so far as it was in the power of our Legislature and Government to do. At various meetings resolutions were voluntarily proposed by individuals in the audience, instructing me to support the measure, and further stating that they would consider it a calamity if a general election were resorted to for the mere purpose of obtaining the consent of the people on the subject, nine-tenths of whose press endorse it. So satisfied were my constituents of the fairness of the scheme on the whole, and of the importance of having it go into operation with the least delay possible, that I feel that I shall be sustained in the vote I am about to give, by the sentiment of those whom I represent in this House. For these reasons, then, I am prepared to vote for the proposed union of all the British American Provinces, as provided for in the resolutions now before

the House. (Hear, hear.) Mr. SPEAKER, I trust the House will not regard me as desirous of assuming the office of a censor, if I express my belief that many of the speeches that have been made upon this question have contained a vast quantity of matter quite irrelevant to the question under discussion. There may be parts of the arrangement proposed that are unsatisfactory to many hon. gentlemen, but it is utterly impossible to devise a scheme that will be acceptable to everybody, or that will not be open to the criticism of seeming to bear harder on one section of the country than on another. But it should not be judged in that manner, but by its general fairness and by its being calculated to promote the welfare of the entire country embraced and to be embraced in the Confederacy. It would be absurd to suppose that a scheme could be devised for the purpose that would please and satisfy every section. The scheme under consideration should not be treated and criticised in this narrow, contracted view. Some portions of the country may have to make concessions and sacrifices for the public good, but these should be cheerfully borne, if not of too aggravating a nature. If Upper Canada is blessed with more wealth than any of the other provinces, it ought not to be forgotten that its accountability and its responsibility are greater—that they are in proportion to its riches—and while the people of that important section of the Confederacy may be called upon to concede some things that they have valued very highly for the general welfare, yet it is not for a moment to be supposed—and no one who dispassionately examines the whole subject can come to that conclusion—that Upper Canada will not receive very important advantages in return, in other respects. There must be conciliation and compromise between the several conflicting interests found in so large and so varied a territory, and we never can have a union without meeting and accommodating ourselves to this difficulty. (Hear, hear.) The question of our defences is another important consideration in connection with the subject; but I am not going to discuss that, because I am not a military man. I cannot, however, see how any hon. gentleman can deliberately stand up and express as his candid conviction, that the proposed union will not in any manner increase our defensive power. To me, such statements seem most extraordinary. But this portion of the question has already

been quite fully discussed ; and not being, as I before remarked, a military man, I do not think anything I could say upon it would add much to the enlightenment of the House at this late stage of the debate. I will, therefore, Mr. SPEAKER, simply say that I look forward to the union with great hope for the future of our land. In the first place, the union will vastly enlarge our ideas of the greatness and ultimate destiny of these provinces, and give scope for higher aspirations. It will make the young men of this country feel that they have a better inheritance than they now feel to be theirs, and an opportunity of rising to higher points of distinction in this the land of their birth or adoption. The same opportunities will also be open to the young men of the Lower Provinces, and in this connection I have no hesitation in saying, from what I know of them, that the inhabitants of the Lower Provinces, for enterprise, industry and general intelligence, will compare favorably with any other portion of the territory that will be embraced in the union. It will be an advantage to us to have their coöperation in working out the future of this country, and our connection with them will give birth and life to those ideas that lie at the foundation of a nation's prosperity and happiness. (Hear, hear.) And now, Mr. SPEAKER, having thus rapidly glanced at some of those important particulars that to my mind render the proposal under consideration a wise and desirable one for our adoption, I shall conclude, because I do not desire to protract the debate, by stating, that for the reasons I have briefly adduced, and from the process of reasoning I have been led to adopt, it is my intention to support the motion for the adoption of the resolutions respecting Confederation, proposed by my friend the Hon. Attorney General West. (Cheers.)

MR. McCONKEY said—Mr. SPEAKER, at this late hour of the night I rise to address you with very great reluctance, but I feel that I would not be doing justice to myself and the people who sent me here, did I allow the vote on this momentous question to be taken without expressing my opinion upon it, however briefly. In doing so, Mr. SPEAKER, I shall not invoke the aid of history, or exhume old newspaper files to give the opinions of other men, but shall simply confine myself to stating a few of the ideas which have suggested themselves to my own mind in considering the subject.

The task is the more difficult at this stage of the debate, as the arguments for and against the measure have been already so ably and lengthily elaborated by members of this honorable House. Mr. SPEAKER, we have had eventful times in Canada. The union of the Canadas was an important event in this country ; and, sir, although latterly it has not worked satisfactorily, I am not one of those who are prepared to say that under that union we did not prosper. From a very small population, we have grown, under the union, to be a very considerable people, comprising a population of two millions and a-half. We have also grown in wealth, intelligence, and everything else that tends to national greatness. But difficulties between the provinces have sprung up ; Upper Canada rapidly increased in population and wealth over Lower Canada, and has for the last ten or twelve years demanded an increased representation on the floor of this House. She argued, and very properly, that her position was a degraded one—that with a population in excess of that of Lower Canada by 400,000 people, and contributing about three-fourths of the revenue of this country, she was entitled to such a constitutional arrangement as would place her on a perfect equality with the sister province, and that she would not be satisfied until that was conceded, as the demand was a just and honorable one. Sir, just although this was, Lower Canada, with, I have no doubt, just as much honesty and quite as much determination, resisted their demand. Hence the terrific struggles which ensued between the sections for the last few years. Within the past three years we have had no fewer than three Ministerial crises. Neither the one party nor the other could govern, so evenly were parties balanced in this House and the country. The machinery of government was almost entirely stopped, and a chronic crisis had set in. Sir, it was apparent to every discerning mind that some solution of existing difficulties must be sought. The present state of things could not continue. Mr. SPEAKER, I well recollect the announcement of the Honorable Attorney General West. After the defeat of his Government, in June last, that honorable gentleman manfully acknowledged the political difficulty in which this country was placed. He informed the House that His Excellency the Governor General had granted the Government *carte blanche*,

involving a dissolution of Parliament, if they chose, but that they, nevertheless, hesitated to exercise the power; that while individual changes might be made in the constituencies, the two great parties would come back nearly the same; and added, that he had had an interview with the hon. member for South Oxford (Hon. Mr. BROWN) of a most satisfactory nature, from which he thought he saw a solution of our difficulties, and asked an adjournment of the House. Subsequently, interviews were had between the members of the Government and the member for South Oxford, which resulted in the present Coalition Government. Sir, after a full consideration of the subject in all its bearings, I decided to give the new Government my support, trusting they would be able, as I believed they desired, to put the affairs of this country on a more satisfactory and enduring basis. But, while I support this Government, I must not be understood as approving of coalitions generally. I hold that to a country enjoying representative institutions and responsible government, it is indeed a matter of very little consequence which of the political parties are in power, so long as there is a strong party to scrutinise their acts, and exercise a general surveillance over them. When, however, the two great parties coalesce, and there is no strong party in the country to watch them, there is more or less danger of abuses and corruption creeping in. I do not, however, desire that the gentlemen on the Treasury benches should understand that I apply this remark to them. They, sir, I believe, are not only pure, but, like CÆSAR's wife, above suspicion. And, if even a necessity existed in any country to justify a coalition, it was in Canada; and I rejoice to know that we had statesmen among us who could rise above the petty political and personal squabbles, in which they had been unfortunately too long engaged, to grapple with a great national difficulty. (Cheers.) I think, too, it was most fortunate—providential, I might say—that this country had a strong, vigorous Government during the past season, when complications between us and the United States were gathering. To the strength of the Government we owe the prompt manner in which raiders and others, desirous of creating a difficulty between England and America, were put down. (Hear, hear.) Mr. SPEAKER, I have read the resolutions of the Conference, now in

your hands, carefully; and while, in my opinion, many of the details are objectionable, from an Upper Canadian point of view, I have, nevertheless, no doubt they were framed with a desire to do justice to all the provinces. No person can read those resolutions without coming to the conclusion that mutual concessions must have been made all round. They clearly bear the impress of compromise. No doubt, sir, much difficulty was experienced by the gentlemen composing the Conference, in fitting and dovetailing the heterogeneous parts or provinces into a homogeneous whole. I have listened attentively to the speeches of the Opposition, and have so far failed to hear of a better proposition than the one before us; and, indeed, I am not surprised that a better proposition should not have been presented to us, considering that this scheme was compiled by the master minds in British America. (Hear, hear.) I stated, sir, that some of the details were objectionable, and I now repeat that had the Government permitted amendments to the resolutions, I certainly would have supported them; but in view of the very critical position in which this country stands, I will not assume the responsibility of opposing this scheme as a whole. (Hear, hear.) Although I admit the building of the Intercolonial Railroad to be just as necessary to the proposed Confederation as the spinal column to the human frame; nevertheless, in view of the jobbing and extravagance committed with the Grand Trunk, I have a dread of the amount its construction and working will cost this country. Sir, I am not as sanguine as some honorable gentlemen in this House in reference to this road. I have no faith in it as a commercial enterprise; I look upon it as a military necessity, and a bond of union between the Confederated Provinces. Sir, we have been told that the Imperial Government has been notified of the intention of the Government of the United States to abrogate the Reciprocity treaty. To my mind this will be most unfortunate for Canada, and I sincerely trust that the members of the Government who will shortly visit England will urge the Imperial Government to secure a renewal of it, if it can be obtained on honorable terms. While hoping this treaty may be renewed, I do not participate in the feeling that its abrogation will drive us into the United States. (Hear, hear.) Sir, I regret to hear

gentlemen speak so glibly of annexation. One tells us that if Confederation is not consummated, annexation is the other alternative—that we are already on an “inclined plane”—and that the abrogation of the treaty and refusal to adopt the resolutions in your hands will certainly “grease the ways.” Sir, I believe nothing of the kind. The assertion is a libel on the people of Canada, who, I believe, are truly loyal to the British Crown, and have no desire to change the state of their political existence. (Hear, hear.) But while provision is made in these resolutions for the construction of the Intercolonial Railroad, I am sorry to see that no decisive provision is made for the western extension. And I would not be at all satisfied myself with the resolutions as they stand, were it not for the positive assurances of the Government that that matter would be attended to simultaneously with the construction of that road. For I hold it to be of essential importance that we should proceed, as soon as possible, with the opening up of the North-West country and the extension of our canal system. (Hear, hear.) And while on this subject, I may be permitted to say that I hope, that in going on with the canals, the Government will not overlook the necessity which exists for the construction of the great Georgian Bay Canal. (Hear, hear.) I reside on the shores of the Georgian Bay, and am satisfied that that is the best feasible route by which we can hope to bring the trade of the Great West through this country. (Hear, hear.) I do hope the Government will seriously consider this when they are framing their canal scheme. I am glad to see the Hon. Attorney General West listening closely to what I am saying on this subject, and I trust he will not overlook it.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—Hear! hear!

MR. McCONKEY—I have no hesitation in expressing my desire that these resolutions as a whole may be carried into effect, and that the whole of the other provinces will come into the arrangement. I hope they will. I would be sorry to see the British Government attempt to coerce them against their will—but I trust that before many months they will see the propriety of coming in—and that before this time twelve months we shall have been formed into one great British American Confederation. (Hear, hear.) I have no doubt that the

consummation of this union will give peace and contentment to the whole country. I have no hesitation in stating my own conviction that it will give peace and contentment to Upper Canada, by giving us the management of our own local affairs without let or hindrance, while Lower Canada in like manner will have the management of her own local affairs. It will also give Upper Canada, at least in the House of Commons, what we have so long contended for—representation according to our population. I am happy to find that this is fully conceded to us in the popular branch of the Legislature. (Hear, hear.) I cannot do otherwise than approve of the proceedings of the Government the other day, on the intelligence reaching us of the result of the elections in one of the eastern provinces. When I heard that many of those elections in New Brunswick had gone against the scheme, I was at a loss to decide what would be the proper course—whether the scheme should still be pressed, or whether we should turn our attention to some other scheme. On full consideration of the subject, I have arrived at the conclusion that the Government have acted properly, and that they deserve every credit for the prompt action they have taken to get a speedy decision on this question: It is clear that the question of our defences, and that of our commercial relations with the United States, must be immediately looked to. Some steps must, as soon as possible, be taken to put the country in a proper state of defence. The season is approaching when we would be in a very unsatisfactory condition for meeting a hostile force, and it is the duty of the Government to take prompt action, that we may be prepared, should the hour of need arise. (Hear, hear.) A good deal has been said during this discussion about the propriety of an appeal to the people. I hold that great revolutions of this kind ought to receive the sanction of the people. But, in view of the fact that it is well known that ninety out of every hundred, in Upper Canada at least, are in favor of the scheme, I do not complain that it has not been considered advisable to submit it to a direct vote of the people. For my own part, being fully alive to the great responsibility I had to assume in voting upon these resolutions, I felt it my duty, before coming here, to hold meetings through my county, in order to consult my constituents. Those meetings were held all through the

riding, and at every one of them the people were unanimous in supporting the scheme. (Hear, hear.) Some of the details were objected to, but the scheme as a whole was approved of. These meetings were attended by men of all parties, and the resolutions were moved and seconded in many cases by my political opponents. I did not find more than three gentlemen, at all of those meetings, who gave opposition to the measure. And I may say further, that, when an appeal to the people was mentioned, the expression of opinion was, that it was not at all desirable or necessary, as it was known that the measure was so generally approved of. The result was, that my constituents instructed me to support these resolutions, giving me authority at the same time to propose amendments to such details as I might disapprove of, if the Government would allow any amendments to be made. (Hear, hear.) I find, from conversation with several hon. members from the west, that I differ from them with reference to the composition of the Legislative Council. I hardly approved of the proposition of the Government when an innovation was made on the constitution of the Legislative Council in 1855. I felt it was a wrong step, and fully sympathized with the opposition given to it at that time by the present Hon. President of the Council (Hon. Mr. BROWN) and the honorable member for Peel (Honorable J. H. CAMERON). Had I then been in a position to give effect to my views, I should have joined those honorable gentlemen in protesting against that encroachment upon the Constitution. I approve entirely of the proposition contained in the resolutions now before the House, with reference to this matter. If a necessity exists at all for a check upon hasty and ill-digested legislation of the popular branch, that check should not derive its power from the same source, and in the same manner. I have, however, for some time inclined to the opinion that the Legislative Council might, with safety, be abolished altogether, and that thereby there would be effected an immense saving to the country. In carrying out this scheme, very much, of course, will depend upon the character of the local constitutions. If such a system can be adopted as will render the working of the local governments simple and inexpensive, it will conduce very much to the prosperity of the whole Confederation. I must say, sir, that if I am permitted to have a voice in the framing of a Constitution for

Upper Canada, I shall insist upon it being of the most inexpensive kind, dispensing with a great deal of the paraphernalia that we see so much of here. (Hear, hear.) In bringing the new system into operation, and laying the foundations of the new nationality of British North America on a permanent and enduring basis, a weighty responsibility indeed devolves on the governments of these provinces, and the most rigid economy consistent with propriety ought to be, and I trust will be, a leading feature in their arrangements. (Hear, hear.) Mr. SPEAKER, I am no alarmist, but disguise it as we may, this country is at the present moment deeply depressed. I entirely dissent from sentiments enunciated by honorable gentlemen on the floor of this House as to the general prosperity of Canada; the actual state of matters is not as they represent it. Through a failure of crops for a number of years back in Upper Canada, that section of the province is in a state of agricultural and commercial prostration; farmers and others are unable to meet their engagements to the merchant, who, in consequence, is unable to meet his liabilities to the wholesale dealers, and the result is that scores, I may say hundreds, are obliged to collapse and go into liquidation; bank agencies are being withdrawn from the country districts, and banking accommodation very much curtailed. Mr. SPEAKER, these are facts that cannot be gainsayed. Every branch of industry is almost paralyzed at the present moment, and a general gloom hangs like a pall over the land. Under these circumstances, it behoves the Government to do everything in their power to revive and foster industry in the country. Sir, I will not say that this Government does so, but governments have been too much in the habit of borrowing from the banks that capital which ought to go into circulation for the benefit of the trade of the country. I hold that it is the duty of all governments to refrain from doing anything that will bear upon the people's industry; and I implore this Government to turn their attention to the position of this country just now, and do all they can to better the condition of the people. While, sir, there are features in the proposition before you which, if they stood alone on their merits, I should certainly oppose, yet, as I stated before, I do not think them of sufficient importance to justify me in rejecting the scheme, which is certainly calculated to elevate us from the position of

mere colonists to that of citizens of a great British American nation, covering as it will half a continent, stretching from the mighty Atlantic on the east, to the golden shores of the Pacific on the west, bounded on the south by the great American Republic, and on the north by—sir, I was going to say the North Pole—with, not an inter-colonial railroad merely, but an interoceanic communication, stretching from sea to sea. Mr. SPEAKER, I deeply feel the great responsibility that attaches to the vote I will shortly be called upon to give. I have weighed well this matter, and taking all things into account, I can arrive at no other conclusion than that it is my duty to vote for the resolutions in your hands, and I am now prepared to do so, believing that I am carrying out the views of the great bulk of my constituents. (Cheers.)

On motion of Mr. TASCHEREAU, the debate was then adjourned.

—o—

FRIDAY, March 10, 1865.

On the Order, for resuming the debate upon the motion "That the question be now put" upon the Resolutions relating to Confederation, being called—

HON. MR. HULTON rose to a point of order, objecting that the "previous question" was in the nature of an amendment, and that no member could move an amendment to his own motion.

After some discussion,

MR. SPEAKER decided as follows:—"The original motion, made by the Hon. Attorney General for Upper Canada, is that the House should concur in certain resolutions relating to a Federal union of the provinces. Debate having arisen thereon, the Hon. Attorney General for Upper Canada moves, not in amendment in my opinion, 'that that question be now put.' The substance of an amendment is to alter the original question. Does this motion alter the original question? So far from that, it is a proposal to bring that question before the House for immediate decision. The authorities cited to show that this motion is an amendment sustain the contrary view in my judgment, because they only state that the previous question is 'in the nature of an amendment.' If it were really an amend-

ment, or were to be used as an amendment it would be stated that it was in fact an amendment. The motion to adjourn is also spoken of as being in the nature of an amendment, but it is not an amendment, and like 'The previous question,' does not displace the original proposition, if carried. Hence I conclude that 'The previous question' is not an amendment. The objection that the Hon. Attorney General for Upper Canada cannot move it, on account of having proposed the original motion, in my opinion is not valid."

MR. TASCHEREAU said—It is not without hesitation, Mr. SPEAKER, that I rise at this late period of the debate to offer a few observations on the measure before us—the plan of Confederation of the British North American Provinces; and my hesitation is the greater that I am under the necessity, not only of speaking on a question which has been so long and skillfully discussed, that it would appear almost impossible to say anything which may interest hon. members, but also and more especially that after long and deliberate consideration—after carefully weighing the gist and tendency of these resolutions, and tracing out the effects which cannot fail, I believe, to result from the measure of which they are the exponents—I feel myself bound, Mr. SPEAKER, to abandon, on this question, those with whom I have always acted hitherto, to differ in opinion from those whose talents and judgment I have never ceased to admire, and to record my vote against the new Constitution which is proposed to us in those resolutions. (Hear! hear! from the left.) It could not fail to be to me a particular cause of regret that I felt compelled to come to this conclusion. I could not understand that this measure was a simple party matter—one of those questions on which those party feelings which have prevailed in Canada so many years ought to influence any body. I could not conceive how, in considering a question which, in my opinion, imperils all that we hold most dear, and opens to us, if it is carried, the prospect of a future, dark with clouds, portending evil not only to us Lower Canadians, but perhaps no less to all British North America—I could not conceive, I say, how I could be unmindful of my convictions, and lay aside my fears and the sense of duty which binds me here, to yield blind obedience and submission to the influence of political party. I thought myself at liberty to think

for myself, even on so important a question; and I am persuaded that if there are members of this House who consider themselves authorized to doubt the sanity of those who do not always think as they do, they are not in a majority here. For my own part, Mr. SPEAKER, I respect every man's opinion. I am willing to allow all who are so disposed to think differently from me, and do not, on that account, hold them to be either prejudiced or dishonest; on the contrary, I am willing to believe that they act according to their convictions, and with perfect good faith. I desire that others will judge me in the same manner, and that those from whom I am now dissentient on the subject of the resolutions in your hand, Mr. SPEAKER, will believe, at least, that I too am acting in this matter according to my honest convictions and with good faith; that I, too, am animated by love for my country and my nationality; that I, too, have at heart the preservation of that nationality and those institutions which have been transmitted to us by our fathers, as the reward of so many struggles and sacrifices. (Hear, hear.) At this advanced stage of the debate, it is not my intention to combat or discuss all the arguments which have been urged in favor of Confederation. I must, however, observe that I have not been convinced by the hon. gentlemen who have spoken before me, that the Constitution offered to us embodies guarantees sufficient to protect our rights. I am of opinion, therefore, that the vote which I shall give against Confederation would be given by a large majority of my constituents, and a large majority of the people of Lower Canada; and my opinion on this subject is so firmly grounded, that I should despise myself if, for the sake of not separating from my party, I were to vote for Confederation, my convictions being so strong and so sincere. (Hear, hear.) We were taught to believe, till within the last two or three days, that the most ample discussion of the question would be allowed; but, by the moving of the previous question, the face of things has undergone a change. This House, and all Lower Canada, supposed that before being called upon to vote on the main question, we should have had an opportunity of obtaining an expression of the opinion of the people. I am persuaded that if, after a full and complete discussion of the measure in this House, the people were called upon for their

opinion, they would be more decidedly opposed to Confederation than they ever were to any measure. (Hear.) Unfortunately, as the previous question has been moved, we must vote on the resolutions as they stand, without being able even to move amendments which might render them less objectionable to the country. I now come to the appeal to the people. Well, I maintain that in voting to change the constitution of the Government, without consulting the people on the subject, the members of this House are exceeding their powers; and that even if the people were in favor of Confederation, they ought not to pass it, as they are now about to do, without special authority. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. MORRIS) has told us that this is no new question—that it has been for a long time a subject of discussion—that the people understood it thoroughly, and that the members of this House were privileged to vote on it without referring it to their constituents. I am quite aware that much has been written on the subject of the Confederation of the provinces; but has the question ever been discussed before the people at elections? I am fully convinced and perfectly certain this question was never brought up at any election, nor the question of any Confederation at all. It has never been laid before the people, and the people have never expressed an opinion on the subject. (Hear, hear.) It appears to me that the amendment which is to be moved by the hon. member for Peel (Hon. J. H. CAMERON), after the present resolutions have been voted by the House, will be in a singular position. (Hear, hear.) I have understood the explanations given by the Honorable Attorney General for Upper Canada (Hon. J. A. MACDONALD), relative to the resolution of the honorable member for Peel—that the resolutions before the House would be passed first, and that afterwards, when the House went into committee, the hon. member for Peel would move his amendment, namely, “that the House will vote the Address to Her Majesty this evening, in order that the Government may despatch it to England to-morrow, if they please, and that on Monday afternoon the hon. member for Peel will come and move an Address to His Excellency, praying that he will refer these resolutions to the people.” (Hear, hear.) I confess that I do not understand how the members of this

House, who are in favor of the appeal to the people, can vote for Confederation after the previous question has been decided, any more than I can understand how the hon. member for Peel can move the appeal to the people after the resolutions have been passed. The hon. member has said that he would endeavor to move his resolutions before the Address is presented to His Excellency, or before it is referred to a committee of the whole House; but I think I understood likewise that the Hon. Attorney General for Upper Canada will not allow this, and has said that the hon. member for Peel is not entitled to do so. (Hear, hear.) I am not alone in feeling the apprehensions which I have expressed relative to the new Constitution intended for us. A member of this House, who wrote, now a long time since, on the subject of Confederation, has allowed us to see indistinctly that the resolutions as presented to us did not afford sufficient guarantees to settle all our sectional difficulties at once. The honorable member for Montmorency could not, in his pamphlet written in 1865, avoid saying as follows:—

But, nevertheless, it is clearly evident that concurrent legislation is full of danger for the future; that is plainly laid down even in the clause that we are now discussing, since, to obviate it, central legislation has invariably been made to predominate over local legislation. Will it be possible to avoid the points of contact likely to be produced by concurrent legislation, or to define them with such precision that these conflicts would be impossible, or nearly so? Without harmony the system would be worth nothing, and would soon destroy itself; and the harmony of the system cannot be found exclusively in the predominant power of the Government and of the Federal Parliament. It is necessary that this harmony should also exist in the inferior machinery, and be felt throughout the whole system.

And afterwards, in the same chapter, he adds:—

In fact, will not the elements upon which the local institutions will be based, be reproduced in all their vivacity in the Government and in the Federal Parliament? And this local power which it has been their object to compress will react dangerously on the whole system. At one time it may be Lower Canada that will be punishing its Ministry and its members for having wounded Lower Canadian feelings and striking at its interests; and another time it may be Upper Canada, or perhaps the Atlantic Provinces, that may make similar complaints. This should not be, and to avoid it our eminent statesmen must put their heads together to find a better solution to the problem.

While the hon. member for Montmorency was writing that article, he naturally saw that Confederation would have some very complicated parts in its machinery, and that the difficulties which might occur would not be easily surmounted—that the resolutions would need to be amended. That was, no doubt, the opinion of the hon. member for Montmorency when he wrote those articles, but since he has found that the Ministry are resolved not to allow any amendment of the resolutions, the honorable member has thought it better to take them as they are, with all their imperfections, than to risk losing Confederation altogether. (Hear, hear.) I believe, Mr. SPEAKER, that we needed a remedy for the constitutional difficulties in which we were involved, but I believe also that the remedy proposed would be worse than the disease sought to be cured. (Hear, hear.) I believe that the country has suffered from those difficulties, but on the other hand I see in Confederation internal strife in the local legislatures, not to speak of that strife which will infallibly spring up at an early day between the federal and the local legislatures. (Hear, hear.) It is evident that the federal will never be able to satisfy the local legislatures. In Lower Canada, for instance, we shall have a pretty strong party—the English party, Protestants, who will carry their complaints to the Federal Government, just as, in Upper Canada, they made complaints relative to representation based on population, and that party being a minority in Lower Canada, will seek a remedy for their evils, real or imaginary, at the hands of the Federal Government. Moreover, we shall have constant contests and sectional heart-burnings between the local legislatures themselves, on all those subjects on which their interests may come into collision. (Hear, hear.) Let us suppose, for instance, that the Legislature of Lower Canada should make some perfectly just demand, something to which that province is clearly entitled, and that the representatives of Upper Canada and the Maritime Provinces should combine to hinder it from obtaining its demand—would the Lower Canadians be well satisfied with such treatment? And this might easily happen. The hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. HARWOOD) has spoken in pompous language of the prosperous future which awaits us under Confederation. To hear him we are not only to have coal mines,

but lakes of gold at our disposal. I think the honorable member's figures of rhetoric have carried him rather too far; and I sincerely believe that instead of that prosperous and happy future foreseen by him, we are preparing for ourselves a state of things which will cause us to repent in ten years of what we are now doing. I believe that we are commencing Confederation ten years too soon. (Hear, hear.) We should have an Intercolonial Railway at least five or six years before thinking of Confederation. At present we are as much strangers to New Brunswick and Nova Scotia as we were previous to last autumn. We may perhaps know them a little better than we did before we began to discuss Confederation; and we ought, in the first place, to establish easy methods of communication between those provinces and ourselves, as a means of bringing about Confederation at some future day, if it be practicable. I say that the Intercolonial Railway ought first to be built, and that Confederation might be put off even several years after that. (Hear, hear.) Article 41 of the resolutions before us says as follows:—

The Local Government and Legislature of each province shall be constructed in such manner as the existing Legislature of each such province shall provide.

If I understand that article right, the local constitution of Lower Canada will be settled by the present Legislature; just as in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, &c., the present legislatures will decide on the constitution of their legislatures under Confederation. Very well; but in that case Upper Canada will give us a constitution, as we may give her one. The effect of that clause will be, that in order to the organization of its local constitution, Lower Canada will stand with 47 French-Canadian votes, against 83 votes of members of other origins. We shall therefore not stand on the same footing as New Brunswick or Nova Scotia in this respect; the difference will be very great. (Hear, hear.) We have only 47 French-Canadian votes out of 130, and we could not count on Upper Canadian members for the safety of our interests—either local or religious—whereas they would have the support of all the English and Protestant members from Lower Canada. (Hear.) And in Confederation the English minority of Lower Canada will not make common cause with the French-Canadian party, but, on the contrary, with the Upper Canadian party;

for they will look to Upper Canada for protection. (Hear, hear.) We are told that all our interests and institutions are protected, and that the clergy are in favor of Confederation. I, for my own part, have seen no proof of the truth of that assertion; I believe that the clergy have not made any display of their opinions on this question. I am moreover convinced that those of that body who have considered the question, have looked upon it as fraught with danger for us—as pregnant with evils, the development of which may be grievous to us as a nation hereafter. Another part of the resolutions which we should not adopt without consideration, is that contained in the 34th article of clause 29. It reads as follows:—

The General Parliament shall have power to make laws for the establishment of a General Court of Appeal for the Federated Provinces.

We have a guarantee that we are to have our own local tribunals, that our judges will be taken from the bar of Lower Canada, and that our civil laws will be maintained. Why then establish a Federal Court of Appeals, in which appeals will lie from the decisions of all our judges? We are told, it is true, by the Hon. Minister of Finance, that the resolutions did not create a Court of Appeals, but only gave the Federal Parliament the power to create it. But what difference is there between creating the court forthwith and granting a right to create it hereafter? The principle is the same. If the Government may lawfully create such a court, no one can prevent the Federal Government from establishing it whenever they think fit. Would this tribunal be an advantage to us French-Canadians, who are so attached to our civil code? It will be composed of judges from all the provinces—from New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Upper Canada, &c.; and notwithstanding the talents and the learning of all those judges, we Lower Canadians cannot hope to find the same justice from such a tribunal as we should receive from one consisting of judges from Lower Canada; for our laws being different from the laws of those provinces, they will not be able to understand and appreciate them as Lower Canadians would. (Hear, hear.) And, moreover, when this new Court of Appeals is instituted, the appeal to England will not be abolished, so that we shall have one more means of producing delay and increasing the costs of suitors. Lower Canadians will

assuredly be less satisfied with the decisions of a Federal Court of Appeals than with those of Her Majesty's Privy Council. In good truth, I do not see why this clause was imposed upon our delegates. I do not suppose that the delegates of the other provinces can have very strongly insisted on it; but even if they had, I do not see why ours submitted to it. Of course our laws would not be understood in such a court, and most of the judges would render their decisions according to principles of jurisprudence unknown to Lower Canada. I am convinced that those Lower Canadian members who are in favor of Confederation are not in favor of a legislative union; but have they not read the speech made at Toronto by the Hon. President of the Council (Hon. Mr. BROWN)? And did they not hear that of the honorable member for South Leeds (Mr. FORD JONES), and the speeches of the members from Upper Canada generally, who nearly all spoke in favor of a legislative union, declaring that they accept Confederation as an instalment—a first step—towards a legislative union, which we shall have in a few years? It is not necessary for me to discuss, on this occasion, the advantages or disadvantages of a legislative union, for all the members are perfectly well acquainted with the question; but I am well convinced that the Confederation will be converted into a legislative union in a few years. I believe that the Hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. member for South Leeds were sincere in saying that, and that they were perfectly convinced of its truth. (Hear, hear.) It has been said, as a reason for hurrying on the passing of the measure, that if we wish for Confederation, now is the time to obtain it; that if we wait another year it will be too late; that the Lower Provinces are ready for Confederation, and that England is disposed to grant us a new Constitution. I believe that the Lower Provinces have proved to be a little slack in fulfilling their engagements, and that the policy of the Government might therefore, with great safety, undergo some modification. (Hear, hear.) But if we must absolutely have Confederation, if there is no getting on without it, why was not an appeal made to the people last autumn, when the scheme was quite prepared? (Hear, hear.) For my part, I think that the want of the measure of Confederation is not so urgent as it is said to be, and that time should be taken to mature the plan. Does anybody believe

that the question of Confederation would have been thought of if the TACHÉ-MACDONALD Ministry had not been overthrown last summer? No; we should not have heard a word about it. (Hear, hear.) So that Confederation was not so very pressing at that time! And if the want of it was so little felt in the Constitutional Committee appointed last year at the instance of the hon. member for South Oxford (Hon. Mr. BROWN), that many members who this day vote themselves, and induce others to vote for Confederation, thought themselves authorized to oppose it then, and to vote against any proposition of the kind, I think that it is not so needful to unite us by Confederation as we are told it is. I believe that if the adoption of the measure is urged forward so anxiously, it is only because there is fear of public opinion being roused to examine it, and fear especially of its not being accepted hereafter, when the people have pronounced upon it. (Hear, hear.) And, I repeat, I believe in my heart, if the Government had not been overthrown on the 14th June last, we should never have heard a word about Confederation this year. (Hear, hear.) As I said when I commenced speaking, I will not discuss every question connected with this scheme, because the House must be tired of such a long discussion. I am bound, however, to declare again, that all the reasons hitherto alleged in favor of Confederation, and all the magnificent pictures presented to our view of the prosperity we are to enjoy under its auspices, have entirely failed to convince me that it is our bounden duty to adopt the resolutions laid before us; and notwithstanding the eloquent speech made to us yesterday by the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. HARWOOD), I cannot say, as he does, that our posterity will be grateful to us for having opened the way for them to become members of the great empire of the Provinces of British North America. I shall say, on the contrary, what will be soon found out, that this Confederation is the ruin of our nationality in Lower Canada—that on the day when Confederation is voted, a death-blow will have been dealt on our nation's life, which was beginning to take root in the soil of British North America. (Hear, hear.) Our children, far from feeling grateful for what we are now doing, will say that we made a great mistake when we imposed Confederation on them. (Cheers.)

MR. A. M. SMITH—MR. SPEAKER, I

cannot permit the vote to be taken on this important measure, without placing on record some of the reasons which induce me to give it my support, and to show why, to some extent, I have changed my views on a few of the leading details of the scheme. When, sir, the people of the first commercial city in Western Canada elected me to represent them on the floor of this House, I publicly stated that by every legitimate means I would oppose the construction of a railroad between Canada and the Lower Provinces—then, as I do now, believing that in a commercial point of view, that Intercolonial road would never pay, nor be even beneficial to Upper Canada. But at the same time, sir, I pledged myself to urge upon the Ministers of the Crown and this House the vast importance to the country of an enlargement of our canals and the extension of our canal system. Since then, Mr. SPEAKER, our political and commercial positions are very much changed. (Hear, hear.) Threatened with the abrogation of the Reciprocity treaty, a very serious loss will be entailed on Canada—if the threat be carried into execution—without any advantage accruing to the United States. Indeed, from the nature of our commercial relations with the United States—the natural result of a trade fostered and carried on between the United States and Canada for years—the abrogation of the Reciprocity treaty cannot be otherwise than attended with great distress and serious loss to the business men of this country. In addition to this, sir, we are threatened with the abrogation of the bonding system. Surely this is much to be deplored. To every thinking mind a resort to such measures must seem absurd, and what could induce a people so thoroughly commercial as the people of the United States, to desire the abrogation of a treaty which, while it benefits us by permitting the transit of goods through their territory, also benefits them largely by increasing their carrying trade, and fosters an immense trade in the purchase of goods of all descriptions in bond—I must declare my inability thoroughly to understand. But, however strange, Mr. SPEAKER, all this may seem to us, angry men, it must be admitted, frequently do indulge in strange antics, and it need not surprise us that a nation plunged in all the horrors of civil war should, under the excitement of some real or fancied wrong, do the same thing; as has been exemplified in the adoption of the despotic system

of passports, the abrogation of the Reciprocity treaty, and the annulling of the treaty for the extradition of criminals. Yet, Mr. SPEAKER, I cannot believe that the United States will abrogate either the one or the other, and I do not believe that the great and high-minded and honorable men who control the moneyed institutions of the United States will permit it. But, sir, it is only right on our part to do the next best, and only thing we can, to protect ourselves from the loss and inconvenience to our trade in winter, and that is, to build the Intercolonial Railroad—for we must have a highway to the ocean at all seasons for our mails and our merchandise. But, Mr. SPEAKER, while I admit that I have changed my mind with regard to the Intercolonial Railroad in voting for the scheme in which it is a prominent measure, I am more and more convinced of the paramount necessity of immediately settling about the enlargement of our canals. We hear of schemes to connect the Georgian Bay with Ottawa by way of the French River route and the Trent route, and sir, perhaps the only practicable and shortest route *via* Toronto and Lake Simcoe; but all these only divert attention from what really can and ought to be done, at a very trifling cost in comparison with any other scheme—I mean the enlargement of the canals we now have. (Hear, hear.) We have now nine feet of water in the St. Lawrence canals, and ten feet in the Welland, and the cost of increasing the depth of those canals to twelve feet, I am told by men competent to judge, would be trifling indeed—probably not over two or three millions of dollars. But if it cost as many pounds, I contend that it would not really cost the country one cent. If the toll of one cent per bushel on grain outward and a proportionate rate on inward merchandise were enacted, the canals would not only be self-sustaining, but would become a source of revenue to the provinces. Take for instance, what I believe a small estimate, one hundred millions of bushels outward, and an equal amount inward for other merchandise, and you would have a revenue of two millions of dollars—a sum more than sufficient to pay interest and working expenses. Then, Mr. SPEAKER, see the impetus it would give to our inland shipping trade, if we could—and we could then do so—attract to the St. Lawrence route the immense grain crops of the Great West. I might also refer, Mr. SPEAKER, to the ship-building suited to the wants of our country, and the immense advantage

shippers of grain would have if their vessels proceeded to sea without the ruinous delay of transshipment, and the mixing and destroying of property round the wharves and storehouses at the different points at which grain, under the present system, has to be transhipped. I only wish I had the elquence of the Hon. Attorney General West; with the little practical knowledge I have of those things, I think I would be able to interest both western and eastern members alike on the necessity of improving, and at once, this great and vital avenue to our future prosperity. (Hear, hear.) Now, sir, with regard to our defences: while I do not object to some expenditure to please the English people if you choose; I am of opinion our best defence is to cultivate with the United States friendly commercial and political relations, and then, sir, I do not fear that if we do what is right, they will do us any wrong. Sound and honorable conduct on our part is of more strength than all the forts of masonry or earthwork that we shall ever see. (Hear, hear.) Mr. SPEAKER, the prompt and manly course that our Government has pursued with regard to the Alien Bill, and calling out a portion of our volunteers to repress raiding and piracy, will entitle them to the gratitude of every right-minded man in this country. Sir, had they commenced to build forts and arm ships, instead of the manly and honorable course which they did pursue, they would, in my opinion, have found use for their volunteers and their forts too; while I hope that in a very short time they will not require either. (Hear, hear.) I wish now to say a few words about this great Confederation, from which so much is expected, commercially and politically. I am of opinion that the advantages will be very evenly divided—they taking our grain and flour, while we buy their fish and oil. We will have an open market for our manufactures with them, and they will have the same for theirs with us, so that it is a mere matter of who gives most. But at present the Maritime Provinces import from the United States flour and grain, if I am correct, to the amount of three or four millions of dollars' worth per annum, which our political and more intimate relations would in a more or less degree attract to Canada; and I have no doubt our merchants would know how to turn those advantages to account. Mr. SPEAKER, these are some of the reasons

why I gave this Confederation scheme my hearty support, believing that the honorable gentlemen who have brought this treaty before this House have no other motive, and can have no other motive, but the promotion of the best interests of this our adopted land. (Hear, hear.) I think the scheme as proposed is, as near as it can be, fair to all the provinces. Before I close, I would just say a word with reference to the course pursued by my respected and honorable colleague from Toronto West (Mr. J. MACDONALD). I have no hesitation in saying that I am confident that he is sincere in his opposition, and he may be right; but I am not so sure that he represents the wishes of his constituents. I attended a large and influential meeting of the citizens of the city of Toronto before the meeting of this House, and a gentleman there proposed that the scheme should not be carried into effect until it was referred to the people, but he could not get even a seconder to his resolution. For myself, I feel justified by the result of that meeting in supporting this scheme throughout. The meeting was extensively advertised—all had an opportunity to attend, and both sides of the question were ably argued. I shall record my vote for the scheme, and shall be happy to see it carried into early consummation. (Cheers.)

Mr. SHANLEY said—In rising to address the House on the great question under debate, it is not my intention to go minutely into the subject; for after all that has been said, and the great length to which the debate has dragged on, I cannot expect to be able to fix the attention of my hearers for very long, even were the subject one to which I could speak authoritatively, instead of being, as it is, one that the ablest and most statesmanlike among us must in a great measure accept upon faith—trusting to the future to develop the excellencies claimed for it on the one hand, or to establish the faults that are charged on it on the other. But though I do not pretend to be able to say anything new on the subject, or to throw any light on the uncertain future that lies before us, still I would be unwilling that in, perhaps, the most important division ever taken in a Colonial Legislature, my vote should be recorded without my first stating some, at all events, of the reasons that actuate me in voting as I intend to vote. One feature has been strikingly observable in the debate, and that is, that from first to

last, as far as it has yet gone, no new thing has been offered or suggested. The programme of Confederation stands now exactly as it was presented in a *quasi* private form to the representatives of the people of this country some four months ago. The promoters of the scheme have added nothing to, taken nothing from the original bill of fare, and they have as good as told us, frankly and squarely, that they would add nothing to, take nothing from it if they could. The opponents of the project on the other hand, while giving it a sweeping condemnation, offer nothing, suggest nothing to replace that which they so summarily reject. Nothing is easier than to find fault with other men's work; it is a talent that we all possess, and that few of us ever think to hide under a bushel. For myself, though in favor of the scheme, being equally at a loss with other honorable members to say anything new upon it, I, too, will have to turn to my fault-finding instincts in the first instance. The honorable member for Montreal Centre (Hon. Mr. ROSE) has said in his able speech that if we could not improve on the project, we should forbear to find fault with it. I do not agree with him. On the contrary, I conceive that even though approving of the resolutions as a whole, it is the duty of members speaking to the question to point out and place on record the faults that strike them as likely to require correction by and by. And first of all—coming to discuss Confederation from my own standpoint—I would say that I have long looked forward to the time when the whole of the British North American Provinces would be united under one stable government; believing, as I always have believed ever since I came to know this country well, that we possess all the elements, in natural resources and endowments, and in distinctive geographical position, to form the ground-work of a power on this continent. I feared, nevertheless, when the project was foreshadowed here last year, that the time was not yet full for bringing about the desired combination. I feared that the almost total separation, political and social, which had heretofore existed between ourselves and the provinces below, might possibly cause a premature union to result in permanent estrangement. It appeared to me that we should first have cultivated social and commercial relations with our kindred on the seaboard before uniting, for better or worse, in a political alliance. These were the views which I took

of the Confederation project when it was so suddenly sprung upon us at the close of last session; and I confess that I still entertain grave apprehensions that we may be about to come together upon too short an acquaintance, before we have an opportunity of knowing one another, and learning to adapt ourselves the one to the other. In this consists my broad and general objection, not to the principle of Confederation, but to the hastiness with which it is sought to be carried out—threatening, as I fear, to mar our destiny in striving to overtake it. To the details of the scheme itself I hold one strong and marked objection, which I desire to record, though I know that this is not the time or place for remedying defective details. I allude to the Federal feature of the project. I own to a rooted dislike, if not to the Federal principle or Federal theory, at all events to the practical results of the working of the system; and neither the warm eulogium which the Hon. President of the Council (Hon. Mr. BROWN) has passed upon the system as illustrated by its working in the United States, nor the milder defence of the system pronounced by my hon. friend the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. MCGEE), has served to clothe it in other than most distasteful colors in my sight. However the Federal system of government may have tended to promote the material growth of the United States—and it would not be safe to assert that such a country, with such a people, would have failed to attain to early greatness under any form of free government—however, I repeat, the Federal form of government may have promoted the material progress of the United States, it does not seem to me to have elevated, politically speaking at all events, the moral standard of the people of the United States. One most marked and evil result of the system has been to produce politicians rather than statesmen—swarms of the former to a very limited proportion of the latter; and I would much fear, if we are to see Canada redivided, that the petty parliaments of the separated provinces will prove to be but preparatory schools for that class of politicians who take to politics as to a trade, and whose after-presence in the greater Assembly—to which they would all aspire—would serve to depress the standard of political worth, to lower the tone of political morality, which we might hope to see prevail in a Confederated Parliament of British North America under a purely legis-

lative union, which is the description of union into which I trust to see the present imperfect Constitution, or proposed Constitution, eventually merge. For the reasons stated I have looked upon this Federal scheme of union with dislike and distrust. But the promoters of the scheme, most of whom, it must be admitted, have appeared here rather as its apologists than as its upholders, tell us that it is a necessity of circumstances, an unavoidable consequence of difference in language, laws and local interests between Upper and Lower Canada on the one part, and an absence of community of local interests between us here in Canada and the Maritime Provinces on the other hand. The latter part of the argument is undoubtedly correct; but, admitting the whole of the premises, for argument sake, the other question naturally suggests itself: Is Confederation, even in the faulty form in which it is laid before us, to be accepted as a likely remedy for the evils under which we now labor in Canada, and as a possible antidote against the greater evils which threaten us in the near future? I would answer that question in my own way, and from my own point of view by and by; meanwhile I would ask to be permitted to say a word in respect of the financial phase of the Confederation project; and upon that point I feel it difficult to agree with my hon. friend the Hon. Finance Minister, in assuming that the joint expenses of the two local governments here in Canada may be kept so much below what we are now paying for our single form of government, as to leave a wide margin towards defraying, if not wholly to cover, our proportion of the expenses of the General Government. I can hardly venture to take such a *couleur-de-rose* view of our position as that. I will not weary the House with estimates and figures, which, after all, can be but problematical and conjectural; but I would venture to predict that under our new condition of existence, with its *quasi* national obligations, our expenditure must increase largely beyond the present limits that we have hitherto been accustomed to. I believe that to be an inevitable result of the Confederation; but I also believe that there is a future looming upon us—Confederation or no Confederation—which will involve us in duties and responsibilities which we must not shirk—which, in fact, we cannot shirk if we would. The signs of the times are not to be

mistaken, and I fear we have an expensive future before us for some time to come. But if, in bringing about a union of all these provinces, we were in reality laying the sure foundation of social, commercial, and political prosperity—if we felt that in reality we were laying the ground-work, as it were, of a new nation on this continent—we might justly, along with the great benefits we bequeath to posterity—benefits which we, in our generation, cannot hope to enjoy in their fulness—bequeath to them also the financial burden which would seem to be the ordained and inevitable accompaniment of progressive nationality. And if I felt assured in my own mind that this measure of Confederation, faulty as it is, promised even a fair chance for successfully solving a great political difficulty, I for one would not fear to take my share of the responsibility of increasing the expenses of government and adding to the debt of the country. I have alluded to the expenses attendant on Confederation as being, to a certain extent, conjectural and problematical; but there is one item of its cost which is not of that character. The Intercolonial Railway is a vital part of the Confederation project—the latter could have no useful, practical existence without the former. As a commercial undertaking, the Intercolonial Railway presents no attractions, it offers no material for a flattering prospectus; we could not invite to it the attention of European capitalists as presenting an eligible investment for their surplus funds. But for the establishing of those intimate social and commercial relations indispensable to political unity between ourselves and the sister provinces, the railway is a necessity. It will, therefore, have to be undertaken and paid for purely as a national work, and it is right that the people of Canada should know and understand in the outset what the probable addition to our public debt would be in connection with the 68th resolution. I do not think the proportion of the cost of the railway falling to the share of Canada can be much short of what we have already given towards the construction of the Grand Trunk Railway—at all events from twelve to fourteen millions of dollars. If it shall come about that the sense of the people is to be taken on the Confederation question, the Intercolonial Railway feature in the plan will prove the most difficult to reconcile the people to, and especially the people of Upper Canada. In my own constituency—and I

may venture to assert that there are not many honorable members in the House stronger in their constituencies than I am—if I were to come before my electors purely on the Confederation issue, and as the advocate of Confederacy, I know that denunciation of the 68th resolution would be a tower of strength in the hands of any anti-Confederate opponent who might choose to measure swords with me in the electoral field; but I would be prepared to face that difficulty, and in the fullest confidence that I could do so successfully and triumphantly, if satisfied that I could—and I think I could—show to my people that the scheme of Confederation, even with the Intercolonial Railway inseparately interwoven in its web, is essential to our existence as a British people. (Hear, hear.) Reverting to the objectionable features I have alluded to in the resolutions before us, I have asked myself this question—Is Confederation, as offered to us, faulty, as the plan may be likely to work well for the future of the country? Is it likely to prove a satisfactory solution of the very grave political difficulties that beset us? It would be in vain to attempt to conceal from ourselves that Canada is at this moment approaching the most critical period of her hitherto existence. Threatened with aggression from without, we are not in a gratifying condition of prosperity within, let blue-books and census returns say what they will to the contrary. Great and momentous events are transpiring just beyond our frontier—events which have already seriously and injuriously affected us commercially, and which must inevitably, in some way or other, affect us politically. A people until recently devoted only to industrial pursuits and the development of their country, have suddenly expanded into a great military power. To use their own expression, the Americans are “making history very fast,” and it is impossible that that eventful history can be manufactured in a territory separated from our own by little more than an imaginary line, without our having eventually some part in its pages, for good or for evil. In fact we cannot conceal from ourselves that some great change is impending over the destinies of our country—a change that will present itself to us in some form or other, and that before long, without its being in our power to avert, though it may be in our power to shape it. There is fast growing up in England a feeling of want of confidence in Canada. We

see it in the tone of the press, in the parliamentary debates and elsewhere. We are told that we are giving more trouble to the Mother Country than we are worth. A similar feeling of want of confidence, amounting almost to contempt, has always prevailed towards us in the United States. The ignorance of everything relating to Canada—of our political and social condition—of our resources and our commerce—our growth and our progress—that exists among our kindred across the border, cannot fail to have surprised those who have mingled much among them, and if not altogether creditable to them is certainly very humiliating to us; but, great as the ignorance is there, it is fully equalled by that which exists with respect to Canada, and all pertaining to Canada, among our nearer and dearer kindred in the old world. What can we do to remedy this unfortunate and humiliating state of things? What can we do to inspire confidence in us abroad; to command respect; to defy contempt? These appear to me to be the practical questions with which we have to deal. We are plainly told by England that we must rely more upon our own resources in the future than we have done in the past, and it is right and just we should do so. It appears to me that there are just three states of political existence possible for us here, when we emerge from the chrysalis-form in which we have hitherto existed. First, there is the attempt to stand alone as a separate nationality on this continent—that is one alternative. Secondly, there is the prospect held out to us in the resolutions—namely, a union of all the British North American Colonies, under the flag of England, becoming more and more every year a homogeneous British people, and building up a consolidated British power on this continent. The last and inevitable alternative, if we reject the other two, is exactly that stated by my honorable friend from South Lanark (Mr. MORRIS)—absorption into the United States. It is in vain to shut our eyes to that fact, or that the time is at hand when we will have to make our selection. I know that the latter alternative—and I can speak from as thorough an acquaintance with the wants, feelings and wishes of the people of Canada as any honorable gentleman in this House possesses—would be most distasteful to the great mass of the people of this country. (Loud cheers.) To myself personally, it would be so distasteful that it

would amount to a sentence of expatriation, rupturing the ties and associations of a quarter of a century. (Hear, hear.) When my honorable friend the Hon. Attorney General for Upper Canada introduced the resolutions to the House, he gave us to understand that the question, or the details of the question, were scarcely to be considered as open for debate. He told us plainly and squarely that the project must be viewed as a treaty already sealed and signed between the contracting parties, and would have to be accepted as a whole or rejected as a whole. I felt the force of the situation then, and when the same honorable gentleman came down here a few days since, and, in reference to the new phase of difficulty resulting from the turn taken by the elections in New Brunswick, announced that prompt and vigorous action was necessary, in a somewhat different direction from that originally contemplated, I felt the force of the situation even more fully than at first. (Hear, hear.) And I would here ask to be allowed to digress a moment from the main question. I wish to take this opportunity of saying that I never had more than a sort of a half-confidence in the Government as now constituted. When the leaders of the Conservative party, with whom I have always acted, saw fit last year to make certain political combinations which, even they must admit, astonished and startled the country—combinations resulting in the present Coalition Ministry—I claimed that I and every member of the Conservative party, in this House or out of it, who chose to dissent from the course adopted by our leaders, had a right to hold ourselves absolved from all party ties and obligations whatever. I claimed then as I claim now, that from thenceforward I owed no political allegiance, no party fealty, to any man or any body of men on the floor of this House. In electing to adopt for myself the anomalous and hybrid position of an "independent member," I knew full well that it was to "burn my ship"—to cast away from me all chances of political advancement; but I never had political aspirations that warred with my own notions of political honor and consistency, or with my love of personal independence. But when great changes in our political relations are taking place; when all feel, as I believe all do feel, that a great and momentous event is impending; when, under such circumstances, my hon. friend the Honorable Attorney General for Upper Canada announ-

ces, as he has done, in a frank, bold, manly and statesmanlike manner, prompt and vigorous policy on the part of the Government in dealing with an unlooked-for difficulty—I allude to the difficulty growing out of the New Brunswick elections—I will tell that hon. gentleman that he and his colleagues may now—and always when boldly grappling with the political emergencies of the country—count on a cordial, earnest and admiring support from me. (Hear, hear.) Without further discussion or debate, I cast my vote for and my lot with the Confederation, and this I do in the fullest confidence and belief that, however faulty may be certain of the details of the scheme, and however awkward it may be to work out some of its provisions successfully, the resources of the people of these provinces, their innate adaptation for self-government, will be found fully equal to overcoming all the difficulties and obstacles that may beset their path. I fully believe that the faults which I now object to in the plan of Confederation will, like the diseases incident to childhood, grow out of our system as we advance in political strength and stature, and that when another decade has passed over us we will be found a strong, united British people, ready and able, in peace or in war, to hold our own upon this continent. (Cheers.)

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the chair.

After the recess,

Mr. SHANLY, resuming his remarks, said—Before the House rose, I had expressed my belief that the people of this country would be found equal to any emergency that might arise in working out the Constitution embraced in the resolutions, and would prove themselves capable of altering or amending it until it worked effectually and well for the benefit of the whole country. And in making the choice which I know the people of this country will make—as between annexation to the United States and connection with Great Britain—as between republicanism and monarchy—as between Canada our country, or Canada our state—I believe they will be choosing that which will best advance the material prospects, and best ensure the future happiness and greatness of the country. If we were to be absorbed into the republic, and become a state of the union, that would in no way relieve us of the great undertakings that are before us for the improvement and de-

velopment of our resources. We would still have a large debt on our hands, of which, unaided, we would have to bear the burden; our canals and other public works would be treated, not as national, but as state enterprises, and the expense of enlarging or extending them would have to be charged upon a diminished revenue, for nearly the whole of the revenue we now raise from customs and excise would go, not to the improvement of this state of Canada, but would be poured into the coffers of the General Government at Washington. I can not understand how any patriotic Canadian, even of those who regard political matters from a material point of view only, can advocate annexation to the United States. I believe there are many persons in Canada who, though entertaining feelings of true loyalty to the Crown of England, imagine that in some way or other—they cannot exactly tell how—annexation would bring about an extraordinary and sudden state of prosperity. I differ entirely, even in the material and practical points of view, from the theorists and visionaries who entertain so false a conviction. How, I would ask, is this country, with diminished means at its command, to be enabled to carry out those great works through which alone it could hope to become great, but the ways and means for constructing or improving which still puzzle our financiers? I have always been of opinion, since I first came to ponder carefully the future of Canada, that that future does not depend so much upon our lands as upon our waters. The land—the *terra firma*—of Canada is not inviting to those who have tilled the soil of Great Britain or explored the vast fertile plains to the west of Lake Michigan. Our country is just on a par with the northern part of the State of New York, and with the States of Vermont and New Hampshire in respect of climatic conditions and conditions of soil. But we possess one immense advantage over those countries, an advantage which gives us a distinctive position on this continent—the possession of the noble river which flows at our feet. It is through that river and our great chain of inland waters that the destiny of this country is to be worked out. But we cannot fulfil our destiny—or the destiny of this country rather—by standing idle in the market place; by, as one honorable member has suggested, doing nothing to improve our natural highways or create artificial ones, trusting to fortune or to Providence for the

development of our resources. I believe that we have a high and honorable destiny before us, but that it has to be worked out by hard toil and large expenditure; and we certainly would not be in a better condition to work it out were we to be united to a country that would at once absorb four-fifths of the revenue on which we now depend for our very existence. The improvement of our internal navigation is the first great undertaking we should consider, whether for commercial purposes or for purposes of defence. And as regards the promoting of our commercial interest in the improvement of our navigation, what advantage, I would ask, could we expect to gain by becoming a state of the American union? There is not one of the seaboard states but would be in every way interested in diverting the western trade from our into their own channels, and in endeavoring to obstruct the improvements calculated to attract that trade to the St. Lawrence. The Western States, doubtless, would have interests in common with us, but they are not in a position to render us material aid for the construction of our works, being themselves borrowers for the means of carrying out their own internal improvements. I believe, then, that even from a material point of view, every unprejudiced thinker must admit that our future prosperity and importance lie in preserving our individuality, and in making the most of our heritage for our own special advancement. (Hear, hear.) I feel quite certain that nine-tenths of the people of Canada would not be deterred from taking their chance as a nation through the fear that they may some day have to strike a blow in defence of their country; and of all else, whether of reality or of sentiment, that should be dear to a brave and loyal people. We stand here the envied possessors of, take it all in all, the greatest river in the world; the keepers of one of the great portals to the Atlantic; and I trust that Canadians will never be found to yield possession of their heritage till wrested from them by force! And that must be a force, they may rest assured, not merely sufficient to over-match the people of these provinces, but all the power of the Empire besides. (Hear, hear.) Now, though I have said I would not enter into details, I must claim the attention of the House for a few moments longer, while I touch upon one very important point. I refer to the 69th resolution, foreshadowing the colonizing by Canada, and at the expense of Canada,

of the North-West territory. There is not in this House one hon. member who appreciates more fully than I do the great natural resources and great future value of that territory; but I am not of that class of sanguine and visionary politicians who would risk losing all by grasping too much, and in the vast dominion extending from Lake Superior to the shores of Newfoundland, the Confederacy will have ample scope for the energy and enterprise of her people for a long time to come. The North-West territory, from its geographical position as regards us, is very difficult of access. A broad tract of barren and inhospitable country intervenes between Lake Superior and the fertile plains of the Red River and the Saskatchewan, which for seven months out of the twelve are, in fact, wholly inaccessible to us save through a foreign country, rendering it next to impossible for us alone to effect close connection with and colonization of that country. We cannot jump all at once from the position of colonists to that of colonizers. That great territory can only be developed, colonized and preserved to us by the exercise of that fostering care which the Empire has ever bestowed upon her colonies in their infancy. The Hon. President of the Council (Hon. Mr. BROWN), in the course of the debate, said he hoped to see the day when our young men would go forth from among us to settle the North-West territory. I harbor no such wish. On the contrary, one of the fondest hopes I cherish as a result of Confederation is, that it will so attract capital and enterprise to the provinces, so tend to develop our internal resources, as to offer to the youth of the country a field for the exercise of that laudable energy and ambition which now cause so many of them to leave their own hearths and cast their lot with strangers. One of the greatest ills that Canada now suffers from is, that the young men born and brought up in her midst look abroad for their future, and bestow their energies and talents on another land; and, although an immigrant myself, I know and admit that a man born and brought up here is worth any two immigrants for the arduous task of clearing and settling what remains to us of the public domain. I hope and trust that the Confederation of the Provinces will create sufficient inducements to keep the young men of the country at home. (Hear, hear.) It is in that hope that I support the measure. I trust at the same time that the great North-

West territory will be preserved to our flag, and that, fostered by the Mother Country, it will in time become great and populous, and finally extend the British American nation to the shores of the Pacific. It would be unfair, at this late stage of the debate, to enter further into details. I promised that I would not do so. With details, indeed, it has all along appeared to me we had little to do now. If the project as a whole be good, surely means will be found, as we go on, to remedy objectionable details. With all its defects—and I admit there are many defects—there never was a written Constitution but had its defects—I feel confident that the general design set forth in the resolutions meets with the approval of a large majority of the people of Canada at all events; and it would be an insult to the sound common sense of a people that have so long proved themselves capable of judging for themselves and of governing themselves, to suppose them incapable of adjusting, from time to time, as occasion arises, the minor details or defects of a system of government to which they have resolved on according a fair trial. (Hear, hear.) And now, Mr. SPEAKER, what I had to say on this important subject of Confederation I have said. I promised that I would not weary the House by entering into details; I trust that I have not done so; but I may be permitted to express a hope—a hope founded in a deep and abiding belief—that the people of these provinces are and will prove themselves equal to the great undertaking that is before them; that aided by all the commercial power of Britain in time of peace, by all her military and maritime power in war, should war unhappily come about, we will show to the world that we are not unworthy scions of the noble races of which we come, but that we are competent to successfully work out to a great end the task that is intrusted to us—the noblest and worthiest task that can be intrusted to an intelligent and enlightened people—that of making for themselves a name and a place among the nations of the earth; that of building up—to borrow a quotation aptly introduced into his able speech by my hon. friend from South Lanark—a quotation from the speech of a renowned British statesman, when speaking on a great colonial question—that of building up “one of those great monuments with which England marks the records of her deeds—not pyramids and obelisks, but states and commonwealths,

whose history shall be written in her language." (Cheers.)

MR. SCOBLE—If I were to consult my own feelings or my convenience, MR. SPEAKER, I should certainly not rise at this advanced period of the debate, to offer any observations on the great question which has now been so long under discussion; but having somewhat altered the opinions that I entertained of the scheme submitted to the House by the Government, I feel it necessary to make a few remarks in explanation and vindication of the vote I intend to give. In approaching the consideration of the question, I shall divest myself, as far as possible, of all party predilections, of all personal preferences, and of all sectional jealousies, and shall endeavor to discuss it upon its merits, fairly and impartially—first, with reference to the great difficulties which unhappily exist between Upper and Lower Canada; and, secondly, in relation to the proposed union of the British North American Provinces for purposes and objects common to them all. These branches of the main question, or rather these two questions, are not necessarily connected, and may, therefore, be discussed separately; for it is possible we may not be able immediately to secure the union of the provinces, and in that case we shall still have to deal with the difficulties of our own position, and try, if possible, to find a satisfactory solution for them. (Hear, hear.) And first, sir, with reference to the difficulties which have so long distracted and disturbed us, and which hitherto we have in vain attempted to remove. If we may believe the hon. member for Brome (MR. DUNKIN), whom I regret to see is not in his place, the difficulties to which I have referred are imaginary, not real. He told us, in his elaborate and exhaustive speech, that in Lower Canada the Catholic and non-Catholic, the English and French-speaking populations, were living in the most entire harmony with each other; and this statement was confirmed by the honorable and learned gentleman the Hon. Atty. Gen. East (HON. MR. CARTIER), who declared that so great was that harmony, that he enjoyed the confidence not only of the Catholic, but the Protestant section of the community, and in fact represented them both. Now, sir, I am not disposed to question the fact proclaimed by these honorable gentlemen; on the contrary, I fully believe it, and ascribe the circum-

stance to their having common objects to pursue, and common interests to maintain. (Hear, hear.) But the hon. member for Brome went further. He affected to believe that no difficulties of any moment existed between Upper and Lower Canada, and that any dissatisfaction that had been manifested by the upper section of the province, might be easily removed without resorting to an organic change in our present Constitution. At least, so I understood the hon. gentleman. On this point I am at issue with him, for I believe those difficulties to be of a most formidable character, and that they threaten at no distant day, unless they be adjusted, the peace and the prosperity of the province—perhaps its disintegration—perhaps its annexation to the United States. Every lover of his country must deprecate such results, and ought to strive to prevent them, or either of them. The House and the country will sustain me in the view I take of the danger of our position, and consequently of the importance of the measure now under consideration, as one means of removing it. (Hear, hear.) If, sir, we can ascertain the true cause of our difficulties, we shall not have to seek far or long for their remedy. In what do they originate? Some tell us in difference of nationality, of religious creed, of civil institutions, and of language. I am not disposed to ignore these, or to deny that they may be made to play a conspicuous part in the non-settlement of sectional questions; but I utterly deny that they are the cause of our difficulties. Take the question of nationality, for instance. Those among us who are of French extraction may be justly proud of their ancestry, of their traditions, and of their history. They can boast of the mighty empire which those of kindred blood with themselves have founded in Europe, and of the vast influence which it exerts over the civilization and politics of the world; but as they are no longer subject to France, but are within the allegiance of the British Crown, and enjoy all the franchises of British freemen, it appears to me that the question of French nationality disappears, whilst that of origin only remains; and that now the only nationality that can be recognized among us is a British nationality, unless indeed we are prepared to sever our connection with the parent state, commence a new nationality of our own, or merge our political existence in the neighboring republic. But who, sir,

among us is prepared for either of these alternatives? Am I to suppose that the people of this province of French origin are less loyal to the British Crown than those of Anglo-Saxon descent? Am I to believe that were the opportunity afforded them, they would reunite themselves with France? These questions, I am assured, they will answer indignantly in the negative. At all events, of this I am satisfied, and I believe they are satisfied, that under no government in the world can they enjoy so large an amount of civil, political and religious liberty as under British sway. The Scotch have their history and their traditions as well as the French, but where is the Scotchman now that is not proud of his alliance with England, or that would wish to sever the connection, though thereby he might regain his parliament or his king? I believe that every enlightened French-Canadian is of the same opinion, whatever hot-blooded and hair-brained demagogues may assert to the contrary. (Hear, hear.) Take the question of religious creeds. These are said to present an insurmountable obstacle in the way of the settlement of our sectional difficulty. If, sir, we had established in this province a non-Catholic or Protestant creed, to which all would be required to subscribe, or if not to subscribe, at least to support by compulsory taxation, then, sir, I could conceive that difference of religious opinion might operate in the way alleged; but as among us the most complete religious liberty is enjoyed—yes, a larger amount of religious liberty than Catholic Christians are allowed in France—I can see no valid ground for the supposition that they would suffer in this respect, or that they ever had the shadow of a reason to fear that in doing an act of justice to Upper Canadians they would be doing injustice to themselves. (Hear, hear.) We are, all of us, too much and too deeply interested in the question of religious liberty, to trespass on the rights of conscience, or to allow of state interference in matters of such transcendent importance as our relations to the Divine Being, and the service and worship we owe to Him. Differing as we do in our creed and modes of worship, religious equality is necessary to the peace and good order of government, as well as to the life of religion itself among the people. We thus become the guardians of the most precious of all liberties, the right to worship God according to the dictates of our conscience,

without let or hindrance from each other or the state. (Hear, hear.) But it is said that the civil institutions of Lower Canada would suffer, were Upper Canada allowed a representation in the Legislature and the Government in proportion to its population. I marvel, sir, much that such a difficulty as this should ever have been started. It is well known that the policy of Great Britain has ever been of the most liberal and comprehensive character in relation to matters of this kind. Trace her history in connection with her conquest in any part of the world; and when, except with the consent of the people, has she imposed upon them the body of her statute laws? Her Constitution and her common law of right belong to the peoples subjected to her sway, and these are the guardians of personal and public liberty; but beyond these she allows the largest freedom in respect of customs, the peculiar institutions, and the administration of civil justice throughout the length and breadth of her dominions. However desirable the assimilation of the laws between Upper and Lower Canada may be, uniformity would be purchased at too dear a rate, if it led to dissatisfaction among any considerable class of the people. Time may accomplish what force might destroy. As an Englishman, whilst I believe our laws, in the main, as well as our whole judicial system, are the best in the world, I do not believe either the one or the other to be perfect. To improve them by importing into them whatever is more excellent in other systems, is the dictate of common sense, and will always have my hearty concurrence. The institutions of Lower Canada are perfectly safe in the keeping of Lower Canadians, for practically nothing could be gained by Upper Canadians in changing them, supposing they had the power to do so, which they neither have nor desire to have. (Hear, hear.) And then, sir, with respect to language, I can hardly suppose Lower Canadians serious when they imagine that any desire exists to destroy the use among them of their mother-tongue. It may do well enough to excite a prejudice among ignorant people to say so, but surely among those that are intelligent it can have no effect. It remains with French-Canadians themselves to determine whether they will abandon the use of their native tongue, and adopt ours, or not. They are free to use either, or both, at pleasure. If, sir, in Lower Canada the English are

compelled to learn the French language for business purposes and for social intercourse, and in Upper Canada the French are compelled to learn English for similar purposes, surely that need not be a subject for regret to the one or to the other, inasmuch as both will gain by it. And this further advantage will accrue to those skilled in both languages: they will have access to the literature, the philosophy and the science of the two foremost nations of the world. No attempt will be made to ignore the French language among us, so long as those who prefer it to all others shall deem it worthy of preservation. (Hear, hear.) Give the people of Upper and Lower Canada a common object to pursue, and common interests to sustain, and all questions of origin, and creed, and institutions, and language will vanish in the superior end to be attained by their closer union among ourselves, or by their wider union with other colonists under the proposed scheme of Confederation. (Hear, hear.) The great difficulty under which we labor, and which we seek to overcome, is a political and not a social one. It has its root in the Constitution imposed upon the province in 1841 by the Imperial Government and Legislature. That Constitution was founded on injustice to Lower Canada, and its fruit, as was then foreseen, has produced the grossest injustice to Upper Canada. Had the principle of representation based on population been then adopted, and the line which separated Upper from Lower Canada been obliterated, except for judicial purposes, we should now be working harmoniously together, instead of seeking organic changes in the Constitution, in order to preserve ourselves from revolution and anarchy. (Hear, hear.) The honorable member for Bagot (Hon. Mr. LAFRAMBOISE), in his speech, quoted largely from the report of Lord DURHAM, to show that that distinguished nobleman was prejudiced against Lower Canadians, and was indisposed to do them justice. By selecting here and there passages from that able document, the hon. gentleman gave a colorable appearance to his accusation, but nothing more. I deem it an act of justice to Lord DURHAM to supplement the extracts read by the hon. member, by further extracts which will show that His Lordship was governed by exact and impartial justice in the measures which he recommended to heal the divisions which then existed in Canada. With the prescient sagacity of a true statesman, he said:—

As the mere amalgamation of the two Houses of Assembly of the two provinces would not be advisable, or give a due share of representation to each, a parliamentary commission should be appointed for the purpose of forming the electoral divisions, and determining the number of members to be returned on the principle of giving representation, as near as may be, in proportion to population.

Where, I ask, is the injustice of this recommendation? Lower Canada had then the larger population, and was entitled to the larger representation in the united Legislature. But the Imperial authorities based the Constitution which they gave to Canada, not on representation according to numbers, but on equality or equal numbers of representatives for the two sections of the province, and the result we have to deplore this day. His Lordship goes on to say:—

I am averse to every plan that has been proposed for giving an equal number of members to the two provinces, in order to attain the temporary end of outnumbering the French, because I think the same object will be attained without violating the principles of representation, and without any such appearance of injustice in the scheme as would set public opinion, both in England and America, strongly against it; and because, when emigration shall have increased the English population in Upper Canada, the adoption of such a principle would operate to defeat the very purpose it is intended to serve. It appears to me that any such electoral management, founded on present provincial divisions, would tend to defeat the purposes of union, and perpetuate the idea of disunion.

These are words of wisdom, but they were not listened to at home, and the consequences have been lamentable. We find Upper and Lower Canada in a state of antagonism, and collision imminent. We find the Legislature brought to a dead-lock, and our public men driven to their wit's end. All this was foreseen by Lord DURHAM and provided for in his admirable suggestions for the future government of this important province. And then, in reference to the peculiar institutions of Lower Canada, its religion and its laws, he said:—

I certainly should not like to subject the French-Canadians to the rule of the identical English minority with which they have been so long contending; but from a majority emanating from so much more extended a source, I do not think they would have any oppression or injustice to fear; and in this case the far greater part of the majority never having been brought into collision, would regard them with no animosity that would warp their natural sense of equity. The endow-

ments of the Catholic Church in Lower Canada, and the existence of all its present laws, until altered by the united legislature, might be secured by stipulations similar to those adopted in the union between England and Scotland. I do not think that the subsequent history of British legislation need incline us to believe that the nation which has the majority in a popular legislature is likely to use its power to tamper very hastily with the laws of the people to which it is united.

Such were the opinions and such the basis of that great scheme of union which Lord DURHAM contemplated, and which he aimed to secure to Upper and Lower Canada. It consisted of two parts: representation based on population in the Legislature; and guarantees that the peculiar institutions of Lower Canada should be protected, and her rights respected. But His Lordship had larger views before him than the union of Upper and Lower Canada. He was anxious that all the British colonies in North America should be consolidated under one government. When His Lordship received his commission from the British Crown, he was strongly in favor of the Federal principle in its application to the then state of Upper and Lower Canada; but a more profound study of the question when in this country, and from consultation with the leading men in the several American Colonies, he arrived at the conclusion that a Legislative would be preferable to a Federal union of those colonies. The change in his opinion is thus stated in the extracts from his report, with which I shall now trouble the House. By a legislative union he means "a complete incorporation of the provinces included in it under one Legislature exercising universal and sole legislative authority over all of them, exactly in the same manner as the Parliament legislates alone for the whole of the British Isles." After a careful review of the whole subject, Lord DURHAM says:—

I had still more strongly impressed upon me the great advantages of a united government; and I was gratified by finding the leading minds of the various colonies strongly and generally inclined to a scheme that would elevate their countries into something like a national existence. I thought that it would be the tendency of a Federation, sanctioned and consolidated by a monarchical government, gradually to become a complete Legislative union; and that thus, while conciliating the French of Lower Canada, by leaving them the government of their own province, and their own internal legislation, I might provide for the protection of British interests by the General Government, and the gradual transition of the provinces into an united and homo-

geneous community. But, [His Lordship adds,] the period of gradual transition is past in Lower Canada, [and therefore he says,] that the only efficacious government would be that formed by a Legislative union.

Having thus dealt with the question in its application to Upper and Lower Canada, he extends the range of his observations to the whole of the British possessions in North America, and remarks:—

But while I convince myself that such desirable ends would be secured by a legislative union of the two provinces, I am inclined to go further and enquire whether all these objects would not be more surely obtained by extending this legislative union over all the British possessions in North America; and whether the advantages which I anticipate for two of them might not, and should not in justice be extended over all. Such an union would at once decisively settle the question of races; it would enable the provinces to co-operate for all common purposes; and, above all, it would form a great and powerful people, possessing the means of securing good and responsible government for itself, and which, under the protection of the British Empire, might in some measure counterbalance the preponderant and increasing influence of the United States on the American continent.

His Lordship had no fears that such an union would lead to separation from the Mother Country. He rather looked upon it as a means of strengthening the bonds which united them, and of its proving an advantage to both. On this point he says:—

I do not anticipate that a colonial legislature thus strong and thus self-governing would desire to abandon the connection with Great Britain. On the contrary, I believe that the practical relief from undue interference which would be the result of such a change would strengthen the present bond of feelings and interests, and that the connection would only become more durable and advantageous by having more of equality, of freedom, and of local independence. But, at any rate, our first duty is to secure the well-being of our colonial countrymen; and if in the hidden decrees of that Wisdom by which this world is ruled, it is written that these countries are not forever to remain portions of the Empire, we owe it to our honor to take good care that when they separate from us they should not be the only countries on the American continent in which the Anglo-Saxon race shall be found unfit to govern themselves. I am, [says His Lordship,] in truth, so far from believing that the increased power and weight given to these colonies by union would endanger their connection with the Empire, that I look to it as the means of fostering such a national feeling throughout them as would effectually counterbalance whatever tendencies may now exist towards separation.

His Lordship then strongly recommends the union of the two Canadas under one Legislature, and of reconstituting them as one province; and "the bill," he says, "should contain provisions by which any or all of the North American colonies may, on the application of the Legislature, be, with the consent of the two Canadas, or their united Legislature, admitted into the union on such terms as may be agreed on between them." These remarkable passages drawn from Lord DURHAM's report, appear to me to embody the very spirit of the scheme submitted to our consideration by the Government, and coming to us recommended by so high an authority, merit our best attention; and if realized, though not in the precise form many of us might desire, we may hope it will heal our intestine divisions, and open to us a glorious future. Representation based on population is denied to Upper Canada, unless coupled with the Confederation of all the British North American colonies; the separation of Upper Canada, pure and simple, is not to be thought of; to return to the position we occupied only a year ago, would be to plunge once more into political contests, with feelings embittered by disappointment; and therefore, with reservations affecting details only, I shall feel it to be my duty to give the motion before the House my best support. (Hear, hear.) And now, sir, I propose to consider the scheme submitted to us in relation to the larger question of the union of all the British North American Provinces under one government, for purposes common to them all. I needed not the arguments or the eloquence of honorable gentlemen on the Treasury benches to convince me of the immense importance of such a junction as shall lead to the development of a new nationality, and secure to generations yet unborn the advantages of unity and power. With the permission of the House, I will read an extract from a letter which I addressed to the Duke of NEWCASTLE in 1859, when that nobleman visited this country in the suite of His Royal Highness the PRINCE OF WALES, bearing directly on this point. Having briefly stated the grounds which induced me to write to His Grace, I said:—

The possessions of Great Britain in North America are not only vast in extent and marvellous in resources, but for facility of internal communication by lakes and rivers, are unrivalled; and their geographical position is such as to make them of the very last importance to the political and commercial greatness of the British

Empire. Possessing the control of this magnificent part of the American continent, with comparatively easy access through it from the Atlantic to the Pacific shores, Great Britain need not fear the rivalry nor dread the preponderance of the United States. But in order that she may derive from it all the advantages it is so well calculated to afford, she must have a fixed and determinate policy, wisely conceived, practical in its details, and perseveringly carried out. In the planting of future colonies in British North America, care should be taken to make them as few as possible. I regret, therefore, that it appears to have been determined to give the Red River settlement a distinct political existence. Canada should have been allowed to expand westwards to the Rocky Mountains, instead of being cooped up within her present limits. She would then have been able to absorb more easily the outlying colonies of Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island on the Atlantic, and British Columbia and Vancouver's Island on the Pacific. Consolidated ultimately under one government, after the model of the Mother Country, with such modifications as the circumstances of the case might require, an empire might be formed over which, hereafter, some one branch of the Royal Family might reign a constitutional monarch, over a free and united people. In the meantime there is nothing to hinder the appointment of a Prince of the blood royal to be Viceroy over all the possessions of Great Britain in North America, and under him, lieutenant-governors to administer the affairs of the separate dependencies, until they could be gradually and permanently united. Your Grace will perceive from this statement that I object to the American system of federation, and would oppose to it the unification of the British colonies in this part of the world. One government, one legislature, one judiciary, instead of many, with their conflicting institutions, interests, and jurisdictions, is what I would respectfully venture to recommend as the true policy of the Mother Country on this side of the Atlantic, as it has been with the most splendid results on the other. A Federal Government, such as that of the United States, for instance, is and must be weak in itself, from the discordant elements of which it is composed, and will be found to contain within itself the seeds of disorganization and dissolution. The multiplication of colonies in a new country like this is tantamount to the multiplication of petty sovereignties, and the creation of rivalries and antagonisms which, sooner or later, will manifest themselves, and prevent the development of that greatness, power and prosperity which an opposite policy, wisely administered, would, in my judgment, effectually promote and secure. By unification, however, I do not mean centralization. I am no friend to the bureaucratic system of France, Austria, and Prussia. A government, to be strong and respected, must leave to the people the largest amount of liberty consistent with the safety and advantage of the whole, in the manage-

ment of their local affairs. Such a municipal system as we have in Canada is all that is necessary to secure that end. With the political franchise extended to all classes of the community, whether native-born or naturalized, the national life could not fail to develop itself in forms that would give permanence to its institutions, contentment to its people, and strength to its government.

The opinions which I entertained in 1859 I entertain now. Now, as then, I am in favor of the unification of the British American Provinces. Now, as then, I am opposed to the Federal principle, as exemplified in the formation and practical working of the Government of the United States. The greatest statesmen, the wisest men, who became conspicuous during the American revolution, were clearly of opinion that a government to be strong must be a unit, and must possess within itself, and in all its organs, supreme power and a commanding influence. To diffuse those powers, or even to share them with state or local governments, they felt would weaken it in its most vital parts. They would, therefore, have stripped the States of every attribute of sovereignty, and confined their action to matters of a purely local or municipal character; but they had not the power, and the consequences are visible in the fratricidal war now raging among them, devastating their fairest provinces and filling the land with mourning and woe. The lessons of history and the experience of other peoples should not be lost upon us; and for myself, I hesitate not to say that if, in the proposed Federation of the British American colonies, we were to follow the example of the framers of the Government of the United States, or to copy its Constitution, it would have my most determined opposition. The scheme before us, however, is formed after a different model, and in its essential features is in perfect contrast to that on which the Constitution of the United States is based. It is true it creates local governments with large legislative and executive powers; it is true it gives those governments concurrent powers with the General Government; it is true it gives them possession of the public lands within their several jurisdictions; it is true it allows two of those governments to levy export duties on lumber, coal and other minerals,—and looked at in the light of an advanced political science, this is to be lamented; but looked at in the light of possible and practicable statesmanship, it was unavoidable. I am, therefore, prepared to accept it as a whole, as in fact the best that

could have been produced under the circumstances in which it was framed. (Hear, hear.) A careful analysis of the scheme convinces me that the powers conferred on the General or Central Government secures it all the attributes of sovereignty, and the *veto* power which its executive will possess, and to which all local legislation will be subject, will prevent a conflict of laws and jurisdictions in all matters of importance, so that I believe in its working it will be found, if not in form yet in fact and practically, a legislative union. (Hear, hear.) Taking this general and, as I believe, correct view of the case, I shall abstain from all criticism of its minor details, in the hope that what is found hereafter immature or unworkable will be abandoned by general consent. The Imperial Government will take care, no doubt, that that part of the scheme which conflicts with the prerogatives of the Crown will be removed, or, at all events, be brought into harmony with them. On one or two points brought out very fully by the Catholic members of the House in opposition to the scheme, I shall venture to offer a few remarks. They take exception to the power conferred on the General Government in the matter of marriage and divorce. I think, sir, the power is very properly placed there. I respect their religious convictions; as a Protestant, I ask them to respect mine. We owe each other mutual toleration. If the Protestant section of this House and this province do not regard marriage as a sacrament, and, therefore, inviolable and indissoluble, I believe they will be found to have as high an opinion of the sacred obligations involved in it, and admit it to be as binding upon the conscience of all who enter upon that holy and honorable state, as their Catholic fellow-subjects. But *quod* the state or the civil government of the country, Protestants at large, regard marriage as a civil contract only, and consequently dissoluble on cause shown. This view ought not to be offensive to the judgment or the conscience of our Catholic friends, for it will not and cannot interfere in the slightest degree, either with the form or the continuity of their marriages; and surely they will grant to us, the non-Catholic section of the province, that liberty of conscience in this matter which they claim and enjoy themselves. (Hear, hear.) Another point touched upon by my honorable friend the member for Peterborough (Col. HAULTAIN) demands from me a passing remark. I believe that my honorable friend correctly interpreted the feelings of Protestants in Lower

Canada, when he referred to the probable effect of the Pope's encyclical on the Catholic mind of the country. They think that if the principles inculcated in that letter were acted upon, their religious liberties and privileges would be in peril. But it would appear that my honorable friend had not the true key to the interpretation of that famous document. Catholic commentators find it to be perfectly innocuous when properly understood. Be that as it may, I rely rather on the good sense and good feeling of Catholics themselves, and above all, on the religious liberty secured to us in this province, than on the Pope's encyclical, for the protection of our liberties, whether civil or religious. Let us be united in object and in interest as a people, and I have no fear, however diversified our opinions may be on matters personal to ourselves, but that we shall grow up to be a great nation, and that a glorious future awaits us. (Hear, hear.) As there are yet several honorable gentlemen to address the House, I shall not trespass on its attention much longer, as I am anxious the debate should be brought to a close as soon as possible, in order that the Government may be able, by its representatives in England, to perform those important duties which are so urgent and so necessary at the present moment. (Hear, hear.) Before sitting down, however, I wish to make one or two remarks on the conflicting opinions entertained by honorable gentlemen on the permanency of our relations to the Mother Country. I do not believe there is any large party there who desire to separate themselves from us. On the contrary, I believe the great bulk of the British people are proud of the connection, and are prepared to maintain it if we do our part in cultivating that connection by meeting their just and reasonable demands. There can be no doubt that one cause of dissatisfaction expressed in England towards us has resulted from our fiscal policy. I shall venture no opinion on that policy just now, whether it was wise or otherwise, but it strikes me very forcibly that we have it now in our power to set ourselves right on that point, and to it I would respectfully invite the attention of the Government. The question of our defences is very earnestly pressed on our attention by the authorities at home; but that is undoubtedly an Imperial as well as a provincial question, and might be dealt with in this way. If the British Government and people really desire to maintain their connection with the Canadas, they are under the obligation, both

moral and political, to afford them adequate defence in money, material and men, in case of necessity; for it is clear that without these our position, except at one or two points, is clearly indefensible. On the other hand, if we are anxious to continue our relations with the Mother Country, then we are bound by the highest considerations of policy to adjust our tariff on imports in such a manner as to give no real cause of complaint to the people at home. I am persuaded that if we do this it will smooth the way for the removal of any hostility that may have been shown towards us by any class of politicians in England. Privileges and duties are reciprocal, and should be met in a cordial spirit; and let it be remembered that material interests are, of all others, the most binding upon nations in amity with each other, and are the best calculated to maintain our relations undisturbed with the parent state. (Hear, hear.) With me, sir, it is a matter of extreme importance that our relations with the Mother Country should be settled on a firm and permanent basis. (Hear, hear.) I therefore quite agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. SHANLY) who has just sat down, on the necessity of pressing this point on the attention of the Imperial Government. Mr. SPEAKER, my most earnest desire and prayer is that by a well-considered scheme of union—a union that shall embrace the whole of the British possessions in North America, from the Atlantic to the Pacific oceans, under one government—results may follow of the most beneficial character, both to the colonies and the Mother Country; and that Providence may so guide the counsels and influence the acts of those who now direct our affairs, as to secure to the people of this country, and to succeeding generations, the blessings of a well-ordered government and a wise administration of public affairs. (Cheers.)

COL. RANKIN—Mr. SPEAKER, never has there been an occasion, since I have had the honor of occupying a seat in this House, when I have been so deeply impressed with the importance of the subject under consideration, as I am to-night. Every honorable gentleman who has addressed the House during the course of this debate has told you, sir, that he rose under some degree of embarrassment. I, too, might give you the same assurance, but I shall not dwell upon it; suffice it to say, I only speak because I think it my duty to explain the reasons which induce me to take the view I entertain of the subject before the House. I have

listened, sir, with great attention to the speeches which have fallen from honorable gentlemen on both sides; and it is to me a matter of congratulation to observe, that at last, something has arisen which has given a higher tone to the debates of this House, and to the utterances of our public men. (Hear, hear.) I attribute this improvement in a great measure to the fact that we are discussing a question of greater importance than has ever before been brought under our consideration; that we are at length turning our attention to something worthy of the consideration of gentlemen who aspire to establish for themselves the reputation of statesmen, while it has unfortunately happened heretofore that too much of our time has been spent in discussing questions which ought properly to be left to the consideration of a municipal, rather than of a legislative body. (Hear, hear.) Inasmuch, sir, as I have reasons, which perhaps are somewhat peculiar to myself, for entertaining the views which I hold upon this question, I trust I may be pardoned if I refer to some of the most prominent events connected with the progress of affairs in Canada for some years past. And here I may remark, that though the country has become more important, though our population has increased, and our prosperity advanced, in perhaps as rapid a degree as any reasonable person could have expected, there are still some respects in which we have not advanced, but rather retrograded than otherwise. I mean that the tone of feeling among the prominent men of the country has rather deteriorated than improved, since the introduction of responsible government. I, sir, am old-fashioned enough to believe, that although there may have been some objections to the mode of government which existed prior to the union, there was a higher tone among our public men in those days than has prevailed for some years past. Still, no doubt, there was much cause of complaint on the part of those who originated the agitation, which resulted in the rebellion of 1837. And speaking now in the light of the experience, many of us would probably be prepared to admit those gentlemen who took a prominent part in bringing about that rebellion, and whom we then considered it a duty to put down, were in reality true benefactors of the country. (Hear, hear.) The result has proved that they differed only from those who

thought it their duty to oppose them, in that they were in advance of the men and the sentiment of that day. They foresaw, indeed, earlier than their neighbors, that the state of things which then existed could not long continue—they appreciated grievances sooner than others. (Hear, hear.) And thence arose the political struggles, which resulted, unfortunately, in a resort to arms. That insurrection was happily suppressed; and the statesmen of the great nation of which we are proud to be subjects, after the rebellion was ended, immediately applied themselves to the consideration of the best means of removing the just causes of complaint which had led to the revolt. The first step was to bring about a union of the two provinces. That union was distasteful to many, who were forced reluctantly to accede to it. There were at that time gentlemen worthy in every way of the respect of their fellow-countrymen who denounced the union, and predicted evil results from it. But is there an intelligent man in this country who will now say that those predictions have been realized? I do not think there is an honorable member of this House, on either side, who would expect anybody to believe he spoke sincerely if he asserted that the union had been attended by disastrous results. The time has passed for hostile feelings to exist between the people of the two sections of this country—I say the two sections, for I have never allowed myself to speak of Upper and Lower Canada as separate and distinct provinces or countries, as has been too much the practice. From the moment the union was consummated, I felt that we should look upon ourselves as inhabitants of one country, and not as the people of two distinct provinces. In some instances legislation might operate with greater advantage to one section, while in others it would be more beneficial to the other section. But whatever was for the benefit of one was for the good of the whole, inasmuch as it added to the importance, the wealth and the influence of the whole. (Hear, hear.) But there were many people who, for many years after the consummation of the union, writhed under the state of things thereby brought about, and were disposed to sneer at responsible government, and to speak of it as a misfortune rather than as a boon. Sir, we have had some severe lessons, such as all individuals passing through the period intervening between childhood and manhood must to

some extent be subjected to, and to which communities rapidly growing from insignificance to importance must also submit. The first lesson we were taught under the system of responsible government was in the passage of the bill for the indemnification of losses sustained during the rebellion in Lower Canada. I, sir, happened to belong to a class in Upper Canada, at that time, who would have considered it almost, if not quite, justifiable to resort to arms in order to resist the enforcement of that law. But, as time has rolled on, I have become more capable of appreciating the course then taken, and I am now prepared to admit that it was but just and reasonable that that law should be enacted. (Hear, hear.) I then sympathised with those who burned the Parliament House in Montreal, and am willing to admit, that if I had been there, I would probably have been one of the first to apply the torch to that building, while under the influence of the feelings which inspired me at that time. But experience and reflection have since taught me to regard things from a very different point of view. We were then taught practically to feel that we really did govern ourselves. We were made to taste the consequences of self-government. We were taught that questions like these must be decided by the will of the majority of the people, as made known through their representatives in Parliament. (Hear, hear.) There was no mistake in that case as to what the will of that majority was; and I am free to admit that the rebellious spirit then indulged in, on account of the passage of that bill, was in some respects more worthy of condemnation than the conduct of those who resorted to arms to redress the real grievances which caused the rebellion; and, in course of time, many of those who were most incensed at the passage of this measure, began to realize the fact that it was only one of the natural consequences of the new state of things; and, step by step, the people of Canada have come to understand and appreciate the advantages of self-government. They have come now to understand that whatever is deliberately expressed as the will of the majority of the people, ought to be submitted to by the minority. (Hear, hear.) And I hope we have arrived at that stage in our political education, that there is no man in Canada who would now justify a resort to violence to resist any enactment by this Legislature,

no matter how unpalatable it might be to the minority, and no matter how important that minority might be. Mr. SPEAKER, we are now invited to direct our attention to another union of a different kind, and on a larger scale. Of that union I have long been an advocate. I have looked forward to it for years, as a desirable event; and in proof that I have done so, I may be permitted to read two or three lines from the *Votes and Proceedings* of this House, so far back as the year 1856. I do not desire to claim for myself any special credit in the matter, but merely wish to establish my consistency, in being now, as I am, the uncompromising advocate of this measure—in being prepared to go so far, as I declared was my intention the other day, as to vote for the motion submitted by the Hon. Attorney General West for the previous question, which, under ordinary circumstances, I should look upon as a very high-handed and objectionable proposal. Sir, in 1856 I called the attention of the Hon. Attorney General West—who, if in his place, would readily recollect the fact—to a scheme such as that now under consideration. I urged it upon him, and prayed him to bring his great abilities to bear upon the attainment of an end of sufficient importance to be worthy of his continued exertions. I endeavored to convince him that, by identifying his name with the attainment of some great and important end, he would establish for himself a reputation worthy of his talents. I failed, however, to enlist the sympathies of that hon. gentleman with my views. His idea was, that it was premature to entertain any such project—that it might be well enough, perhaps, at some future period, but that it was then quite out of the question; I nevertheless proceeded to draft a series of resolutions, and gave notice of them two or three weeks in advance of the day I intended to move them. During the intervening period, I addressed myself to honorable members of the House, but, I regret to say, met with no encouragement from any quarter, with one single exception—the late Hon. Mr. MERRITT cordially approving of the idea. Finding that sufficient support could not be obtained in the House to commend the idea to the country, I felt it to be prudent—as even leaders of parties sometimes do under similar circumstances—not to make an exhibition of my own weakness; I came to the conclusion that the resolutions would not

receive favorable consideration from any considerable number of hon. members, and that to move them would only be to attract attention to what might be looked upon as my own eccentricities. I accordingly abandoned the idea of pressing them at that time. But, with the leave of the House, I will now read the motion, which is as follows:—

MR. RANKIN—On Wednesday next (30th of April, 1856)—Committee of the Whole on the general state of the province, for the purpose of considering the subject of a union of the British North American Colonies, with a view to an address to Her Majesty to recommend the same to the consideration of the Imperial Parliament.

This, sir, I am happy to say, is the proposal which the Government are now carrying out. (Hear, hear.) This was what I proposed nine years ago, and I shall have the greatest pleasure now in giving them my hearty support while they endeavor to carry it into effect; and I congratulate them on having, though so long after myself, arrived at the same conclusion. (Hear, hear.)

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—It was advocated long ago by Bishop STRACHAN and other gentlemen.

MR. RANKIN—Far be it from me to deny that these gentlemen are entitled to the credit of having suggested the idea, long before I was of an age to think of anything of the kind. But I may congratulate myself that I had conceived the same idea—without borrowing it from them—which had been previously advocated by men so distinguished and illustrious. (Hear, hear.) The result shews, however, that in looking upon the movement as then premature, the Hon. Attorney General was right, and that he correctly understood the feelings of the country; for I am willing to admit that the course of events has proved that it *was* premature. But, had it not been for certain occurrences which I shall not comment upon (since to do so might savor of a spirit unbecoming on this occasion)—had it not been for the extraordinary state of things brought about before the formation of this Coalition, I am not prepared to acknowledge that it would have been thought of, as a practical scheme, for twenty years to come. But now honorable gentlemen have taken it up, and it only remains for me to congratulate them on having done so. When this Coalition was proposed, after the vote which resulted in the defeat of the CARTIER-MACDONALD Ministry, the honorable member for South Oxford, the Hon. President of the Council,

and then recognized leader of the Opposition, did me the honor to invite me to a meeting of his supporters. Though I never was one of his followers—having been all my life, in the proper sense of the word, a conservative—still I was associated, for the time, with the gentlemen forming the party of which he was chief; and I think they will do me the justice to admit, that while allied with them, I acted in good faith, and they all knew that, though I was with them, I was not of them. (Hear, hear.) At the meeting of the Opposition, called by the Hon. President of the Council, the project now under consideration was submitted; and in justice to that gentleman, I am bound to say he made a frank, clear and intelligible explanation of the terms which had been agreed upon between himself and the other section of the Government. He informed us fully of all that had taken place between the negotiating parties, and submitted to us the question whether we would support him in the step he had taken, and support the Government which was to be organized for the purpose of carrying out this project. Much was said after those explanations, and to the best of my recollection of what occurred—for I have not since refreshed my memory by reading the report of the proceedings—there was a general assent to the project. Though some hon. gentlemen did entertain views peculiar to themselves, and expressed opinions that perhaps did not convey a hearty or cordial assent, yet there was a unanimous consent that this Government should be formed. (Hear, hear.) I think every one assented to that proposal. I, at all events, fully assented to it in good faith—(hear, hear)—and in doing so, my meaning was to allow the fullest latitude to those hon. gentlemen to concoct the best scheme they could, and to sustain them in working it out. I had no trick in my mind. I did not mean, as some honorable gentlemen seem to have meant, to place them in a false position, and afterwards assail them. (Hear, hear.) I honestly meant to empower them to confer with delegates from the other provinces, and to endeavor to bring about an understanding by which a union of some sort might be accomplished. (Hear, hear.) It is true that there was one feature in the explanations given by the Hon. President of the Council which was not acceptable to me, but it was not of a character which rendered it necessary for me to make any remark at the time. To prevent misapprehension, I

however, will explain what I mean. One idea suggested was, that failing the Confederation of all British North America, the Federation should be carried out with reference to Canada alone.

HON. MR. BROWN—With provision for its extension, so as to embrace the other provinces, whenever they were prepared to come in.

COL. RANKIN—Certainly; but though I did not approve of a Federation of Canada alone, I did not feel that it was part of my duty to rise and protest against any such project. I felt it was right to empower these hon. gentlemen to frame that scheme, which they found to be the best and most practicable—although I certainly had a mental reservation with reference to the point I have mentioned; and I did not then, nor will I at any future day, assent to a Federation of the Canadas alone, with a local government for each section. Rather than accept such a Constitution, I would prefer to remain as we are; for I never can be a consenting party to the making of two or three paltry provinces out of Canada. But I am prepared to give my hearty support to the project now under consideration—not because I consider it perfect; for if I were so disposed, I might raise many valid objections to the scheme; but I am not so disposed. I really believe the gentlemen who have taken it in hand have applied themselves to the task committed to them in a spirit of patriotism and faithfulness to their trust, and I shall not permit myself to indulge in any remark with reference to the position they occupied towards each other previous to the Coalition now established. While on this subject, I may remark that the Hon. President of the Council seemed most favorable to the idea of a Federation of the two provinces of Canada alone, and I am bound to say, when he made his explanations, he appeared deeply impressed with the gravity of the step he was about to take, and perfectly well aware that he was exposing himself to be assailed by parties unfriendly to him, on points where he was, perhaps, open to attack. I do not say he is not vulnerable, but I, at all events, shall not assail him now. If I have any attacks to make upon him, I shall suspend them till some future time; and if he succeeds in carrying out this project, he will find in me one who will always be ready to accord to him the highest meed

of praise, and, for the good he will do in bringing this about, I, sir, will be prepared to forgive him for all the evil he has heretofore done. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—You have great faith.

MR. RANKIN—We ought all to profit by the lessons of experience. In the course of this discussion, it has been a pleasure to me to observe the general spirit of loyalty which has been displayed by hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House. Even those who are adverse to the scheme have not been behind its greatest advocates in their declarations of attachment to British institutions and British rule on this continent. (Hear, hear.) And I am not disposed to insinuate that there is a solitary member of this House who entertains sentiments of disloyalty to Great Britain. We all have a right to express our views, and in fact it is our duty to do so, since we are sent here to consider what is best for the interests of Canada first; for though we owe allegiance to England, Canada is *our* country, and has the strongest and best claims to our devotion. (Hear, hear.) I, sir, am not one of those Canadians who place the interests of England first, and hold those of Canada in secondary estimation. It would be better if we could regard the interests of both with the same degree of concern—and I trust they always may be united; but we ought not to permit ourselves to lose sight of the fact, that with nations as with individuals, the time does arrive when it becomes each person to be responsible for himself, and when he can no longer look to his parents to give him a standing in the world. Sir, the time must come, sooner or later, when this country must cease to be a colony dependant on Great Britain; and whatever we do, whatever arrangements for the future we may make, we ought always to keep the fact plainly before our eyes, that passing events are calling upon us, either to commence the establishment of a nationality for ourselves, or make up our minds to be absorbed in the republic lying along our southern borders. I, sir, do not desire to see the latter state of things brought about. Nothing could be more distasteful to me than to become what is called a citizen of the United States, though I admit the enterprise and intelligence which characterise the people of that country. Mr. SPEAKER, it is within the recollection

of every honorable member of this House, that some fifteen years since a movement was set on foot in Montreal, which had as its avowed object the severance of Canada from its connection with England, and its annexation to the United States. The gentlemen who inaugurated that movement were men of influence and high standing in the country, and some of them, as we all know, now occupy prominent positions in this House; they claimed then, as they do now, to be good and loyal British subjects, and yet they deliberately framed a document to which they attached their signatures, in which they prayed their Sovereign to allow this province to withdraw from its connection with England, and attach itself to the United States. Sir, the framers of the document to which I refer—the *Annexation Manifesto*—were not animated by a rebellious feeling against the Mother Country, but by feelings of loyalty to the interests of this country; their arguments were logical, and founded upon those material considerations which, after all, do exercise, and must continue to exert a more powerful influence over the minds of intelligent men in the nineteenth century, than any mere sentiment, or preference for any particular form of government; and sir, we all know that but a short time after the publication of the annexation manifesto, a new era dawned upon the country. The Grand Trunk Railway and other important public works were inaugurated. British capital flowed into the province in copious streams, the pockets of the annexationists were replenished, and their loyalty reestablished, upon a basis which has lasted ever since. The reciprocity, too, contributed largely to the removal of the depression which engendered the annexation movement; and under the operation of that treaty, the material interests of the country have prospered to a degree that will only be fully appreciated when we have been deprived of its advantages. Sir, no conceivable state of things would have induced me to become a party to that movement in favor of annexation, but I am free to confess that the arguments advanced by the framers of the document to which I have referred were sound and logical—regarding them from a material point of view; and if they were so at that time, why should they not be equally so now? For the last ten years, we have enjoyed all the advantages of free intercourse and free trade with our powerful neighbors

of the United States. We are now in danger of being deprived of both—and if we are, what will be the condition of this country three years hence? Shall we not be reduced to a state more disastrous to our agricultural and other important interests, than we have yet experienced? And am I wrong, sir, in assuming that similar causes would once more produce the same effects? It is all very well for hon. gentlemen to say “No, no,” but I maintain that I am right; and, Mr. SPEAKER, it is our duty to look the existing state of things in the face. The impulses of mankind have been the same in all ages. We cannot change human nature, nor make men honest or disinterested, by act of Parliament. But, sir, I have only referred to the past in the hope that the recollection of the events and the state of things to which I have alluded, may have some influence upon the minds of hon. gentlemen—may, perhaps, induce some modification in the course of even a single member, who has hitherto been prejudiced against the scheme of union brought down by the Government. That we have arrived at a critical period in the history of this continent, is universally admitted. Events of the most momentous character are transpiring upon our borders, and I regret to say there exists towards us among our republican neighbors a deep-rooted feeling of hostility. Occurrences have taken place during the progress of the war which have tended, step by step, to intensify that feeling, which has displayed itself in the stoppage of unrestricted intercourse, and the threatened abrogation of the treaty of reciprocal free trade. In view of this state of things, Mr. SPEAKER, if we wish either to continue our connection with England or to maintain a separate national existence of our own, it is our duty to devise some means by which we shall be enabled at all seasons to obtain access to the seaboard through our own territory; to strengthen ourselves numerically; to increase our wealth materially, and to add to our importance territorially. All these results, Mr. SPEAKER, may, in my opinion, be obtained by the union now proposed. Sir, it is because I entertain this opinion that I am prepared to accept the proposition under consideration without criticising its details. If I were disposed to enter into details, I would most earnestly object to that part of the project which relates to the development of the North-West, and the

uncertain period of the introduction of that territory into the Confederation; indeed I should object to the Federal principle altogether—for what I would prefer, Mr. SPEAKER, would be a Legislative, rather than a Federal union; but, sir, I am willing to award the highest credit to the Government for having accomplished as much as they have done. If we are not to have a legislative union in name, we shall have something very closely resembling it. In fact, to have expected that any body of delegates, representing a number of different provinces and a great variety of conflicting interests, could concoct a scheme which would prove acceptable to everyone, would have been most unreasonable; and I think it ought to be admitted that the Administration are entitled to the gratitude of the country, for the great pains and patient labor they have evidently devoted to the consideration of this project. It must be borne in mind, sir, that the scheme of Federation agreed upon by the delegates is not final; and we should remember that the House of Commons, or Parliament of British America, will have power to make such modifications and changes as the interests of the country may render advisable. If it is found that the working of the Federal system is objectionable, that the people would rather have their local affairs managed by municipal councils than by local legislatures, they can make their wishes known to the Federal Parliament in a constitutional manner, and that body can, and doubtless will, find means of abolishing the petty provincial parliaments provided for by the plan now before the House, and replacing them by extending the municipal system throughout the whole of British America. Indeed, sir, the Federal Parliament will possess the same power to change, alter or amend for the whole country, as we now possess for Canada alone, and therefore it is that I so willingly accept the present scheme, believing it to be the best we can now obtain, and leaving to those who are fortunate enough to hold seats in the British American Parliament to detect and remedy its defects. And, sir, we have seen that the opponents of the union between Upper and Lower Canada were mistaken in their predictions of the disasters which they insisted would flow from that union. May we not venture to tell the opponents of the larger and more important change which we are now discussing, that

their predictions will prove still more unsound, their apprehensions still more groundless? Mr. SPEAKER, our destinies are in our own hands; by the consummation of this union, we shall lay the foundation of a great and important nationality; while on the other hand, if we reject this scheme, even if we are permitted to remain unmolested as we are, what is there in our present condition that we can reflect upon with pride or satisfaction, We are but a province, a dependency at best; the reputation of our statesmen is but local; their fame is confined to the limits of the colony; our Ministers of the Crown, as it is the practice to call them, are but the advisers of a deputy sovereign, upon subjects purely provincial, wholly unknown to the rest of the world, and attracting no attention beyond our own borders,—while the public men of the most insignificant European power would take precedence of them in any other country—even Mexico, with its mongrel and semi-barbarous population, enjoys the standing of a nation, and has its diplomatic representatives, and its foreign relations—and shall we be content to stand still, while all the rest of the world is moving on? Sir, the most experienced, the most distinguished statesmen of the Mother Country appreciate the importance of the proposed change, and regard the movement as deserving of the highest commendation; and a writer in a recent number of the *London Times* remarks, that the Parliament of British America will exercise sway over a larger portion of the earth's surface than any other legislative body in the world. Some hon. members have objected to this project on the score of expense; they have argued that some of the conditions were too favorable to the Maritime Provinces; while, on the other hand, the people of those provinces complain that we are getting the best of the bargain. I, however, shall not detain the House by discussing the question, of whether we have or have not undertaken to pay a few thousands more than any of the other provinces, than some may think they were fairly entitled to; for I hold that the advantage to be derived from this union would be cheaply bought at a cost far greater than any liability we shall incur in carrying it out. Mr. SPEAKER, the extent of the British possessions which it is proposed to unite under this scheme includes some four millions square miles—more than the whole of the United States, North and South together, and

equal to one-tenth of the surface of the whole world; the resources of the Lower Provinces are of incalculable value, while the boundless prairies of the North-West, with the fertile soil and genial climate of the Saskatchewan and Red River may be made the home of millions upon millions of our fellow beings. Our population, including the Maritime Provinces, is at least equal in numbers, and far superior in intelligence and enlightenment, to that of the United States when they asserted their independence; and under the rule of the proposed Federal Government we may grow in strength and importance as rapidly as our republican neighbors; for though in some respects they are more favorably situated than we are, there are others, and important ones too, in which we have greatly the advantage over them—for instance, a far more advantageous line of communication from the Atlantic to the Pacific can be established through our country than through theirs; indeed so great is the superiority of our route, that they never could compete with us for the through traffic from Asia to Europe, which, within a few years I trust, will pour in a continuous stream through British territory from one ocean to the other. Sir, in support of these views, I trust I may be permitted to read an extract from an interesting and instructive pamphlet by an hon. member on my left (Mr. MORRIS), in which he quotes from the words of a distinguished American statesman as follows:—

The route through British America is in some respects preferable to that through our own territory. By the former, the distance from Europe to Asia is some thousand miles shorter than by the latter. Passing close to Lake Superior, traversing the water-shed which divides the streams flowing towards the Arctic sea, from those which have their exits southward, and crossing the Rocky Mountains at an elevation of some three thousand feet less than at the south pass, the road could be here constructed with comparative cheapness, and would open up a region abounding in valuable timber and other natural products, and admirably suited to the growth of grain and grazing. Having its Atlantic sea-port at Halifax and its Pacific depot near Vancouver's Island, it would inevitably draw to it the commerce of Europe, Asia and the United States. Thus British America, from a mere colonial dependency, would assume a controlling rank in the world. To her other nations would be tributary; and in vain would the United States attempt to be her rival, for we could never dispute with her the possession of the Asiatic commerce, nor the power which that commerce confers.

Sir, this is not the language of an enthusiast or a visionary, but the opinion of one perfectly acquainted with the subject, and eminently capable of discussing it—one, too, whose judgment was certainly not biased by national prejudice. And again, Mr. SPEAKER, on a more recent occasion we find the Premier of the United States, the Hon. Mr. SEWARD, using the following language:—

Hitherto, in common with most of my countrymen, as I suppose, I have thought Canada—or to speak more accurately, British America—to be a mere strip, lying north of the United States, easily detachable from the parent state, but incapable of sustaining itself, and therefore ultimately—nay, right soon—to be taken on by the Federal union, without materially changing or affecting its own condition or development. I have dropt that opinion as a national conceit. I see in British North America, stretching as it does across the continent from the shores of Labrador and Newfoundland to the Pacific, and occupying a considerable belt of the temperate zone—traversed, equally with the United States, by the lakes, and enjoying the magnificent shores of the St. Lawrence, with its thousands of islands in the river and gulf, a region grand enough for the seat of a great empire.

Mr. SPEAKER, the great consideration with me is how can we best preserve for ourselves and for our children the essence of British institutions; by what means can we best prolong the connection which now so happily exists between England and ourselves, with mutual advantage and with equal satisfaction to both parties; and how can we best prepare, when the time comes, as in the natural course of events it most assuredly will, to assume the responsibility of a separate and independent nationality? Sir, by uniting the scattered and now insignificant British Provinces under one general government, we shall, in the first place, consolidate and strengthen British feeling and British influence on this continent. By the adoption, on the part of the proposed Federal Government and Parliament, of a bold, enlightened and progressive policy, British America may be pushed forward in material wealth, in the numbers of her population and in general importance, to a point which will qualify her to take her place among the nations of the earth, in a manner and with a standing alike honorable to ourselves and creditable to the great country under whose glorious flag we have been sheltered, and by whose example we have been stimulated, while prosecuting that course of political studies which must in

time qualify us to commence a national career of our own—as I would fain hope, under the sway of a constitutional monarch descended from the illustrious Sovereign who now so worthily fills the British Throne. But, sir, some honorable members object to this union from the apprehension that it will subject us to serious financial embarrassments. If the only effects of the union were to be the increased extent of our territory, and the addition which the inhabitants of the other provinces would make to the number of our population, I should be inclined to admit the force of their reasoning; but surely no one can anticipate that the Federal Parliament will be composed of men incapable of appreciating their responsibilities, or without the capacity to deal with the important interests committed to their charge. Mr. SPEAKER, no one thing has done so much to attract emigration to the United States as the great public works that have been constantly going on in that country for the last five and twenty years. We hear much said about the superiority of their climate and the other advantages which, it is alleged, they enjoy in a greater degree than we do; but I can assure the House that those advantages have been greatly overestimated, and that such considerations have had but little weight in the minds of emigrants, compared with the knowledge of the more important fact, that in that country the demand for labor was always greater than the supply, and that the emigrant arriving without a shilling in his pocket need be under no apprehension about the maintenance of his family, knowing that he could always find employment at rates of compensation sufficiently liberal to enable him in a few years not only to secure a home of his own, but to surround himself with comforts which would have been far beyond his reach in his own country. Sir, the construction of the Interoceanic Railway will afford employment to thousands of laborers, it will open up vast tracts for settlement, and render accessible an extensive region abounding in mineral wealth and other natural resources of incalculable value. Then, Mr. SPEAKER, the next great public work that should be undertaken is the improvement of the navigation of the Ottawa, so as to render that magnificent river the shortest, safest and most advantageous outlet to the ocean for the products of the fertile and boundless west, with its rapidly increasing millions. Mr. SPEAKER,

the expenditure which it would be necessary to incur to render the Ottawa navigable for seagoing ships, great as it would be positively, would be insignificant when compared with the extraordinary advantages which it would confer upon the country by the thousands whom it would attract during the progress of the work, in the first place; and, secondly, by the immense manufacturing power which it would place at our disposal, thereby affording profitable employment for a dense population, throughout a line of some three hundred miles of country, the greater part of which is now but a comparative wilderness; for, considering the unrivalled water power which would thus be secured along the main line of communication between the west and the commerce of Europe, it is not too much to expect that that power would attract the attention of men of capital and enterprise, and that a succession of mills and factories of every conceivable description would soon grow up, along the whole line, which would afford employment for a numerous, industrious and valuable population. And then, sir, there is that still more important and magnificent project, the Atlantic and Pacific Railway. All the best authorities agree that a far better, shorter, and cheaper line can be constructed through British than through United States territory. Mr. SPEAKER, it would be impossible to over-estimate the advantages which any country must derive from being possessed of a line of communication destined to become the highway from Europe to Asia. Sir, the acquisition of this advantage alone would be sufficient to justify us in advocating this measure; but when we reflect upon the almost boundless extent of fertile agricultural territory through which this line must pass, the millions upon millions of human beings which that territory is capable of supporting—when we bear in mind that by means of this union we shall not only secure the control of a larger portion of the world than is now under the sway of any power on earth, but that, by the adoption of such a policy as I have suggested, our population may be more than doubled within ten years, and that though our liabilities will have increased, those liabilities will fall upon the shoulders of so greatly augmented a population, that the burden to be borne by each individual will be more likely to be diminished than increased—when we remember, sir, that it will be in our power so to shape the

destinies of British America, that even the census of 1871 may show that we possess a population of from eight to ten millions. I must confess, Mr. SPEAKER, that I cannot understand how any hon. gentleman can stand up here, and labor to perpetuate our present insignificance, by interposing obstacles to the carrying out of the only really great or statesmanlike idea which has ever been brought under the consideration of a Canadian Parliament. And now, sir, though I have already trespassed too long upon the patience of hon. members, I must crave their indulgence a moment longer, while touching briefly upon the subject of defence. Mr. SPEAKER, without discussing the question of how much or how little we ought to contribute towards the defence of the Empire, in a war with any other nation than the United States, I assume that every true Canadian, whether of French or British origin, will be prepared to resist the invasion of his native soil; and if I am right in this. I take it, all we have to do is to inform the home Government that we are determined—not to contribute so much in men, and so much in money, to the defence of Canada, but that we are resolved—that every man and every farthing we can control shall be sacrificed before we submit to the power of our republican neighbors, and that all we ask of England is to pursue a course becoming the glory of her ancient renown. That she will do this, sir, we have no reason to doubt; but I regret to observe that Colonel JERVOIS, in his report upon the subject of fortifications, seems altogether to have ignored the Western Peninsula, for he makes no mention of any point west of Hamilton as capable of being fortified, from which I infer he must have come to the conclusion that in the event of war with the United States, it would be impossible for us to hold the country above the head of Lake Ontario. Sir, this may be the opinion of that gallant officer, and it may be correct; but, as the representative of the most exposed portion of the western frontier, I am bound at least to say that the people of that part of the country would be most unwilling to admit that they are less able now to hold their own than their fathers were in 1812. Mr. SPEAKER, our chief danger lies in the possibility of a reunion with the North and South, upon the basis of the Monroe doctrine; for unhappily the course pursued by England, so far from conciliating either

party, has only engendered feelings of hostility in the minds of the people of both sections; and for the belligerents to combine their united forces against a common enemy, and that enemy one whom they both hate as intensely as they do England, would be an event which could excite no surprise in the minds of any one acquainted with the feeling which prevails among the masses of republican America. Sir, talking of fortifications and defence, no force we can bring into the field, no line of forts we can build, nor, indeed, any course that could be adopted, would so effectually protect us, so absolutely guarantee the inviolability of our soil as the recognition of the independence of the Southern States by Great Britain; and when the proposed deputation from this Government reaches England, I trust they will feel it to be their duty strongly to urge the consideration of this fact upon Her Majesty's Government; for with a powerful British fleet upon their coast, a formidable, warlike and bitterly hostile nation bordering them upon the South, and some half million well armed and resolute Canadians in their front, depend upon it, Mr. SPEAKER, we need be under no apprehension of war's alarms. And now, sir, it only remains for me to thank honorable members for the patient hearing they have accorded me, and to express a hope that the deputation to England will not swerve from the course they have informed us they intended to pursue, in consequence of anything that has transpired in any of the other provinces, but that they will impress upon the home Government the fact that four-fifths of the people of British America are represented by this House, which sustains the scheme of union by an overwhelming majority; that they will urge the Imperial Ministry to exert all the influence they can command in a constitutional manner, to induce the people of the Lower Provinces to reconsider their recent course, and to acquiesce in the project agreed upon by the Quebec Conference as the basis of an arrangement by which a balance of power may be established on this continent, the spread of republicanism checked, and our own immediate prosperity and future influence insured to such an extent as to secure for us a higher degree of consideration while we retain a colonial position, and qualify us hereafter to take our place among the family of nations, still animated by sentiments of reverence for the great people under whose fostering

care we have attained our majority, and with whom, I trust, we shall always continue to maintain the closest alliance. (Cheers.)

MR. DUFRESNE (Montealm) — Mr. SPEAKER, in rising at this moment to express my humble opinion on the merits of the resolutions now under discussion by this House, I do not intend to follow the formula or preamble hitherto invariably adopted, by saying that I approach the subject with fear and trembling. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) But though I do not approach the question with anxiety and hesitation, it is not that I feel myself more competent than others for the treatment of it; it is simply for the good reason that I rely upon the indulgence of this House. We all know how difficult it is for a person who is not an habitual public speaker, or a member of the legal profession, to express himself with facility before a distinguished and highly educated body of men such as I now have the honor to address. I look upon the resolutions submitted to us as expressing the sentiments of the people, through their constitutional organ the Legislature. We ask our Sovereign and the Imperial authorities to unite, by means of a Federal union, all these Provinces of British North America. In examining this question, and in order to express more clearly and fully my opinion of these resolutions, I may say that I accept them for many reasons, but chiefly as a means of obtaining the repeal of the present legislative union of Canada, and securing a peaceable settlement of our sectional difficulties. I accept them, in the second place, as a means of obtaining for Lower Canada the absolute and exclusive control of her own affairs. I accept them, thirdly, as a means of perpetuating French-Canadian nationality in this country. I accept them, fourthly, as a more effectual means of cementing our connection with the Mother Country, and avoiding annexation to the United States. I accept them, fifthly and lastly, as a means of administering the affairs of the country with greater economy. Such are my reasons for accepting the Confederation scheme submitted to us by the Government. (Hear, hear.) I shall not undertake to discuss the merits of all the resolutions, for the honorable gentlemen who have already spoken have ably and fully developed the merits of the whole question; and, besides, if I may dare say it without being thought ridiculous, I have undergone a heavy loss—I have, in fact, been plundered. The honorable member

for Vaudreuil (Mr. HARWOOD) is the offender—(laughter)—but I cannot complain much of this, for the theft has turned to the advantage of the House. What he has stolen from me is the history of the Helvetic and Germanic Confederations; but inasmuch as he has set forth the facts in a far more able manner than I myself could have done it, and as the House has been a gainer thereby, I must endeavor to practise a proper degree of resignation under my own heavy affliction. (Hear, hear.) I intended to have said something on the Helvetic and Germanic Confederations, but as I have been thus despoiled, and as the honorable member for Vaudreuil has treated the subject so powerfully, I shall refrain from entering into the matter. And here again the House will be the gainer. (Laughter.) As the question of Confederation itself has already been fully treated with far more ability than my own feeble powers would enable me to bring to bear upon the discussion, I will confine myself to answering certain statements made by honorable members of the Liberal party *par excellence*. Contrary to the opinions of the Church, or rather of the Head of the Church, who declares that the name Liberal cannot be allied with the doctrine of the Church, we have seen the extreme Liberals coming forward in this House as the champions of the Church and of its ministers. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) The honorable member for Richelieu gave us in pompous terms a sketch of the benefits derived from the union of the Canadas. I must say that I listened to him with no little astonishment, for it was the first time I ever heard a democrat—a demagogue—lauding the union and the public men whom the country has, since the union, placed at the head of affairs. (Hear, hear.) He told us that we had had statesmen who succeeded in securing a triumph for the rights of Lower Canada—men who protected our interests and caused us to advance in the path of progress. “We see them in their works,” he says—“see the progress the country has made under the union; look at our primary-school system and our university system; look at the establishment of our ocean line of steamers, bearing our products to Europe, and returning to us freighted with the wealth of every foreign country! See that magnificent work, the Grand Trunk Railway, which is without a parallel in the world! See our splendid canals, the finest works of the kind in existence.” Really, Mr. SPEAKER, I am utterly

astounded at these laudations falling from the lips of the honorable member for Richelieu, and more especially at his praise of the Grand Trunk Railway; and I feel certain that every honorable member who heard his speech must have been delighted with that portion of it. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) And while it will probably be admitted that other portions of that speech might well have been omitted, it is surely a good thing that the honorable member should have discovered at last that the statesmen of his country in his own day had done their duty. (Hear, hear.)

MR. PERRAULT—Yes, but they might have done better still.

MR. DUFRESNE—The honorable member says that they might have done better still; but that was not what he said in his speech, since he declared that they were men of the very highest order of merit, and deserved the greatest possible praise for the works and improvements they had carried out. Now this is indeed peculiarly gratifying to one in my position, after contending for years with the party of the honorable member for Richelieu, and opposing them because they constantly strove to excite popular prejudice against all improvement and every great undertaking. I shall have occasion to exhibit to the House the means resorted to by that party, in order to prejudice the people against every man who labored in behalf of real progress, and I shall endeavor to contrast the prejudices they appealed to ten years ago with those they are now striving to excite. (Hear, hear.) The honorable member for Richelieu also stated that since the union we had advanced the settlement of our townships, and that this is why he wishes us to remain as we are at present. He says the union has not completed its work. He is right, only it is unfortunate that he and his party should not have succeeded in making that discovery a few years ago; it is unfortunate that they should only make that discovery now, when they themselves and the whole people are convinced that a change in the Constitution is unavoidably necessary—for we French-Canadians, a minority in the country, cannot dictate to the majority. (Hear, hear.) I shall not endeavor to excite popular prejudices, as the honorable member for Richelieu has done. I do not desire to be too severe with the honorable member, or to condemn him too strongly; for his mode of treating this question may be simply the result of some peculiarity of mental organization; I merely wish to show that his views

as to the dangers of the future are not a whit more sound than the views upon which he must have acted during the past. He has exhausted the library of Parliament in order to show, in black and white, that the people of England are the greatest oppressors on the face of the earth—(hear, hear, and laughter)—in order to demonstrate a fact which is not true, for he has cited to us nothing beyond the mere views of certain historians, whose opinions only go for what they are worth. (Hear, hear.) It is not my purpose to undertake the defence of a people who have no need of me to defend them, nor to avenge the insults offered them by the honorable member; but I must say that I repudiate all he has said against the English people and against England, against the institutions and government of that country, and against her system of colonial administration. (Hear, hear.) What good can result from thus ransacking history in order to hold up a single page, the record of an evil deed? What was the condition of public manners among nations at the period of the events he has spoken of, connected with Acadia? Why bring up that matter now? What good can it do? Does the honorable member desire to provoke the prejudices of a sensitive and powerful nation against us? Does he want to bring about the ruin of this country? The honorable member, in his youth and inexperience, has rendered us a very questionable service. (Hear, hear.) He rakes up an event which occurred one hundred years ago, and taunts a conquering nation with her mode of dealing with the vanquished! Surely this is a strange way of serving his fellow-countrymen—of laboring to promote their welfare and interests! Am I not right in saying that the honorable member has displayed an utter want of tact and experience? I trust, for the honorable member's own sake, that the charge of inexperience is the heaviest charge to which he may be held amenable; for I cannot think it possible that he was in any way actuated by malicious motives. (Hear, hear.) But, **MR. SPEAKER**, the honorable member tells us that "the union has not yet done its work." Is he not aware that the population of Upper Canada—that the British population vastly outnumber our own population in the province? What then does he mean? Can it be that he really thinks because the union has not finished its work, that it ought to be preserved, and that we ought to remain as we are? I cannot be convinced that he is so

completely devoid of information and judgment as really to desire that we should remain as we are. (Hear, and laughter.) Does he not perceive that if the present union be continued, the Upper Canada members will unite together as one man, in order to carry representation based upon population in the Legislature? Notwithstanding the facts we have witnessed during the past few years; notwithstanding that he is aware that three-fourths of the Upper Canadian members were sent here by their electors in order to secure representation based upon population, he says the union has not done its work, and we must remain as we are! No, I cannot, I repeat, believe him to be sincere in that. He knows that we cannot remain as we are. We are in favor of Confederation, not because we believe it to be the very best possible remedy for our evils, but because we are convinced of the necessity of providing a remedy for our sectional difficulties. The honorable member for Richelieu may play the alarmist as loudly as he likes. I can assure him that the vast majority of his fellow-countrymen are too intelligent to be deceived. They know full well that the minority cannot control the majority. The duty of the minority is to better their position as far as possible, but they cannot pretend to dictate to the majority—more especially when that majority is composed, if we are to believe the honorable member for Richelieu, of men who delight in oppressing others. (Hear, hear.) The speech of the honorable member for Richelieu is the speech of a mere youth, and is devoid of weight and importance; but it is a speech which would have been extremely injurious to the best interests of Lower Canada, had it emanated from a man possessing a wider reputation or greater importance than that honorable gentleman enjoys. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) He also stated that “the cry of representation based upon population had been used in Upper Canada merely for the purpose of securing the success of party leaders, of enabling them to get into power.” But we know that commanders are leaders of men; that commanders are to be dreaded when they have followers at their back; and the Upper Canada leaders surely do not lack followers. The honorable member for Richelieu went on to say:—“But we are in a good position! The liberals passed the Separate School Bill!” I believe he was in the House when the Separate School Bill was passed; but if he was not present, he may be somewhat excusable for that statement. I

ask the honorable member how many liberals—how many supporters of the Government of the day voted for the Separate School Bill? If he did not know when he spoke, it would have been better for him to have kept silent on that point, and not to have referred to the matter at all.

MR. PERRAULT—It was the **MACDONALD-DORION** Government that passed the measure.

MR. DUFRESNE—No. It was not the Government that introduced the measure, and carried it in the House; it was an independent member of this House—**MR. SCOTT**, of Ottawa—who introduced the bill. The Government of the day supported the measure, but only two of their Upper Canada supporters voted for it, and one of the two, the honorable member for South Wentworth (**MR. RYMAL**), did not do so until I had called upon him to give his vote, and forced him to record it. (Hear, hear.) These are the facts as they occurred, and they are proof positive that liberalism is no better here than elsewhere. (Hear, hear.) The honorable member for Richelieu loudly accuses the majority of servility and venality. There was a time when he spoke in a different tone, when he himself formed part of the majority, and when he availed himself of that position to make a little trip to the Saguenay at the expense of the Government, and to write a little romance afterwards. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) For my part, **MR. SPEAKER**, as one of the majority at present, I have yet to learn when and in what I have been servile towards my friends in the Government; nor am I aware how or when the majority have evinced venality, as the honorable member asserts. (Hear, hear.) The honorable member for Richelieu has himself experienced the mode in which a majority evinced venality, and the lesson has evidently not been lost upon him. (Hear, hear.) The honorable member says—“We have a magnificent public domain in Lower Canada; we have an immense quantity of land, while Upper Canada has none left; we can establish magnificent settlements, and increase our population. Let us remain as we are under the union.” Now, for my part, I assert that for that very reason we ought to accept Confederation in order that we may get the complete control of that noble domain, instead of holding it only in common with Upper Canada. He gives us a grand outline of all we could do with that splendid domain, and then says he does not

care to have possession of it. Well, for my part I do desire to have possession of it. The honorable member also said that we are to have direct taxation under Confederation, and that the local governments are to be mere municipal councils. I shall refer presently to the question of direct taxes; but I must say that municipalities having at their disposal millions of acres of land, will be something new in the way of "mere municipalities." I rather think the honorable member does not quite do justice to the importance of the functions of the local governments. (Hear, hear.) The honorable member compares the local governments to municipalities. Now, I find that the Local Government of Lower Canada will have a tolerably wide range of matters to deal with; for besides the public lands, it is also to have control of the following:—

Direct taxation, and in New Brunswick the imposition of duties on the export of timber, logs, masts, spars, deals and sawn lumber; and in Nova Scotia, of coals and other minerals.

I call the attention of honorable members of this House to these provisions, and I will say a few words with reference to each provision in its turn. If some do not understand their importance, others will. "Direct taxation."—I know that even your ultra democrat will cry out—"But, for my part, I prefer having the right to tax myself to leaving the power in the hands of others, for I never will use the right, and others might perhaps enforce it. I quote again:—

Borrowing money on the credit of the province.

The establishment and tenure of local offices, and the appointment and payment of local officers.

Agriculture.

Immigration.

Education; saving the rights and privileges which the Protestant or Catholic minority in both Canadas may possess as to their denominational schools, at the time when the union goes into operation.

As to education, the honorable member for Richelieu has eulogised our system of education; but do those honorable members who cry out so loudly against Confederation take a very deep interest in the education of our youth? Are they really anxious that that education should be in accordance with our principles, and the principles they themselves have advocated since they have constituted themselves the defenders of the altar and the throne? (Laughter.) We are to have the control of the public laws and of education,

and yet are to be a mere municipality! Emigration and colonization are mere trifles—the functions of a mere municipality! (Laughter.) Be it so, but hereafter we shall be very glad to enjoy all this:—

The sale and management of public lands, excepting lands belonging to the General Government.

Sea coast and inland fisheries.

The establishment, maintenance and management of penitentiaries, and of public and reformatory prisons.

The establishment, maintenance and management of hospitals, asylums, charities and eleemosynary institutions.

Municipal institutions.

Shop, saloon, tavern, auctioneer and other licenses.

Local works.

The incorporation of private or local companies, except such as relate to matters assigned to the General Parliament.

Property and civil rights, excepting those portions thereof assigned to the General Parliament.

Inflicting punishment by fine, penalties, imprisonment or otherwise, for the breach of laws passed in relation to any subject within their jurisdiction.

The administration of justice, including the constitution, maintenance and organization of the courts, both of civil and criminal jurisdiction, and including also the procedure in civil matters.

And generally all matters of a private or local nature, not assigned to the General Parliament.

Now, I call the attention of hon. members of this House to the powers here granted to the local governments, and which would consequently be granted to us in Lower Canada. When we opposed representation based upon population, was it because we feared that the majority would pass a tariff weighing unequally on the two sections of the province? Was it because we feared they would erect no more light-houses in the Gulf or elsewhere? Was it because we feared that Upper Canada, by means of its majority, would establish a greater number of post-offices, or increase the rates of postage on letters? No, Mr. SPEAKER, it was not for any of these reasons; but it was because we properly and rightly feared that when Upper Canada obtained a larger number of representatives in the Legislature than Lower Canada, they would invade our rights and endanger all that we hold most dear. That is what we feared. (Hear, hear.) And at the very moment when the Government presents a measure securing the safety of all our rights and institutions, with guarantees for the minority, honorable members declare that the union must be maintained, even with

representation based upon population. No, they are not sincere in this; it is a mere subterfuge on their part, for they cannot propose anything to the country in place of the Government project. (Hear, hear.) The Opposition attempt to shew that a Federal union and a Legislative union are the same thing, but the whole world knows that the two kinds of union are not in any way alike. In a Federal union the Legislature cannot go beyond the rights and powers assigned to it, whereas in a Legislative union it is vested with all power—it is sovereign. And is it to be supposed that under a legislative union, with representation based upon population, the majority would refrain from encroaching on our rights, our institutions, and all that we value as important for our well-being?

MR. PERRAULT—Hear, hear.

MR. DUFRESNE—The hon. member distinctly sees the mote in his neighbor's eye, but he cannot in any way discover the beam in his own! He forgets that he wearied this House for five or six hours, reading passages from history calculated to excite prejudice against a nation which is in a majority both here and elsewhere. I can only account for his having forgotten his own speech so soon, by taking it for granted that the honorable member did not himself make the research required in order to swell it up to its vast dimensions, for it was nothing but a mass of scraps with which he wearied the House during five long hours. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) I do not wish to be severe, but I trust the hon. member will pay attention to the remarks I now desire to make. He asserted, on the floor of this House, that the liberals had struggled to obtain responsible government. If he said that of the men who really did do so, it would be all very well; but if he asserts it of those who form his own party, he is greatly in error; for we all know that that party has always protested against the union and against responsible government. (Hear, hear.) That party declared, at elections and elsewhere, on every occasion, that responsible government was a deception and a snare—an insult cast in our teeth by England. (Hear, hear.) That has been the cry of his political party ever since we obtained responsible government. How, then, can he have the hardihood to assert that we owe it to them? (Hear, hear.) The hon. member for Richelieu also said that the clergy were wrong in 1837, and that they are wrong now in supporting the Government.

MR. PERRAULT—I did not say that.

MR. DUFRESNE—I made a note of it at the time, as I did of his remark, that "even in the episcopacy there were men of talent." (Hear, hear, and laughter.) He thought that "the bishops themselves might possess talent."

MR. PERRAULT—No, no.

MR. DUFRESNE—Let the honorable member retract his words, and I shall be quite satisfied.

MR. PERRAULT—You have completely distorted the meaning of what I said.

MR. DUFRESNE—The honorable member stated that the clergy were wrong in 1837; that they are wrong now; and that there were men of talent even among the bishops.

MR. PERRAULT—Will the honorable gentleman allow me to say a word in explanation, and in order to set him right?

MR. DUFRESNE—With pleasure. I do not wish to take advantage of the honorable member's blunder, and his words certainly require explanation.

MR. PERRAULT—I have often heard words spoken in this House misquoted, but I must say I have never heard that species of tactics carried to such excess as it has been in this instance, with regard to myself, by the honorable member for Montcalm. (Hear, hear, from the Opposition.) What I said with reference to the episcopacy and the men of talent who adorn it, was this—I stated that with our present system of public instruction in our rural districts, every child is enabled to receive such an education as will fit him to aspire to the highest position in the country, and to the highest rank in social life. I then added, in proof of my assertion, that we now see in the highest ranks in society men belonging to humble country families, whose parents possessed neither the fortune nor the influence necessary to push their children forward, and that they had succeeded only through their own talents, their industry, and the advantages afforded by our system of education. I also said, in proof of my assertion, that the children of the rural population had attained seats on the judicial and ministerial benches, and even among the episcopacy. Now, any one who understands the obvious meaning of words will admit that it is impossible to interpret that sentence as an expression of astonishment that there should be men of talent in the episcopacy, as the honorable member makes a pretence of doing. On the contrary, by reserving the most forcible expression to the

last, when I said that even in the ranks of the episcopacy are to be found the sons of farmers who advanced themselves by their own talents, I wished to shew that even the episcopal chair, the first and most elevated position in our country, was within the reach of our men of talent, thanks to our system of education, which enables all to compete for the highest dignities. And I defy any one capable of understanding the sense and use of words, to deduce any other meaning from my remarks, unless it be done with the set purpose of foisting upon me words I never used. (Hear, hear.)

MR. DUFRESNE—I have allowed the honorable member for Richelieu to explain what he said, or wished to say, but he had no right to conclude with an unjust insinuation. However, I am not greatly surprised, for I am aware that it is the habit of his party, and that those honorable gentlemen never lose an opportunity of insulting those who differ from them in their opinions. (Hear, hear.) A few days ago, when I begged leave to interrupt the honorable member for Richelieu, he consented courteously, and in replying to my remark—which was not of an insulting nature—he told me that he was not like me, for my speeches and my works were as yet things of the future. It was quite true, though it is not always well to speak the whole truth, nor, in fact, to hear it. (Laughter.) But I must tell him that in my humble position, not being fully informed of all that takes place in the world, I have neither the means nor the leisure to bring forth works of such vast importance as those of the honorable member. I content myself with coming here to discharge my duty towards my constituents, and I do it myself. I do not employ an official in making researches in the library to enable me to make long speeches. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) I do not require a paid *employé* of the Government to prepare my speeches; and, moreover, I have not as yet found means to live at the expense of the Government. And if my speeches and works are as yet things of the future, I am not, at all events, in the habit of supporting myself, like the honorable member for Richelieu, by drawing upon the public chest, with or without any just claim or right. (Hear, hear.) I have now done with the honorable member for Richelieu. I have a word to say to the honorable member for the county of Bagot. Though his speech was not an excessively brilliant one, yet he did not weary the House like the honorable member for Richelieu. He

told us that we did not represent the sentiments of our electors, but that there was no danger of our voting for an appeal to the people on the question of Confederation, because the people are so strongly opposed to the project that the Government dare not submit it for their approval. He was not the first to make the assertion, and I shall refer to the point presently. He then told the Government "that it never was their intention to have the question of Confederation seriously discussed, and that they did not desire a discussion of their scheme. But how did the honorable member expect to be believed? Was not the Government plan laid before the House at the commencement of the session—seven weeks ago? Have not the Government and their friends done everything in their power to promote the discussion of the question, while honorable gentlemen opposite were unwilling to do so, and constantly strove to prevent its discussion? What was their motive in so acting? The honorable member for Bagot was, therefore, wrong in stating that the Government did not desire a discussion, and that they stifled discussion; for it is perfectly clear that the Opposition did not desire it, and persistently refused it. (Hear, hear.) The honorable member for Bagot is not in his seat; but when he returns I shall have a few words to say in reply to certain points in his speech. The honorable member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. J. B. E. DORION) also told us that the movement throughout the country is so strong that it cannot be resisted; that the people are discontented, and that the consequences of that discontent will be highly disastrous. He spoke of the vast number of petitions presented to the House against Confederation, in order to shew that the people are opposed to it. Well, if all the honorable members of this House who sent petitions to their counties for signature have followed the same course as the honorable member himself, it is not surprising that they should be numerous signed, for we all remember the honorable member's letter, which was read in this House a few days ago by the Honorable Attorney General for Lower Canada (Hon. Mr. CARTIER). There can be no two opinions as to the character of that document. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) The House will bear in mind that he wrote to the wardens of his county, directing them to get the petitions he forwarded signed by the men, the women, and the children! (Laughter.) And when his letter was read in this House, instead of blushing with shame and confusion,

the honorable member said he gloried in having written it! "It was an energetic step," said he, "and I am not ashamed of it." (Laughter.) I do not desire to make any insulting remarks, nor to indulge in painful comparisons; but it must be remembered that it is not the hardened criminal that blushes for his evil deeds; the rogue that blushes may still mend his ways; but those who have lost the power of blushing are in final impenitence. (Laughter.) The honorable member told us of the astonishing progress of the United States, in spite of the war and the enormous expenses it has entailed; and he told us that in five years from the present time New York will have paid off its debt; then why not unite ourselves with the State of New York? He did not say all that, but nearly all; it is the natural conclusion to be drawn from his speech. He tells us that the people are discontented, and that they will rise up in rebellion if we force Confederation on them. But what means does he employ in order to excite the prejudices of the people? We may judge of the means he resorts to in this instance by those he employed in former days to prejudice the people against a measure favorable to their own interests, but unjust in some of its provisions, involving the spoliation of a particular class in society—I speak of the abolition of the Seigniorial Tenure. Were it not for the abolition of the Seigniorial Tenure, the seigniors would now be extremely wealthy. The effect, then, of that law was to despoil the seigniors for the benefit of the people—whom the honorable member for Drummond and Arthabaska pretends to represent. But, Mr. SPEAKER, how did the honorable member act at the time? How did he attempt to deceive the people, and excite prejudices against that measure? I have endeavored to find the pamphlet written by the honorable member at the time, but it is not to be found in the library of Parliament—it has disappeared. However, the democratic journals of that period are still forthcoming, and as they published a portion of the honorable member's pamphlet, I will read a few passages, in order to shew what a *pot pourri* it was. The means then used succeeded so well with the people, that an attempt will probably be made to resort to similar expedients now against Confederation. The people, convinced of the truth of what the hon. member wrote against the seigniors and against the Government, were incensed against the "traitors," and in the county of Lotbinière they

prevented the commissioners charged with the preparation of the schedules from proceeding with their duties during a certain period. It is well to bear in mind the existence of these documents, now that our adversaries are loading us with abuse; and it is time the people should know who are their friends and who are the "traitors." (Hear, hear.)

MR. J. B. E. DORION—You will awake the House!

MR. DUFRESNE—I trust I may be pardoned if I have spoken too strongly, but I feel so strongly on these matters that I must reply to the statements made. (Hear, hear.) Well, here is the treatment awarded at the time to the men who introduced the measure for the abolition of the Seigniorial Tenure—a measure exclusively in the interest of the people:—

SEIGNIORIAL TENURE.—PAY, WRETCHED PEOPLE! PAY! The people will learn properly to appreciate the tendency of our political institutions only by the evil effects that must result from them, and the day will come when the disease will work its own cure.

This is a dark day, but the hour is coming when light shall succeed to darkness.

Such were the writings then distributed amongst the people.

MR. J. B. E. DORION—Go on.

MR. DUFRESNE—Of course, I do not expect to see the honorable member exhibit any sense of shame; he has got beyond that. He would find it as difficult to blush as it would be for a negro to turn pale. (Laughter.) I quote again:—

TO THE CANADIAN PEOPLE.—People! I am one of your sons; JEAN BAPTISTE, I am one of your brothers. When a brother does you a wrong, I feel that wrong; when you pay, I pay; when you are struck, I feel the blow; when you are brought low, I feel myself abased; when you suffer, I suffer; when you moan, I moan; when you weep, I weep. [Laughter.] When anything good befalls you, I rejoice at it; when you prosper, I am happy; when you laugh, I laugh; when you sing, I sing. [Laughter.]

People! Here I am; look at me from head to foot. A simple rustic, living in the midst of you, I desire to render you a service. I ask but one favor—that you will read the following pages. I seek no reward, for if I can only make you understand your position and induce you to claim the restoration of your violated rights, to bless what is good and curse what is evil, I shall deem myself fully rewarded. [Prolonged cheers and laughter.]

"Yes, take the cup and drink the poison to the very dregs," were the words of a democrat

and demagogue. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

In these evil days, when political prostitution holds the place of civic virtue, when feebleness and sluggishness hold the place of courage and action, when a flood of demoralization rushes forth from the very fountain head of power—put on the armor of patience, be of good heart, be vigilant and doubly vigilant, so that you may escape far worse evils.

Your son,

LE FRERE DE JEAN BAPTISTE.

MR. J. B. E. DORION—That is as true now as it was ten years ago. (Hear, hear, from the Opposition.)

MR. DUFRESNE—I shall not read the whole of it, for it is too long; but I will read another short extract:—

Pay; for your most sacred rights are of no weight against the privileges, extortions and brigandage of which you have so long been made the victims by the seigniors. Pay; for MIGHT IS RIGHT, and justice ceased to prevail in Parliament on the 15th December, 1854.

Then we shall have the rehearsal of the legal farce which is to be played, with a view of convincing Jean Baptiste that he is to get justice done him. The fourteen high judges of Lower Canada will form a special court to decide questions in dispute between the seignior and the *ceusitaire*. If they do not agree, an appeal may be had to England. The dissent of a single judge will suffice to cause the matter to be referred to England. Is not this also an admirable arrangement, more especially when it is borne in mind that the judges, who are, in some cases, themselves seigniors, may act as judges in their own cause? What a mockery!

The whole pamphlet is in the same style. I do not desire to occupy the House any longer with it, for I have quoted enough to show how the demagogues acted ten years ago with reference to a measure of such importance to the country. When the Government presented a measure for the despoiling of the seigniors, and voted an enormous sum for the redemption of the Seigniorial dues, that was the incendiary and dishonest language in which the people were addressed. And it is by the use of similar language that an attempt is now made to excite popular prejudice against the Government, when they present a measure giving to Lower Canada the full and complete control of her institutions, of her public lands and of education. (Hear, hear.) It is by means of similar incendiary pamphlets that the attempt is now made to excite the feelings of the people against those who are working in behalf of the interests of their fellow-countrymen. (Hear, hear.)

118

MR. J. B. E. DORION—Will the honorable member for Montcalm allow me to say a few words? I merely desire to state that I am not ashamed of what I wrote at that time, and that so defective was his great Seigniorial law when I wrote that document, that it took five years to amend it into anything like proper shape.

MR. DUFRESNE—It is true, nevertheless, that the first law took the burthen of the Seigniorial Tenure off the shoulders of the *ceusitaires*, and from that moment the seigniors were despoiled of their rights for the benefit of the *ceusitaires*. I admit that the bill was defective, and in fact I voted against the Act of 1854; but I did not act like the honorable member, and my only object was to compel the Government to do better. The honorable member may say what he likes—I maintain that the demagogues did everything in their power to ruin us, in connection with that question, and they are doing the very same thing now as regards Confederation. (Hear, hear.) We French-Canadians form to-day but one-third of the population, and despite the progress we have made under the union, any man of sense who reflects on the position we now occupy, must admit that we ought to be delighted to accept the scheme of Confederation, since it will give us the control of our system of education, our institutions, and all the interests of Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) I have made a note with reference to the speech of one of my friends in this House—the hon. member for Beauce (MR. TASCHEREAU). I was really surprised to hear him express himself as he did with reference to this question of Confederation. I am quite sure he was sincere; but I must say I think he might have expressed his own opinions and refrained from adopting the false arguments in vogue on the other side of this House. (Hear, hear.) I feel that with a friend one must not be severe. Between the honorable members for Drummond and Arthabaska and Richelieu, and myself, there need be no such reticence of expression; but with the hon. member for Beauce it is quite a different matter. He told us that Confederation would give the death-blow to our nationality; but how can he possibly think so? I can easily understand such arguments being used by honorable gentlemen opposite, because they are in the habit of distorting facts; but I am pained to see the honorable member for Beauce resort to such tactics, for I am convinced that the legislative separation about to take place under Confederation, cannot fail

to have the effect of restoring French-Canadian nationality to the position it occupied previous to the union, coupled, moreover, with all the improvements since effected. (Hear, hear.) I do not desire to occupy the time of the House any longer; but as I have still a brief extract or two to read, I trust I may be permitted to say a few words more. (Cries of "Go on," "go on.") The honorable members opposite reverence as their special apostles and patrons, LOUIS BLANC, CONSIDÉRANT, BLANQUI, &c., &c. Now, as to BLANQUI, I shall quote his own words to shew what his principles are. His sentiments are not very edifying, but it is necessary to read them in order that we may be enabled to judge of the disciples from the teaching of their masters. I quote:—

The people planted the red flag on the barricades of 1848. Let no one seek to scout it down. It was red solely with the generous blood shed by the people and by the national guards; it floats wide spread over Paris; it must be upheld. The victorious people will not remove their flag.

I shall not quote anything from LOUIS BLANC, who is well known to the Democrats; the following passage is from CONSIDÉRANT:—

Duty, says this singular apostle, comes from men, and attraction comes from God. Now, attraction is the free tendency of our passions. Every attraction is a thing natural, legitimate, and to which it is impious to resist. To yield to one's attractions is true wisdom, for the passions are like a fixed compass which God has placed within us.

A free run then to your passions! The impulse comes from God! (Laughter.) Such are the doctrines of the democrats, the great leaders of our demagogues. I now quote FOURRIER:—

All the passions of our nature are holy and good: they are like the notes in music, each one has its special value.

The passions, then, are to be man's guides. Good, or bad, it is all one. (Laughter.) These are the principles of the men who have taken religion under their protection. (Laughter.) I would beg of them not to degrade the sacred name of religion, by using it as a political engine; not to drag the ministers of the gospel through the mire. The other day your cry was, "Let them remain in the vestry;" why, then, do you drag them forth? They know our opinions, and they do not need you to defend or protect them. (Hear, hear.) I say, moreover, to the honorable members opposite—show yourselves French-

Canadians in earnest, and as your country requires your assistance and that of all its children to rescue it from its difficulties, give a helping hand to those who are working in the good cause. The ship is in danger; join hand in hand with the party which desires to save our nationality and our institutions; unite with us for the safety of our language, our laws, and all that we hold dear. I am aware that a famous demagogue, next to VOLTATRE, the chief promoter of the French Revolution, used these words at a public meeting:—

When the last of the GRACCHI was expiring, he cast a handful of dust towards heaven, and from that dust was born MARIUS—MARIUS who earned his greatness less by defeating the Cimbri, than by driving the aristocracy out of Rome.

That was the language of a great demagogue, a great orator, a great citizen—of a man who might have been great in every way, but who brought his country to a sad position. Attempts have often been made to blacken the reputation of the Hon. Attorney General for Lower Canada, and to depreciate the fruits of his labors; for my part I cannot entertain a doubt but that posterity will yet say that the Hon. Attorney General for Lower Canada was great by his works, great by the codification of the laws, great by the abolition of the Seigneurial Tenure, and great, above all, in that he overcame and routed the demagogue. (Cheers.)

MR. J. B. E. DORION—Oh!

MR. DUFRESNE—As I now see the honorable member for Bagot in his place, I desire to make a few remarks in English, with reference to his speech. [Mr. DUFRESNE having hitherto spoken in French.] The honorable member for Bagot stated to us in this House:—

You are robbing Lower Canada of \$500,000, and for what? To give it to Upper Canada. Upper Canada will vote almost unanimously for this scheme of Confederation, because you rob Lower Canada of this amount for its benefit. And how so? Because there are only \$100,000 due for public lands in Lower Canada, while there are \$500,000 due in Upper Canada; and you in Lower Canada will receive only \$100,000, while you give to Upper Canada \$500,000. You are thus committing a spoliation of Lower Canada for the benefit of Upper Canada.

The proposition of the honorable member for Bagot is then, if I understand it aright—and I took down his language at the time—to

take from Upper Canada one-half of the dues on public lands and apply it for the benefit of the Local Government of Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.)

MR. J. B. E. DORION—He never used such language.

MR. WEBB said—MR. SPEAKER, in the consideration of the scheme presented by the Government for the Confederation of the Provinces of British North America, I must say that I find a great deal of difficulty in dealing with it. It appears to me that before asking for a vote, the Government should have come down to the House with a more full and explicit statement of the measure in its entirety, so that honorable members might be able to arrive at a reasonable and just conclusion as to the merits of the case. (Hear, hear.) And I think, sir, that taking into consideration the position in which the greater part of the population are placed who live in the section of country which other honorable gentlemen as well as myself have the honor of representing in this House, this line of argument is of much greater force coming from us than if it had been advanced by the people of any other part of the proposed Confederation. We all know that if this scheme is adopted, the English-speaking part of the population of Lower Canada will be in a very small minority in the Local Legislature; we all know that those who first opened up and settled the country which I allude to spoke the English language, and that the great majority of the people now living there are English-speaking Protestants; and, therefore, when their representatives are called upon to vote for a measure of this kind, which so deeply and intimately affects their future position and prosperity, I believe that all the details of it, all parts of it, should be fully and clearly placed before them, in order that they may know exactly in what position they stand with regard, and how it is to affect the interests they represent. (Hear, hear.) The honorable gentlemen on the Treasury benches, in introducing this scheme and asking our assent to it, have thought proper to take a different course; they merely bring down the resolutions which consent to Confederation, reserving the all-important details for future consideration. It may be the right course, but I doubt it very much. (Hear, hear.) Although the Government has not given all the information which I would desire, I do not, however, think that the people of the section of which I am one of the representatives would be justified in opposing a scheme that may prove beneficial generally,

merely because some of their interests may possibly be affected by it. I shall, therefore, vote for the resolutions in your hands, reserving to myself the right of voting for or against the details of the scheme for the local constitution as in my judgment may seem advisable. (Hear, hear.) I consider that by voting for this measure I do not pledge myself to anything more than the general principle of a union of the Provinces of British North America. I admit, sir, that last summer the political affairs of this country were in a state of extreme difficulty, and I admit, too, that it was necessary something should be done to get rid of that difficulty. I would have thought, however, that the Conference which met here in October last, to consider a subject that has been before the people of this country since 1858, would have proposed, for the consideration of the respective legislatures, a legislative union of the British North American Provinces. It appears to me that a legislative union would be far more effective in binding the provinces together, and far more economical than the Federal union proposed. (Hear, hear.) I admit, however, that there may be very great difficulties in bringing about a legislative union, that may not be in the way of a Federal union; and under all the circumstances of the case, the scheme proposed may have been the best that could have been devised. The greatest objection I now have to it is that many of the people do not understand—that its details are not yet fully comprehended by the country. I believe that if hon. gentlemen had come down with the scheme in its entirety—presenting all its details, and the results expected to flow from them—that there would be far less opposition to it than there is in the country and in this House. (Hear, hear.) But as it is now, they call upon the representatives of the people to give their consent to a measure that neither they nor the people thoroughly understand. These objections have been made to the scheme, and in my opinion they have great weight, more particularly in the part of the country which I have the honor to represent. It is not to be wondered at that the English-speaking part of the population of Lower Canada view it with apprehension, or rather have fears in their minds as to the working of it, when gentlemen like the honorable member for Peterborough, who are far removed from any of the difficulties that surround our position, have entertained the same feeling of apprehension. They have thought proper to express doubts and fears as to the

result, and it cannot, therefore, be surprising that we should have our doubts and apprehensions about it. (Hear, hear.) I take it that the Protestants of Lower Canada have no cause of complaint against our French-Canadian neighbors. We have lived together since the union on good terms, and all our intercourse has been founded on equity and justice. (Hear, hear.) But there is a feeling amongst our community that they should be removed beyond the possibility of danger from any aggression by the French-Canadian population, and it is difficult to satisfy them that the scheme before the House and country will permit them to indulge in that feeling of security. (Hear, hear.) It is not necessary for me, sir, to enter into any lengthy remarks upon this subject, nor to follow those honorable gentlemen who have gone into the matter thoroughly. I have no doubt that if a union of all the British North American Provinces can be brought about on terms that shall be just and equitable to all sections and interests, it would be very advantageous to all of them. (Hear, hear.) I shall not, sir, detain the House any longer, but shall conclude by expressing my sincere hope that when we are again called upon to legislate upon this subject, we shall find that the details of this important change of our Constitution will be founded on justice and equity to all, and that we shall also find that honorable gentlemen who have now in a great measure the future destinies of Canada on their hands, may be found equal to their task, and that Canada, in connection with the other provinces, may become the land fit in every respect for the home of the free. (Cheers)

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—I have listened, Mr. SPEAKER, with great interest to the observations of the honorable member for Richmond and Wolfe, who has just sat down. There is not the least doubt that the honorable gentleman represents a constituency and population, the majority of which is Protestant in its religious belief; and we know very well that great efforts have been made by those opposed to this scheme to create apprehension and distrust in the minds of the Protestant minority in Lower Canada in regard to it. But I now reiterate what I have already stated to this House, as a Catholic and as a member of the Canadian Government, that when the measure for the settlement of the Local Government of Lower Canada comes before this House for discussion, it will be such as to satisfy the Protestant minority in Lower Canada. (Cheers.)

MR. RYMAL said—Mr. SPEAKER, relying upon the pledge given by the Hon. Attorney General West, that the members of this House would have a fair opportunity of expressing their views upon all the details of this measure, I had proposed reserving what little I had to say till such time as amendments embodying my views were before the House. But the pledge which I expected would be carried out in good faith has been violated by that hon. gentleman, and I am compelled now to raise my voice, and in my weak way, to assert what I would much rather have recorded by my vote. You are well aware, sir, and every member of the House is aware, of the circumstances that called into existence the present Government, and the avowed object for which it was formed; and all they asked, so far as I am aware, was that a certain degree of forbearance should be shown to them, in order that they might form a scheme that would remove the difficulties existing between Upper and Lower Canada, and, perhaps, tend to bring about a union of all the provinces. As I understood the policy of the Government, the Federation of the Canadas was the first object aimed at, arranging it in such a manner as to allow the Lower Provinces to come in when they desired to do so. Mr. SPEAKER, that has by some been denied; but reading the memorandum drawn up and read by the Government at the time explanations were given to this House, and understanding as I do the purport of it, I think there is no loop-hole of escape from the obligation the Government were under to carry out the Federation of the Canadas first, leaving it to the other provinces to come in afterwards if they saw fit. (Hear, hear.) I bring, then, two charges against the Government—one against the Hon. Attorney General West, and the other against those hon. friends in the Government with whom I have so long acted. The first is, that the Hon. Attorney General West broke faith with the House in preventing amendments being moved; and the second is, that the Reform members of the Government broke faith in not bringing down a measure for the Federation of the Canadas. (Hear, hear.) I had hoped, sir, that the infusion of some pure blood into the Government—the addition of two or three men who had denounced all sorts of wickedness and corruption so loudly as the hon. gentlemen who went into the Government last summer—would at least have brought about some

improvement in the other members of the Administration—(laughter)—and although I have been deceived and disappointed in my expectations, had the scheme propounded to this House been such as to commend itself to my judgment, and convince me it would remove the sectional difficulties long complained of, it would have received my approval. I had hoped, too, and fully believed, that when it came to be pronounced upon by the Legislature, it would, before final adoption, be submitted to the people for their approval. (Hear, hear.) That this was the opinion of a large majority of the people of Upper Canada, in November and December last, is, I think, beyond doubt. The local papers in all sections of Upper Canada asserted that the Government could not take upon itself the fearful responsibility of forcing such a measure upon the people, without asking whether they consented to it or not. Allow me, sir, to read an extract from one that has accidentally fallen into my hands, in order to show the feeling of the people of Upper Canada upon this point. I am not in the habit of addressing the House very often, and when I speak I fear I do not acquit myself very creditably; and feeling on this occasion an unusual sense of responsibility, I am afraid I shall be worse than usual, which at all times is very indifferent. But I am impelled by a sense of duty to give my views upon the subject, and the House, I am sure, will overlook any shortcomings that I may exhibit. (Hear, hear.) The extract to which I have alluded reads as follows:—

Whatever mode may be finally chosen to bring the matter before the public, we feel certain that the people of this province, and of either of the Maritime Provinces, will tolerate no proceeding on the part of any one that has a tendency to despotism. The Canadians have battled for a long series of years for the liberties now enjoyed by them, and we greatly mistake if they allow the present or any other Government to make such sweeping alterations in the Constitution of the country without consulting them. The members of the respective governments were not appointed to frame a new Constitution; neither were the members of the various legislatures chosen for that purpose.

Mr. SPEAKER, I feel that in my own case in its fullest force. (Hear, hear.)

The question, as we have already said, was not even hinted at, during the last election.—

I never, sir, heard it mooted. (Hear, hear.)

Nor was the voice of public opinion in its favor so strong, that it was forced upon the Government or Legislature. So far as Canada is concerned, it was the conception of the Government itself, and was taken up by its members to serve a necessity. This being the case, we contend that the people have a right to be asked to say yea or nay on the subject.

AN HON. MEMBER—What is the name of the paper?

Mr. RYMAL—It is the *Norfolk Reformer*, a paper the several issues of which, for the months of November and December last, were full of sentiments like those I have quoted; but, looking over the numbers that have appeared since that magnetic or mesmerism circular was sent out from the Provincial Secretary's Office, I see that it has sung dumb. (Laughter.) I fearlessly assert that the Confederation of the British North American Provinces has taken no strong hold of the public mind of Canada. It never was demanded, and I believe as certainly as that I am now speaking, that if this matter were submitted to the people, and fully understood by them, they would reject it. (Hear, hear.) I have endeavored to obtain from the leading men in the riding which I have the honor to represent, an expression of their opinions with reference to this scheme. At the time the resolutions were printed here, I secured from twenty to twenty-five copies, and mailed them to my constituency, asking an expression of opinion as to the propriety of adopting them. Only two sent anything like a favorable verdict, and all they were able to say in their favor was, that they thought the scheme might be advantageous in a national point of view, but they feared the expense of carrying it out would more than counterbalance the advantages. These are the most favorable expressions of opinion I have got, while in other instances they are denounced *in toto*. Allow me to read an extract from a letter I have received from one of the most influential gentlemen residing in South Wentworth, and who is withal a strong practical reformer, having received a part of his political education from the *Globe*. (Hear, hear.) He says:—

I did at one time allow myself to fancy that Confederation was destined to afford a means of escape from most of the evils which surround our political fabric. When I glanced over the printed resolutions now before the Legislature, I thought that we, the strongest member of the proposed Confederation had, in some respects decidedly the

worst of the bargain. I now feel satisfied that this is the case.

Mr. SPEAKER, I am glad to find that I am not the only man resident in the South Riding of Wentworth who questions in a very slight degree the honesty of purpose of some members of the Government in bringing down a scheme of this kind, while, at the same time, refusing to give the House that information by which it ought to be accompanied. My correspondent goes on to say:—

I do not believe there is so much patriotism as is pretended among the advocates, or at least the parents of the scheme. I fear they see in it a nice arrangement by which they can extend their term of office, either in the General Government or in the present one. Their departure from the plan proposed by themselves last session; their hurrying the resolutions through the House without giving the country time to consider them; their great reluctance to give information on the subject, and some other things, lead me to doubt whether they are actuated solely by patriotic motives. I should not have been so uncharitable as to doubt their sincerity, had not their conduct on former occasions been characterized by a lack of that quality.

And I must say, Mr. SPEAKER, that to a certain extent I entertain the same opinion. I do not propose to go over the whole ground in discussing this scheme. I do not feel competent to that task. But since this debate commenced, I have listened carefully to almost every speech that has been made, with the view of receiving that light which would qualify me to give a vote satisfactory to myself and to my constituents. And I have come to the conclusion that taking this scheme all in all, I am not in a position to approve of it. (Hear, hear.) The refusal on the part of the Government to submit it to the people of this country, who have the deepest interest in it, proves conclusively to me that there is something in it which they do not wish the people to know. Their refusal, also, to give the fullest information on a matter of such importance, imparts to me a suspicion, that to use a homely but expressive phrase, "there's a nigger in the fence." (Laughter.) It has been contended that with a view to our security, it was necessary to combine our strength. Now the strength, in my humble judgment, which we would obtain by consummating this union, is just that kind of strength which a fishing rod would obtain by fastening to it some additional joints. (Hear, hear.) If you can,

by some convulsion of nature, bring Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland, and place them where the uninhabitable mountains, fifteen or twenty miles north of this place, now are, or leave a couple of them in the bosom of Lake Ontario, we might have additional strength. But, under our actual circumstances, you propose merely to add to us several hundred miles more of length, without any additional hands to defend them. (Hear, hear.) I must allude to one matter, which is to bring upon us almost unlimited and unknown expenses, if this union is consummated. To undertake the construction of the Intercolonial Railroad is, in my judgment, to start upon a career of extravagance which will swamp this young country. As one of the agriculturists of Canada, and speaking in their name, I beg to assure the House—if it needs any assurance on a point so palpable—that the agriculturists of Canada are not in a very flourishing condition. The failure of the crops, with low prices, and the heavy burdens they have hitherto borne, have left them in a bad position to bear increased burdens. (Hear, hear.) The balance-sheet of our public financial operations, I think, should be a warning to every one of us, that no uncalled-for or unnecessary expense should be entered upon, but that our means should be economised, and that a balance should, if possible, be shown in our favor for the first time in ten years. We also see many of our business men at present rushing into the bankrupt courts. I find no fewer than 905 insolvent notices in the *Canada Gazette*, from the 1st September to the 24th December last. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. A. MACKENZIE—But did all these become bankrupts during the year?

Mr. RYAN—I cannot say. They at all events gave the notice during the year. And I believe the misfortunes which have befallen these men will, in each case, affect at least half a dozen, making an aggregate of 5,000. (Hear, hear.) I am satisfied, therefore, that this is not the proper time for these increased burdens being thrown upon the people of Canada. I think hon. gentlemen must agree with me, that we have lived as it were too fast, that we have gone beyond our means, and that we are reaping now the bitter fruits of this in the heavy debt which we at present bear. Without enlarging upon the reasons why I feel it my duty to oppose this measure, I may mention some half

dozen which to my mind justify me in opposing it. In the first place, I oppose it because this is not the scheme which the Government pledged themselves to submit to the House this session, nor the one which has been considered by the people of Upper Canada. I oppose it also, because I was not sent here to change the Constitution, or to enter into partnerships, without those who sent me here having an opportunity of pronouncing their opinion concerning them. I oppose it, because of the arbitrary conduct of the promoters of the scheme in endeavoring to wrest from the people privileges which they have enjoyed without abusing, and which they do not wish to give up. I refer here to the proposed mode of appointing the Legislative Council. I oppose it, because the expenditure which this scheme involves, in my opinion, far outweighs the advantages to be derived from it. Further, I oppose it, because I do not believe it will settle the sectional difficulties we have complained of, but, on the contrary, will multiply them to the same extent as we take in new partners, and will leave Upper Canada the victim, not of one, but of several smaller provinces. (Hear, hear.) In conclusion, I think honorable gentlemen will agree with me, that in 1850 Canada was the admiration and the envy of most of the people who were acquainted with our position. I would compare the position of Canada at that time—and I think I may without impropriety—to that of a young man of eighteen or twenty, handsome in figure, with a good constitution, of robust strength, and under the care of a tender and loving parent (as I presume England is to Canada), and this parent has committed the health of this child of his—this lovely youth—to the care of a family physician, who, however, has transferred him from time to time to the care of other physicians of different schools. Some of them were allopaths, some were homœopaths, some were hydropaths—but they all bled—(laughter)—they all blistered—they all sweated. (Continued laughter.) Under such treatment this lovely youth became pale and sickly. The ruddy hue of health passed from his countenance, and instead of his step being firm and bounding, he began to stagger in his gait. Then the parent began to call the physicians to account, for they were acting or pretending to act under responsibility for the result of their treat-

ment. And what answer did they make? Each one of them protested that his own nostrum was sufficient to cure the malady, although it was evident that he was sinking under the treatment. But in order that he might have the benefit of the craft, and themselves not be dismissed for want of skill, they agreed to join, and, making an admixture of their several nostrums, to administer that to the patient. (Great laughter.) Under this treatment, however, the kind parent began to think that his son had but a poor chance. He remonstrated—as I presume our parent (England) has done—and declared that this could not be allowed, that the patient would die, and that the neighbors were wondering at the amount of the patient's endurance, and the parent's folly in permitting this bleeding, blistering, sweating process to go on so long. And what do you suppose the quacks, in order to satisfy the parent, proposed to do? After acknowledging, as they could not help but acknowledge, that they had brought the lovely youth to the brink of the grave, they proposed now to the parent that he should hand over three or four other members of the family, that they might experiment upon them also. (Laughter.) But, Mr. SPEAKER, I am glad to say, that when they heard of this proposition, the other children said—“We will have none of it—no quack doctors for us from Canada—we will manage our own affairs and select our own physicians for ourselves.” (Hear, hear, and laughter.) I have spoken in a figurative manner, but I trust my language has conveyed the sum and substance of our present position to the minds of hon. gentlemen. (Hear, hear.) It conveys exactly, at all events, the opinion I entertain of the treatment which Canada has received at the hands of her rulers for a number of years past. They have been playing their parts, one arguing “I am right,” and the other, “You're wrong”—each party arrogating to itself the greatest amount of wisdom—until Canada has been reduced to a state of poverty—I won't say how low; I do not like to describe it—but to a position in which every one admits we cannot remain. And now the men who have brought her to that position, who have been instrumental in creating the sectional difficulties and religious strifes that have embroiled the people of Canada, are to be the doctors who are to cure this malady! If they can do it, I shall be happy to assist

in my humble way. But believing the nostrum they are about to administer will aggravate the evil rather than cure or alleviate it, I feel it to be a duty I owe to my constituents and to my own conscience to vote against the scheme, be the consequences what they may. (Cheers.)

DR. PARKER—MR. SPEAKER, before the debate closes, I desire to make a few observations in explanation of the vote it is my intention to record on this question. I shall not trespass on the indulgence of the House, but will compress in a few sentences the explanations I desire to make. It is pretty well within the knowledge of the House that I entertain strong objections to the Address on the table—not only objections of principle, but detail—objections not only as an Upper Canadian, but as a British North American, and objections as to the time and manner in which it is sought to give to these resolutions the force of law. If it was possible to propose or secure certain changes, I would make them or warmly support them. The motion of the “previous question” by the leader of the Government precludes all amendments; for it I am not responsible, but by it I am forced to give a *yea* or *nay* vote on the Address as it now stands. I have no choice but to accept or reject these resolutions as a whole. If I could take the responsibility of the latter, I would state my objections to the basis of Confederation fully, perhaps strongly. I refrain from this expression, because, under the circumstances to which I have alluded, it would serve no good end or purpose. It has been persistently urged during this debate that the opponents of this measure should propound a better. A sufficient answer to that argument is, that they are not allowed to do so. But aside from this, the opponents of a public measure are not always called upon to submit an alternative proposition, but may stand on their strict logical and parliamentary right of proposing nothing and conceding nothing, not even attempting to prove the particular measure to which they are opposed bad, but that its supporters have not proved it to be good. Upon all questions of ordinary magnitude and importance from which I dissented, I would feel justified by that answer. But, sir, this is not a question of ordinary magnitude and importance; our domestic and external difficulties are pressing and importunate, and I feel in rejecting this measure, I am bound

morally and in duty to the country and the people I represent, to see my way to something better. On this part of the issue I am entirely with the Government. I believe the period has arrived when it is necessary to remodel our institutions, even for the purpose of conducting the civil government of the country. The time has come when it is necessary to carry some measure of constitutional reform. The public opinion of the country—all the events of the last year—the reconstruction of the present Administration expressly to settle this question, places us in a position whence we can neither recede nor stand still. The *status quo* is impossible. Under these circumstances, the practical question is—Can a better measure than that now before us be secured? Better measures could, perhaps, have been devised, but it is doubtful if they would have secured general concurrence or be carried. The only question, however, I have to determine is, that under the necessities of the time and the restriction from all choice—for neither of which I am in any way responsible—I can see my way to nothing better, and I have therefore determined to record my vote for these resolutions. (Hear, hear.) Conceding, as I honestly do, the necessity of constitutional changes, I accept this as the only practical measure at the present time. If I could see a reasonable probability of securing anything better, I would vote otherwise. But from some of the remarks made by leading members in opposition to this Address, the changes which they would probably propose I could under no circumstances support; because then, sir, circumstances, over which I have no control, make this the only practicable change possible; and, as the necessity is urgent, I accept these resolutions as a necessity of the time and situation. In voting for this Address, however, I reserve to myself the right of judgment on every question in these resolutions, which may hereafter become the subject of deliberation in Parliament, should I have the honor to hold a seat in this House. In voting for these resolutions, I hold myself in no way committed to any proposed improvement; and will vote on them, and particularly the Intercolonial Railway, as though they were in no way mentioned in these resolutions. Should this measure fail, either in the House of Commons or by the persistent refusal of the Maritime Provinces to

make good their contract, I shall consider the Government still bound to find some other solution for our difficulties. Reasonable time and allowance being made for the difficulties of their task, I will continue to hold them responsible for some satisfactory measure of settlement. Should British North America become united on the basis of these resolutions, a serious responsibility will rest on those public men who will be called in the first days to administer these several governments. Should they fall into prodigal hands, the most serious injury, even ruin, may be entailed on the country. These dangers may be averted by prudence and economy in our future legislators, by which happier results may be achieved. But, sir, under the most favorable auspices, I believe difficulties and embarrassments will grow up under this new Constitution. I hope it will not then be considered a finality, but capable of amendment as time goes on. I sincerely trust that so far as its future defects may have their origin in matters of law, they will be redressed by wise, legal and enlightened means; and, so far as they may have their foundation in matters of sentiment or opinion, that they will be redressed by the cultivation of better and more fraternal feeling between the people of the different provinces. I trust and believe that by such happy means, although it is not now such a Constitution as we can all approve, that it may in the future be so modified and administered as to meet the requirements and expectations of the country, and that under it all the residents of these six provinces may become one united, firm, prosperous and happy people. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. HOLTON said—MR. SPEAKER, I endeavored to catch your eye in the early part of the evening, with the view of offering a few observations, both upon the merits of the subject referred to in the motion in your hands, and of replying to some of the arguments adduced by the friends of the measure; but, knowing the extreme anxiety that existed on the part of many others to speak to the resolutions before the vote is taken, and feeling that there would be another opportunity to address the House, when the motion, of which notice has been given by my honorable friend from Peel, comes up, I have determined not to claim the attention of the House for any lengthened remarks at the present time. There are, however, just one or two points to which I feel that I ought briefly to refer,

119

before a division is taken. My honorable friend from Granville (Mr. SHANLY), in the course of his very interesting speech—a speech to which I listened with a great deal of attention—took occasion to remark upon what he characterised as the bold and manly course adopted by the Government, on learning of the rejection of this scheme by the people of New Brunswick. Sir, on that point, I join issue with that gentleman. The course of the Government ought to be bold and manly, to entitle it to the support of a bold and manly mind like his, that was so much in doubt as to what course to pursue before this bold and manly policy was adopted. But, sir, instead of its being a bold and manly course, I hold that it was a mere running away from the difficulty which the defeat of those resolutions by the people of New Brunswick presented. What was the position at that moment? We were discussing the desirability and feasibility of having a union of all these colonies, founded upon resolutions adopted by a conference of delegates from the various colonies, which met in this city in October last. These resolutions were to be concurred in by all the provinces, and were represented to us as being in the nature of a treaty. Suddenly we hear that the Province of New Brunswick, the only one whose territory adjoins ours, had, in effect, refused to ratify that treaty, and hence the treaty falls to the ground, and the refusal of that province to join the union renders a union impossible. My hon. friend says it was a bold and manly course to insist on going on with that which it had become impossible to carry out; but, sir, I maintain, as I said before, that their course was merely a method—cunning and adroit, perhaps, but neither bold nor manly—which they adopted of running away from their duty. (Hear, hear.) The refusal of New Brunswick to join the union, or to ratify the treaty, having destroyed it, a new duty then devolved upon our Government—a duty growing directly out of the obligation under which those gentlemen placed themselves in the re-formation of their Government in June last. That obligation was to settle the Canadian difficulty this session, either by a Confederation of all the provinces, or by a Canadian Federation. The one now under consideration for the former object being dead, they were bound to deal with the Canadian question apart altogether from that relating to the Federation of all the British North American

Colonies. Instead of dealing with it, however, I say that they have run away from it. And that is what is called a bold and manly course. (Hear, hear.) Instead of that it was, in my opinion, a most cowardly course to pursue. (Hear, hear.) It was a stratagetic course, the effect of which was to avoid the difficulty, and hold their places in the Government; but was anything but a manly one. The honorable gentleman spoke of this as a treaty. I am surprised that a gentleman for whose astuteness I had learned to entertain a very high estimation, should be carried away by such a fallacy as that. I maintain, sir, that no treaty has been submitted to us. It is not found in the resolutions, nor yet in the despatch of the Governor General transmitting them to this House. Neither the resolutions nor the despatch contain any intimation of there having been a treaty between the respective provinces, and certainly we have had no correspondence laid before us purporting to relate to a treaty between this and the other provinces. (Hear, hear.)

MR. SHANLY—The treaty was constructed in Conference, and therefore no correspondence was necessary.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Well, we know that there was correspondence between the colonial governments which has not been submitted to us. It was referred to in the resolutions submitted to the Legislature of Nova Scotia. That correspondence, though moved for in this House on the first day of the present session by my hon. friend from Hochelaga, has never to this day been brought down, and yet, sir, it has been pretended that it is a treaty. If it is a treaty, why did not the Government submit the treaty or the correspondence which proved the existence of a treaty? The seventeenth clause, sir, is the only one that can be quoted as having any bearing whatever on the question of a treaty. It reads as follows:—

17. The basis of representation in the House of Commons shall be population, as determined by the official census every ten years; and the number of members at first shall be 194, distributed as follows—Upper Canada, 82; Lower Canada, 65; Nova Scotia, 19; New Brunswick, 15; Newfoundland, 8; and Prince Edward Island, 5.

Of course, sir, the honorable gentlemen undertook to bring before their respective parliaments the propositions which they had agreed upon in conference, and which, if acceptable to all the legislatures, were to serve as a basis of a Constitution for the contem-

plated union. But there is nothing in that clause to show that the governments, or the provinces which they represented, were to be bound to regard this whole scheme as a treaty, and to lay it before their respective legislatures as such. On the contrary, we find Ministers in the Lower Provinces stating that the whole of the scheme might be modified. (Hear, hear.) And, sir, if it is a treaty, and the governments were bound as by that treaty to stand or fall by it, that treaty has been grossly violated by the other parties thereto. What, sir, was the course pursued in Newfoundland? Why, the leader of the Government himself moves a resolution in the Legislature, to the effect that the consideration of the whole question be postponed until next session, with a general election intervening. If there was a treaty binding on all parties—and there cannot be a treaty unless it is binding on all parties—that is the very nature and essence of a treaty. If honorable gentlemen are justified in their statement that it is a treaty, do they not, by necessary implication, thereby charge the governments of all the other provinces with a breach of faith? (Hear, hear.) But, sir, there was no treaty, and it was never intended to consider these resolutions as being in the nature of a treaty. It was simply intended that these heads of agreement—for they are hardly worthy of the name of resolutions, so clumsily are they strung together—should be brought before each Legislature in the shape of propositions, to be considered and voted upon separately, at the same time keeping in view the importance and expediency of adhering to the agreement arrived at in the Conference. Any other agreement in a conference composed of members of the Opposition, as well as of the governments of the Lower Provinces, would have been simply absurd; but our Government were shrewd enough to see the difficulties that were likely to arise in considering the resolutions separately, and that it would be impossible to obtain the assent of this House to all of the self-contradictory, and, in some cases, absurd propositions, contained in this scheme; and, therefore, they hit upon this expedient of proclaiming it to be in the nature of a treaty, of using their strength as a Government in its favor, and of asking the honorable members of this House to vote for it *en masse*—to vote in stultification of all their antecedents upon every question that has engaged the attention of this Legislature, or that has been the subject of discussion in our Provincial Parliament during the last quarter of a cen-

tury. (Hear, hear.) Sir, up to a recent period there might possibly be said to have been some little life in this debate; but during the last week it has been to me not without its ludicrous aspects. When I have heard honorable members get up day after day and argue gravely for union with a people who we now know will have no union with us, and arguing that that union will be a means by which we could emerge from our sectional difficulties here in Canada, it has presented to my mind a most ludicrous aspect. I cannot conceive why hon. gentlemen, in the face of the intelligence we have had from New Brunswick and Newfoundland, and for what we know is likely to be the action of Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia, should go on gravely arguing in favor of this as a live scheme, from which anything else could come than the perpetuation of the official life of a few hon. gentlemen, brought together by means that I shall not now allude to more particularly, but which I shall take another occasion to characterise in such terms as I think are appropriate. Their Confederation scheme is dead, sir, and they know it is dead; and yet they go on and ask their supporters here to vote for this string of seventy-two propositions. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, said he was going to vote for the motion, but wished it to be distinctly understood that he was not in favor of any one of the propositions which the motion embraces. I tell my honorable friend that he is going to record his vote in favor of every one of these propositions. I tell him that the Government will not give to him, or to this House of Parliament, the privilege of recording a vote on one proposition alone, unless it is recorded in favor of the whole scheme.

DR. PARKER—What I said was this—that I reserved to myself the right of voting as I pleased on every resolution which might become the subject of parliamentary action on another day.

HON. MR. HOLTON—I understood my honorable friend perfectly; but notwithstanding any declaration that he may make in reference to the subject, the fact still holds good that by his vote he will place himself on record as being in favor of those seventy-two resolutions. That is the inevitable result of the mode in which these resolutions are put to this House—a very unsatisfactory mode, a very unparliamentary mode, and a mode which I maintain is an insult to this House as a free Parliament, representing British freemen—and I trust that before the final

passing of the resolutions and Address, this House will resist this endeavor to tamper with its freedom, and condemn with it the men who have been the authors of the attempt. Well, sir, the scheme is dead, and yet it is to keep the men alive. (Laughter.) That is the whole object of this discussion. The honorable gentlemen know very well that the scheme is dead. (Hear, hear.) They know perfectly well that I am uttering the simple truth when I say that when they came down with their new programme, they were in the greatest possible difficulty; and it was to retire from this difficulty, and not to force it, that they hit upon the expedient we saw them resorting to—proclaiming the refusal of the Lower Provinces to come into the union as the strongest reason why they declared in favor of the union. (Hear, hear.) These are the few observations I proposed making to-night, reserving any further remarks I may have to make for the debate which will probably arise on the motion of the honorable member for Peel (Hon. Mr. CAMERON). But while I am up, I desire to call the attention of the House to a somewhat startling statement which appears in the English newspapers that arrived to-day. I hold in my hands the *Times* of February 21st, containing the extended report of the debate in the House of Lords, of which we received a summary by telegraph a few days ago, and in respect to which some information was recently conveyed to the House by a member of the Government, on the authority of a telegram which had been received from New York. It will be remembered that the first telegraphic report we had of the conversation in the House of Lords represented an appropriation of £50,000 as having been made towards the defences of Quebec. Although we had applied for this information, it was refused us, but it was given unhesitatingly by Lord DE GREY, the Secretary at War, in the House of Lords, connected with some other statements respecting the share in the defences of the country to be undertaken by the people of this country. The honorable gentlemen, however, improved the opportunity which the news afforded them in their own way. They made it the basis of a new flank movement. It served as an excellent excuse for moving the previous question, in order that they might close this debate at the earliest possible moment, and start for England with the greatest haste, in order to save the country from impending invasion. The telegraphic report created a good deal of excitement in the

House. It will be remembered that when my honorable friend from West Middlesex (Mr. SCATCHERD) was making some remarks in reference to this subject, the Hon. President of the Council rose in his place and told the House that either he himself or some other party had telegraphed to New York to learn the precise facts as to the alleged appropriation by the Imperial Government of £50,000. The honorable gentleman stated he had learned that the sum was not £50,000.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD — Thirty thousand pounds.

HON. MR. HOLTON—£30,000, or £50,000—it was variously stated—but £200,000. Well, sir, we have the extended report at length, and it appears that £50,000 is the sum to be placed in the estimates this year. They look to the expenditure of £200,000 in the course of four years, beginning this year with an appropriation of £50,000. It appears from this that they do not consider the case as so very urgent—not, at all events, so urgent as to require the business of the Parliament of this country to be suspended, in order that Ministers may hasten thither to make provision for the defence of the country. (Hear, hear.) So much would follow from the fact of their spreading the £200,000 over four years. But that is not all. Very startling statements on the subject of the defence of Canada were made in this debate in the House of Lords. We know how persistently our own Government have refused us the necessary information to guide us on the subject—seeking, in the absence of that information, unfairly to use the subject of defence as a means of persuading honorable gentlemen to support their measure of Confederation. (Hear, hear.) Now I hold this doctrine, that *quoad* Canadian affairs, our Ministers are bound to furnish us with the same ample information as the Imperial Government are bound to furnish the Imperial Parliament, *quoad* Imperial affairs, when it is not inconsistent with the public interest so to do. (Hear, hear.) Well, we find that weeks ago this debate came up in an incidental manner in the House of Lords, on a motion of a noble lord (Lord LYVEDEN), for information on the subject, and that the Government at once entered into the fullest explanations, in the course of which they made some rather startling statements as to their negotiations on the defence question with this Government, and in respect to which all information has been withheld from us. In answer to Lord LYVEDEN, Earl DE GREY said :—

The Government undertook to provide for the necessary improvements in the defence of Quebec, which had always been considered as an Imperial fortress, and which, though formerly of great strength, like other fortifications, required improvements to meet the altered circumstances of warfare. They had proposed to the Canadian Government to undertake the fortification of Montreal and the western points. The Canadian Government was well aware of the obligations which rested on them, and when they had received the necessary answer from the Canadian Parliament, were ready to undertake these works.

Mark this, that the Canadian Government are ready to undertake the fortification of Montreal and the western points. (Hear, hear.) Such is the information which we get from Earl DE GREY, that our Ministers have entered into this understanding, provided that they can get the assent and authority of the Canadian Parliament to incur the whole expense of permanent defensive works westward of Quebec. (Hear, hear.) And yet, sir, although information on this subject has been sought for at almost every stage of the debate—almost daily—they have persistently withheld it from us. But now fortunately before this debate is closed, we learn from the lips of the Secretary at War that in so far as in them lay, they pledged the resources of this country to an untold amount for the construction of fortifications throughout the province, with the exception of Quebec. They have agreed to this, I say, subject to the approval of Parliament, and which approval they dare not ask until this scheme, the whole of the seventy-two resolutions, with all their clumsy contrivances, is adopted by this House—in order that their official existence may be lengthened out for a few months longer. (Hear, hear.) The whole amount which will be required for permanent fortifications, as stated in a leading article in the *Times*, is £1,300,000 sterling—about \$7,000,000, of which the Imperial Government propose to expend £200,000, or about \$1,000,000. We therefore learn that our Government have really bargained for the expenditure by Canada of \$5,000,000 to \$6,000,000 towards the permanent defences of the country, in respect of which we have had no information whatever. (Hear, hear.) There can be no doubt that they have made this bargain, because I have quoted the words of Earl DE GREY stating in precise terms that the Canadian Government had agreed to it, subject to the approval of our Parliament. I say that this is a startling fact, and I hope that the honorable gentlemen

who intend voting for these seventy-two resolutions, which in reality sanction this arrangement—because the Government have insisted upon it and urged it throughout this debate—will pause before they add other \$6,000,000 to the untold millions to which we shall be pledged by the adoption of the scheme now before the House. (Hear, hear.)

MR. FORTIER—In rising to speak at such an advanced stage of the debate, it is not my intention to occupy the attention of the House for any lengthened period, especially as the topic of Confederation which has been under consideration for several days past, has been pretty thoroughly exhausted. I do not, however, consider that I should be doing my duty were I to allow this question to pass without remark, and without stating to the House and to the country the reasons which have brought me to the determination to vote as I have resolved to vote on this great question of Confederation. What, I would ask, Mr. SPEAKER, do Ministers call upon us to do on this occasion? To pass an Address to Her Majesty, praying Her by a single stroke of the pen to cancel our present Constitution, and to substitute another based on the seventy-two resolutions adopted by the Conference at Quebec, held on the 10th October last, and which resolutions are now before the House. I am convinced that the Quebec Conference, when they framed the basis of our new Constitution, far from being actuated by any sentiment of disinterestedness, were on the contrary influenced by the desire of personal advancement. I may be deceived, Mr. SPEAKER, and I sincerely hope that I am. I hope that the electors of New Brunswick, who have just rejected the scheme of the Quebec Conference, and at the same time passed a direct vote of censure against the most illustrious men in that province, for having agreed to this scheme, and, by so doing, compromised the interests of their country—I hope, I say, that these electors have also been mistaken, knowing, as I do, that obedience must be yielded to the majority, and that, in spite of their triumphant opposition, Confederation will be imposed upon us as now projected. It is sought by a single stroke of the pen to abrogate our Constitutional Act, and to substitute for it a Constitution of the details of which we are altogether ignorant, of which, indeed, every effort is made to keep us in ignorance. We are urged to exchange what we now have or something that they propose to give us.

FRANKLIN has told us that "a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush." I am one of those who would prefer the bird in the hand, and for that reason I am not prepared, without further guarantee, to change the Constitution of the country. (Hear, hear.) I hold to the Constitution of 1840, because it consecrates a great principle in favor of Lower Canada, that of equality of representation in the Legislature; and I adhere the more firmly to it, Mr. SPEAKER, when I bear in mind that it is one of the express conditions of my presence in this House as the representative of the county of Yamaska, and I do not intend to betray the confidence reposed in me. In relation to this subject, I will take the liberty of reading to the House extracts from two letters which have been addressed to me by two electors of great influence in my county:—

ST. MICHEL D'YAMASKA, 29th Jan., 1865.

MY DEAR FRIEND,—From the little information I have been able to obtain in relation to what has taken place in the House since the beginning of the session, I observe that the true patriots, far from being able to avert, will not even have the satisfaction of delaying, the storm which threatens our unhappy country. The French-Canadian egotists are, as usual, in the majority, especially in this nineteenth century—the age of progress it may be, but the age of selfishness, of hazardous speculations, in which conscience (now, alas! only a by-word) takes no part—the age of usurious loans, to the great detriment of the poor people, whom, not content with pillaging and ruining, it is now proposed, with the view of securing a few years of power and position, to deprive of their nationality, their laws and their religion. • • • What ought we to do under these circumstances, when we see our country threatened by its own children, allied with its bitterest foes? Treat the traitors with disdain, and maintain with firmness (no matter how few in numbers we may be) an energetic and constitutional opposition. It may be that at last the Catholic clergy will awake from their dream, and will manfully aid the Opposition, whose sole object is the preservation of its most cherished rights.

Mr. SPEAKER, I read such language with pride, and I now proceed to read the views of another of my electors, no less patriotic than the one whose letter I have just read:—

RIVIÈRE DAVID, 21st Feb., 1865.

DEAR SIR,—I have received a copy of the resolutions in relation to the projected union of the Provinces of British North America, and after having examined and studied them, and having read with care all that the papers on either side have to say for and against them, I beg to state as my opinion, that they are very far from meeting with my approval. Even were they better

than they are, I should be very sorry to see them adopted before an opportunity has been afforded to the electors to pronounce upon them, and to authorize their representatives to vote in favor of them. I shall abstain, in view of the want of space in a simple letter like this, from discussing the reasons which have led me to form this opinion. Suffice it that I unite my voice with that of the best friends of our country in telling you that you were not elected to destroy, but rather to promote the working of our Constitution.

These remarks, Mr. SPEAKER, are so true and so reasonable, that I should be ashamed did I not agree with them; yet if I had reason to anticipate that our country would be endangered by the refusal of this House to pass the scheme of Confederation now proposed to us, I would not hesitate to vote in favor of it. But I am very far from believing that our Constitution cannot be made to work with benefit to the country for many years to come. If the TACHÉ-MACDONALD Government had not been defeated last year, and if it could have retained a majority of one or two votes only, as has been so well observed by the hon. member for Beauce, Confederation would still be in the clouds, and the hon. member for South Oxford would still be at a great distance from his long-sought haven. It is, however, to be hoped that the offspring of the present Administration—composed, as it is, of such heterogeneous elements—will not be the victim of premature birth, and that the Government will have something else to present to the country than a still-born child. (Hear, hear.) Mr. SPEAKER, that great principle of sectional equality was consecrated anew by the Legislative Council Act of 1856. And by whom was it consecrated? By the men who are now in power. On the 14th March, 1856, the hon. member for Montmorency, seconded by the Hon. Mr. SPENCE, moved the adoption of a law establishing equality in the Legislative Council between Upper and Lower Canada, and rendering that branch of the Legislature elective. The principle of that law was assented to by eighty-three votes against six. I read from the *Journals* of this House as follows:—

The order of the day for the second reading of the bill to change the constitution of the Legislative Council, by rendering the same elective, being read, the Hon. Mr. CAUCHON moved, seconded by the Hon. Mr. SPENCE, and the question being put, that the bill be now read a second time, the House divided, and the names being called for, they were taken down as follow:—

YEA.—Messrs. Aikins, Alley, Bell, Belling-

ham, Biggar, Bourassa, Brodeur, Bureau, Cartier, Cassault, Cauchon, Cayley, Chapais, Chisholm, Christie, Conger, Cooke, Cook, Chas. Daoust, Jean B. Daoust, Darche, Delong, Desaulniers, DeWitt, Dionne, J. B. E. Dorion, A. A. Dorion, Dostaler, Atty. Gen. Drummond, Dufresne, Felton, Ferrie, Foley, O. C. Fortier, Fournier, Frazer, Freeman, Gamble, Gould, Guévremont, Hartman, Holton, Jobin, Labelle, Laporte, LeBoutillier, Lemieux, Loranger, Lumsden, Lyon, John S. Macdonald, Atty. Gen. Macdonald, Mackenzie, McCann, Marchildon, Masson, Matice, Meagher, A. Morrison, Munro, Papin, Patrick, Poulin, Pouliot, Powell, Prévoist, Price, Rhodes, Sol. Gen. Ross, J. Ross, Sanborn, Shaw, Sol. Gen. Smith, S. Smith, James Smith, Somerville, Southwick, Spence, Stevenson, Thibaudeau, Turcotte, Valois, and Wright.—83.

NAYS.—Messrs. Bows, Brown, Cameron, Crawford, Robinson, and Yelding.—6.

So it was resolved in the affirmative.

Thus, on this exciting question of representation by population, eighty-nine members from Upper and Lower Canada voted and took part in the discussion, forty-four from Upper Canada, of whom only six demanded representation by population (the Hon. Mr. BROWN being one of them), and forty-five Lower Canadians, ten of English and thirty-five of French-Canadian origin, constituting eighty-three votes against six. Observe the immense majority who voted upon the constitution of the Upper House, and ratified the Constitutional Act of 1840 to which I have just referred. Not only was this principle consecrated by a large majority in both branches of the Legislature; as I have just shewn, it was also confirmed by the Government of the Mother Country, for whose sanction this law was reserved, at most eight years ago. And, Mr. SPEAKER, these two Constitutional Acts have been the means of establishing the peace, happiness and prosperity of the country since the troubles of 1837 and 1838; behind these two acts the French-Canadians have sheltered themselves as behind an impregnable rampart, and yet these two acts the present Administration, sustained by a majority of French-Canadians in this House, are ready to scatter to the four winds. (Hear, hear.) For the last quarter of a century, Canada has enjoyed responsible government and the advantage of equality in the representation. What then is there to complain of, and by whom are complaints made? Who have complained during the last ten years—have the French-Canadians, have the Upper-Canadians? No, sir, it is the hon. member for South Oxford

(Hon. Mr. BROWN), and on what ground? On the question of representation based upon numbers. Why has that hon. gentleman created such a turmoil in Upper Canada, and why has he tried to tread under foot that which the French-Canadians hold most dear—their religion? It was to attain power, to reach the seat which he now occupies on the other side of the House, supported by the honorable members for Kamouraska and Dorchester, like altar posts on each side of a statue. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) Who are those who have opposed that hon. member in this House? All the members for Lower Canada, both French and English without distinction. Never have the members from Lower Canada been divided on this vital question. *Bleus* and *Rouges*, Mr. SPEAKER, have united as one man to preserve that which guaranteed to them their future as descendants of old France. And what was the cause of this union of French-Canadians against the hon. member for South Oxford? To refuse him that which the present Administration has conceded to him, by the Quebec Conference. What was the reason given by the Hon. Attorney General for Upper Canada, during the session of 1863, to the member for South Oxford, who reproached him for having governed Upper Canada by a Lower Canadian majority? He replied—and his words are still ringing in my ears—"Never," said he, "has Upper Canada had to complain of anything which my Government has imposed on Upper Canada by means of a Lower Canadian majority. You have no grounds of complaint, and you will never obtain your extreme demands." This was the language used at that time. But things are changed, and unfortunately *autre temps autre chose*. *O tempora! O mores!* And afterwards, the honorable member for Montreal East added expressions more or less ironical, more or less founded, comparing the Grits of Upper Canada to so many codfish in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. It was then, Mr. SPEAKER, that the honorable member for South Oxford took an active part in the discussion. (Hear, hear.) You, no doubt, remember the occasion, for then you yourself, Mr. SPEAKER, were, in the eyes of the hon. member for Montreal, only a codfish eager for the bait. Mr. SPEAKER, I have always admired the energy displayed by the hon. member for Montreal East in resisting the hon. member for South Oxford; his courage and boldness were boundless, and there

was such a vast difference of principles, and so much animosity existed between those two hon. gentleman and their respective supporters, that you could never for one moment have imagined that they could endure each other as neighbors on the Treasury benches. This mutual reconciliation, Mr. SPEAKER, reminds me of the effect produced on my mind by the happy family, which I had an opportunity of seeing at New York a few years ago, when the rat was to be seen between the paws of the cat, the monkey running after the rabbit, and the sparrow coquetting with the owl. (Hear, and laughter.) How long have the men to whom I have just referred paid any attention to the claims of the hon. member for South Oxford? How long have they listened to him? It is only since those hon. gentlemen have found themselves in a minority in this House, since the TACHÉ-MACDONALD Government have resolved *per fas aut nefas* to retain office—never before. Now, all this has not tended to inspire me with any confidence in the plan of Confederation, and has indeed made me resolve to vote against the whole, because this scheme is to be accepted *in toto* or not at all. (Hear, hear.) The Government tells us, Mr. SPEAKER, that these resolutions cannot be amended in any particular; the seventy-two resolutions, they say, must be voted all together, so as to give no ground for complaint on the part of the Maritime Provinces. It is a treaty from which no deviation can be allowed. But how is it that the Honorable Mr. TILLEY, of New Brunswick, offered to allow the Opposition in that province to amend this treaty? And did not the Government declare, at the end of the last session, that they intended to propose an amendment of some kind to the Constitutional Act, and that they would submit it to the people for their consideration before seeking its adoption? And now they refuse to do this. Ah! I repeat, all this is very far from inspiring me with the least confidence in the scheme of Confederation, and in the present Administration. You must swallow the whole scheme without hesitation, without power to offer a single amendment. Let those who please vote for such a measure, the humble member for Yamaska assuredly will not. I therefore declare that I am prepared to vote against the measure now under consideration. (Applause.)

HON. MR. EVANTUREL said—Mr. SPEAKER, in return for the indulgence

extended by the House, I have to say that I do not rise to make a long speech, but that I shall content myself with giving a silent vote. However, before recording my vote upon the measure which is submitted to us, I wish to put a question to the Government. I acknowledge that if I confined myself to consulting my own ideas, I should not put this question; but I do so in order to meet the wishes of several of my friends, both within this House and beyond its precincts. Those friends have expressed alarm in relation to one of the clauses of the resolutions, and have requested me to ask an explanation from the Hon. Attorney General for Upper Canada, as to the interpretation of that clause. I have therefore to ask him whether article 46 of the resolutions, which states that "both the English and French languages may be employed in the General Parliament and in its proceedings, and in the Local Legislature of Lower Canada," is to be interpreted as placing the use of the two languages on an equal footing in the Federal Parliament? In stating the apprehensions entertained by certain persons on this subject—and I consider that it is a mark of patriotism on their part, and that their apprehensions may be legitimate—I hope the Government will not impute to me any hostile intention, and will perceive that the course I adopt is in their interest, as it will give them an opportunity of dissipating the apprehensions in question (Hear, hear.)

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—I have very great pleasure in answering the question put to me by my hon. friend from the county of Quebec. I may state that the meaning of one of the resolutions adopted by the Conference is this, that the rights of the French-Canadian members as to the status of their language in the Federal Legislature shall be precisely the same as they now are in the present Legislature of Canada in every possible respect. I have still further pleasure in stating that the moment this was mentioned in Conference, the members of the deputation from the Lower Provinces unanimously stated that it was right and just, and without one dissentient voice gave their adhesion to the reasonableness of the proposition that the status of the French language, as regards the procedure in Parliament, the printing of measures, and everything of that kind, should be precisely the same as it is in this Legislature. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. DORION—I do not rise to

offer any lengthened remarks, but to draw for a moment the attention of the members of the Administration, with a view to obtain some information in connection with this scheme; but before doing so, I would say a word in reply to the explanation given by the Hon. Attorney General West to the question put by the hon. member for the county of Quebec (Hon. Mr. EVANTUREL), with regard to the use of the French language. The Hon. Attorney General West stated that the intention of delegates at the Quebec Conference was to give the same guarantees for the use of the French language in the Federal Legislature, as now existed under the present union. I conceive, sir, that this is no guarantee whatsoever, for in the Union Act it was provided that the English language alone should be used in Parliament, and the French language was entirely prohibited; but this provision was subsequently repealed by the 11th and 12th Victoria, and the matter left to the discretion of the Legislature. So that if, to-morrow, this Legislature choose to vote that no other but the English language should be used in our proceedings, it might do so, and thereby forbid the use of the French language. There is, therefore, no guarantee for the continuance of the use of the language of the majority of the people of Lower Canada, but the will and the forbearance of the majority. And as the number of French members in the General Legislature, under the proposed Confederation, will be proportionately much smaller than it is in the present Legislature, this ought to make hon. members consider what little chance there is for the continued use of their language in the Federal Legislature. This is the only observation I have to make on this subject, and it was suggested to me by the answer of the Hon. Attorney General West.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—I desire to say that I agree with my hon. friend that as it stands just now the majority governs; but in order to cure this, it was agreed at the Conference to embody the provision in the Imperial Act. (Hear, hear.) This was proposed by the Canadian Government, for fear an accident might arise subsequently, and it was assented to by the deputation from each province that the use of the French language should form one of the principles on upon which the Confederation should be established, and that its use, as at present, should be guaranteed by the Imperial Act. (Hear, hear.)

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—I will add to what has been stated by the Hon. Attorney General for Upper Canada, in reply to the hon. member for the county of Quebec and the hon. member for Hochelaga, that it was also necessary to protect the English minorities in Lower Canada with respect to the use of their language, because in the Local Parliament of Lower Canada the majority will be composed of French-Canadians. The members of the Conference were desirous that it should not be in the power of that majority to decree the abolition of the use of the English language in the Local Legislature of Lower Canada, any more than it will be in the power of the Federal Legislature to do so with respect to the French language. I will also add that the use of both languages will be secured in the Imperial Act to be based on these resolutions. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. DORION—I am very glad to hear this statement; but I fail to see anything in the resolutions themselves which gives such an assurance, in proof of which we have the honorable member for Quebec county asking how the matter really stands. But it is not simply for the use of the French language in the Legislature that protection is needed—that is not of so great importance as is the publication of the laws and proceedings of Parliament. The speeches delivered in this House are only addressed to a few, but the laws and proceedings of the House are addressed to the whole people, a million or nearly a million of whom speak the French language. I now beg to address one or two observations on a different subject. When the question was first brought before us, I drew the attention of the Government to the discrepancy between the printed resolutions which are now submitted to us, and the resolutions which were despatched to the members of the Legislature, during the recess, by the Hon. Provincial Secretary. The discrepancy consists in the wording of the third section of the 29th resolution. In the resolutions which were sent us by the Hon. Provincial Secretary, the 29th read as follows:—

The General Government shall have power to make laws for the peace, welfare and good government of the Federated Provinces (saving the Sovereignty of England), and especially laws respecting the following subjects.—[The subjects, 37 in number, follow, the 3rd reading thus]:—
3. The imposition or regulation of duties of customs on imports and exports, except on exports of timber, logs, masts, spars, deals,

and sawn lumber, and of coal and other minerals. [The 43rd of the same resolutions states]: The local legislatures shall have power to make laws respecting the following subjects:—
Direct taxation and the imposition of duties on the export of timber, logs, masts, spars, deals, and sawn lumber, and of coals and other minerals.

So that the General Government are forbidden to place export duties on lumber, coals, and other minerals found in any of the several provinces, such right being reserved to the local legislatures. But in the resolutions submitted to the House in English, there is a most important and invidious distinction, and I drew the attention of the Hon. Finance Minister to it early in the debate. It states:—

The General Parliament shall have power to make laws, etcetera, respecting the following subjects:—
3. The imposition or regulation of duties of customs on imports and exports—except on exports of timber, logs, masts, spars, deals, and sawn lumber from New Brunswick; and of coals and other minerals from Nova Scotia.

By the first of these series of resolutions the General Government was deprived of the right of imposing export duties on lumber, coals, and other minerals in regard to all the provinces; whilst by the resolutions now before the House, the General Government is allowed to impose such duties except on lumber exported from New Brunswick, and coals and other minerals exported from Nova Scotia. Then the 43rd resolution now before the House says:—

The local legislatures shall have power to make laws respecting the following subjects:—
1. Direct taxation, and in New Brunswick the imposition of duties on the export of timber, logs, masts, spars, deals, and sawn lumber; and in Nova Scotia, of coals and other minerals.

That is to say, in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia they have a right to impose duties, for local purposes, on the export of lumber, coals, and other minerals, whilst in Canada and the other provinces that power is withheld; and while the timber and minerals from Canada can be taxed by the General Government for general purposes, the timber of New Brunswick, and the coal and minerals of Nova Scotia, can only be taxed by the local governments of these provinces, and for local purposes only. This is a most unjust arrangement for both Upper and Lower Canada. Now, sir, I find in an official document, published in Nova Scotia under the sanction of

the Government of that province, and submitted to parliament now sitting, that the powers of the General Government and of the local governments in respect to the export duties upon lumber, coals, and other minerals, are exactly the same, word for word, as are set forth in the printed copy sent to the members during the recess. (Hear, hear.) It has been asserted that this was a treaty entered into by the delegates of the several provinces; but it seems to be a treaty in which alterations have been made. (Hear, hear.) I called the attention of the honorable gentlemen opposite to this discrepancy, and asked which was the true and correct copy of the resolutions, and I was told that it was the copy which had been submitted to the House. There has been an alteration somewhere; and in a matter of this serious importance, the Government ought to tell us how and where it occurred—they ought to inform us if it is not the case that the treaty was changed after the Conference had ceased to meet, and at whose request and by whom the change was made. It is evident that we are called to vote for a scheme, here, different from that submitted to the Legislature of Nova Scotia, and one more unfavorable to us than that which the delegates from Nova Scotia have reported to their Government. While on this subject, I will also remark that there is also a discrepancy between the French and the English versions of the resolutions submitted to the House, the French version being the same as the one communicated to the members by the Hon. Provincial Secretary, and also to those submitted to the Nova Scotia Legislature. This would indicate that the change has been made in these resolutions submitted to this House, and it is well that we should have some information, and know what has taken place about this pretended treaty since the separation of the delegates. (Hear, hear.) There is another important matter which demands the attention of the House. It has been stated here that the whole of the delegates had agreed to the resolutions of the Conference. (Hear, hear.) The name of Mr. PALMER was mentioned as being an exception, and to that the honorable gentlemen opposite declared that all the delegates had agreed to these resolutions. Is not that what was stated?

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—Yes.

HON. MR. DORION—But I find that besides Mr. PALMER, who asserted publicly that he had signed the resolutions of the Conference to authenticate them, and that he had not agreed to these resolutions, there is

also Mr. DICKEY, another delegate, who has taken the same course. Mr. DICKEY even went so far as to address a letter to the Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia, Sir R. GRAVES McDONNELL, in which he says:—

The Honorable Provincial Secretary has submitted for my inspection a report to Your Excellency, dated 5th December last, and signed by himself, the Honorable Attorney General, the Honorable J. McCULLY, and A. G. ARCHIBALD, Esq., of the result of a mission with which we were charged by Your Excellency, to attend a Conference at Quebec upon the subject of Inter-colonial union. In that report I am happy to be able cordially to concur, except as to that portion of it which would seem to imply the unanimous action of members of the Conference. As I had the misfortune to differ from my colleagues in several important details of the scheme submitted to Your Excellency, I feel myself constrained to withhold my signature from the report, unaccompanied by this explanation. My regret at this circumstance is greatly diminished by the reflection that the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in his despatch of 3rd December last, sustains my view that the scheme is susceptible of modification and improvement.

(Hear, hear.) These are two points which I think are very important, and the honorable gentlemen opposite ought to offer some explanation—on the first point, at all events. In the return of correspondence presented to the Nova Scotia Legislature, I find also a very important letter which was addressed on the 9th of January last, by the Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia to the Governor General of Canada. That letter has never been communicated to us, although an Address for all the correspondence in reference to this Confederation scheme was proposed and carried several weeks ago. This letter of Sir R. GRAVES McDONNELL was in answer to a despatch from Lord MONCK of the 23rd December, 1864, and the third paragraph reads as follows:—

It is evident from the communication of the Right Honorable the Secretary of State, that Her Majesty's Government expects to be aided in the preparation of a bill embodying the suggestions of the Quebec Conference, by deputations from the several provinces. It also appears to myself and the members of my Government, that to avoid the probable multiplied divergence of opinion in each Legislature, inseparable from discussing a great variety of details in several independent parliaments, despite of a general agreement in the main objects and principles of the general scheme, it is better for these provinces to avail themselves of the friendly arbitrament of the

Queen's Government and send delegates to consult with the latter during the preparation of the proposed Imperial Bill. The peculiar "views"—and this is the point—of each legislature might, if necessary, find expression in instructions to the delegates from each.

(Hear, hear.) So we find in this letter, which has been withheld from us, a suggestion that amendments can be made to the scheme in the form of instructions to the delegates from each of the several legislatures; and yet honorable gentlemen have stated that these resolutions were, in point of fact, a treaty, which this Legislature could not alter or amend in the least important particular, but that honorable members must say "aye" or "nay" upon them precisely as they stand! (Hear, hear.) There are three material circumstances here cited—first, the discrepancies in regard to the export duties on lumber, coals and other minerals; second, the discretion which is reserved to the Lower Provinces, by their legislatures, to alter and amend the resolutions; and third, the dissent by two of the delegates to the so-called treaty, although we have been informed by our own Government that the Conference was unanimously in favor of it. (Hear, hear.) I desire explanations from the Ministry on these important points. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. GALT.—As to the first point, I can only say that full explanations have already been given on several occasions; with reference to the second point, the Canadian Government is not responsible for the opinions of the delegates after they left this country; and as regards the third point, His Excellency the Governor General sent down the correspondence to this House as fully as he thought proper, and I presume the lieutenant-governors of the other provinces did the same.

HON. MR. DORION—I will remind the honorable gentleman that there is another discrepancy. The French copy of the resolutions before the House is exactly in accordance with the printed document sent from Nova Scotia, and with the copy sent to members by the Hon. Provincial Secretary, while the English copy now before the House is different. Now, of these different versions which is the correct one, and where has the alteration been made? The importance of the question is, I think, very great; for if the version given in this *Blue-Book* from Nova Scotia, and in the French copy, be correct, we in Lower Canada will have a right to impose, for local purposes, an export duty

on all timber, either from Upper or Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) The resolution is in plain terms, and declares that the General Government shall have no right to impose an export duty on timber, but that the local governments shall.

HON. MR. BROWN—The right copy is that in the Speaker's hands, of course.

HON. MR. DORION—But there are two versions of it—the one in English differing from that in French.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—I moved the resolutions in English, and if there is any difference in the French copy, it is an error in the translation.

HON. MR. DORION—Well, if the English copy is the right one, the General Government will have the right to impose an export duty on all timber except that exported from New Brunswick, and on all coals and minerals except from Nova Scotia.

SEVERAL MEMBERS—That is the right one.

MR. DE NIVERVILLE—MR. SPEAKER, as the junior member of this honorable House, it was proper that I should be the last to speak on the question which now engages our attention. A very few days before the commencement of the present session, I did not know that I should fill the seat which I now occupy in this chamber, and should be called on to vote on the question of Confederation, and take part in the debate upon it. Accordingly, I have not had time, as most of the honorable members who have spoken on the scheme submitted to the House have had, to prepare myself to treat it in a political and diplomatic sense, and to examine the basis on which it rests. If, on the other hand, I had had the time necessary to make myself thoroughly acquainted with it in all its bearings, I should have acted not otherwise than I shall now act. I should have left, as now, to other members of this House better qualified than I am in respect of knowledge, and the discussion and consideration of great political questions, which are the fruit of a long service in Parliament—I should have left to such honorable members the office of viewing the question in the various aspects which distinguish it. (Hear, hear.) As member for the chief place of the district of Three Rivers, and a French-Canadian, I ought to speak in explanation of my views. The difficult position of the country for the last few years, arising from the equal strength of the two parties in the political arena, and rendering the administration of public affairs arduous to the va-

rious ministries which had, one after another, come into power—that position, I say, necessitated a change which might put an end to such a deplorable state of affairs. Our situation was like that of the Roman Empire when near its fall. The union, as the Hon. Attorney General for Lower Canada (Hon. Mr. CARTIER) so well said, had lasted its time; it now became necessary to try something else. It was necessary that the nation which, of all the different races which inhabit the British Provinces in North America, is foremost in duration, energy and prosperity, should take the lead and initiate that measure which was to deliver the country from its difficulties. Well, Mr. SPEAKER, the most natural remedy which occurred was the scheme for the Confederation of the English Provinces on this continent, and as the opponents of the measure—men who have thrown all their powers, courage and perseverance into their opposition—have never moved any other, it seemed to be the only one which found acceptance. This scheme has not had the effect of producing fear in my mind, as it has in several members who have spoken before me. After careful examination, I have arrived at the conclusion that it is practicable, and that it ought to be adopted. I am well aware that it is not perfect, for there is nothing perfect in this nether world. It was not possible to take every advantage for Lower Canada, and to leave nothing for Upper Canada and the Maritime Provinces. Some concessions were necessary to be made in common justice, as we were obtaining great material advantages, together with the preservation and protection of our dearest interests. In short, it was necessary that we and they should make what is generally termed a compromise, and that compromise was such as to be in our favor in every respect. I do not profess to be a religious man, but I may venture to assert, without transgressing the bounds of modesty, that I love and revere my religion as much as any other man in this House. Before, therefore, I could form any decided opinion on the question that is now before the House, and give my vote in favor of it, I did not omit to consult our priests. I have always blamed the conduct of those priests who interfered in elections and matters of policy, acting the parts of canvassers and ultra-partisans, instead of endeavoring from the pulpit—the very abode of truth—to calm the animosities of parties, and to aid the people in making an honest, free, independent and judicious choice, and turning in a manner the pulpit of truth

itself into a political tribune, from which they promulgate principles which might be termed seditious. Such conduct I have always condemned. I love to find in the members of the clergy those virtues which ought to characterise them; and as now the business in hand is not the election of a member of Parliament, but a complete change in the Constitution of the country, it is my opinion that they ought to be considered citizens, and to enjoy as fully and completely as any other class the endowments and privileges which belong to others, and that, as others have, so should they have a right to examine the new Constitution which we are to receive, and to give their opinion on its merits and imperfections. Relying on the judgment and the intelligence of certain of this order, I thought it right to consult them. I had recourse to two members of the clergy of the district of Three Rivers—men of great learning, and eminently qualified to give an opinion on the scheme of Confederation—men who were perfectly free from the spirit of party, without political bias or personal ambition to be gratified in preference to the interests of the country, and whose opinions were entitled to respect as being the fruit of a life of study and labor constantly employed to increase the happiness and prosperity of their fellow-citizens and their country, and to protect our religious institutions. (Hear, hear.) I have no intention to name those two venerable men, who are known throughout the country as two of the most distinguished members of our Canadian clergy and most eminent citizens. Well, Mr. SPEAKER, I consulted those two men, and both agreed in making answer that they were favorable to the project of Confederation of the British North American Provinces on this continent. Resting, then, on my own convictions that Confederation is the best means we have at hand of escaping from the present difficult position of the country, and on the authority of members of the clergy—an authority which I take pleasure in mentioning, because the opponents of the Ministerial plan have affected to believe that all the clergy in the country are opposed to the measure—thus supported, Mr. SPEAKER, I hold it to be my duty, and I do not hesitate to give my vote in favor of the principle and the project of Confederation. Certain apprehensions have arisen in the public mind relative to the project in question; these fears, I need not say, have been excited by the opponents of the measure, who make themselves hoarse with crying that French-Canadian

nationality would be swallowed up by Confederation, and that in twenty-five or thirty years' time there would not be a single French-Canadian left in Lower Canada. Well, Mr. SPEAKER, I appeal, to prove the falsehood of these declarations, to the men who in 1840—the time of the union of the two provinces—labored with so much zeal and energy to guard the natural depository of our social and religious rights from danger—I appeal, to prove it, to those men who applied all their energy, their abilities, and their patriotism to prevent the union; to those men who, endowed with a singleness of mind at least equal to that which animates the opponents of Confederation, procured numerous petitions to be signed against the union of Upper and Lower Canada; to those men, in short, who predicted that in ten years' time there would not be a single French-Canadian left—these men I summon to the bar of public opinion, and I ask them—"Gentlemen, did you predict truly? What has become of that French-Canadian nationality which was to be swallowed up by the union? Has it disappeared, as you said it would? See and judge for yourselves." That nation, which was doomed to be annihilated, has built up Montreal, the first commercial city in the two Canadas—Montreal, on which the honorable member for Richelieu (Mr. PERRAULT) pronounced such a pompous eulogy in his speech the other evening—an eulogy that he extended to the country generally—praising its immense resources and growing prosperity. It was under the union and through the union that the splendid Victoria Bridge was erected, the most magnificent work of the kind in the world. Under its auspices, also, we constructed those immense canals which have received honorable mention from the lips of the honorable member for Richelieu; and everybody knows that that honorable member is eminently qualified to pronounce a judgment on such matters, having seen and examined the canals constructed in Europe. Accordingly we are justified in saying that our canals are immeasurably superior to the canals of Europe, as he tells us in respect to several of our canals, that a boy in the smallest of skiffs could touch the *revêtement* walls with his two tiny oars. I must say that I do not accept the interpretation put on that part of the honorable member's speech by the honorable member for Montcalm (Mr. JOSEPH DUFRESNE), in which he said that there were men on the bench of bishops as well informed and as eminent as any that were to be found

in any ministry. This is the interpretation I put on that phrase of the honorable member for Richelieu, and I do not think I mistake in saying that it turns against those who, at the time of the union of the two Canadas, did everything they could to prevent it. In 1840 those men, those good and zealous patriots, told the people, by way of serving their cause, that in twenty-five years there would not be a single French-Canadian left in Lower Canada; and now the honorable member for Richelieu comes out and gives them the lie direct by saying that, at this present time, the Roman Catholic bench of bishops numbers among its members men—of course French-Canadians—who are as eminent for their talents and acquirements as the most distinguished members of our political world; and that religion is amply protected by the present Constitution, which was nevertheless destined, according to those great patriots, to swallow us up and sweep us from the face of the continent.

MR. DENIS—That is very true.

MR. DE NIVERVILLE—One word to comfort those French-Canadians who are afraid of suffering wrong in the Federal Parliament, being as they say an insignificant minority of that body. Ever since nations began to comprehend their true interests, a certain equilibrium has been established which it will always be their aim to maintain. This constitutes the protection which the union of two weak parties affords against a strong one, which would aggrandize itself at their expense. This law of equilibrium is reproduced in all times and places—among nations and among individuals: it is found even among animals. For what purpose did the two first nations in the world, France and England, unite together to resist the invading forces of the powerful despot of the north—the Emperor of Russia, and what was the object of the campaign in the Crimea? Was it to reap the barren glory of shouting that the French soldiers rushed to the assault with the impetuous speed of the thunderbolt; that the English soldiers received the enemy's fire without yielding a foot; that they marched with the cool determination of a wedge of iron against the enemy's squares, and that nothing could resist their onward movement? By no means. Those two powers were perfectly acquainted with the qualities which distinguished their respective armies, and did not need to put them to the proof. Their intention was simply to prevent the

rious ministries which had, one after another, come into power—that position, I say, necessitated a change which might put an end to such a deplorable state of affairs. Our situation was like that of the Roman Empire when near its fall. The union, as the Hon. Attorney General for Lower Canada (Hon. Mr. CARTIER) so well said, had lasted its time; it now became necessary to try something else. It was necessary that the nation which, of all the different races which inhabit the British Provinces in North America, is foremost in duration, energy and prosperity, should take the lead and initiate that measure which was to deliver the country from its difficulties. Well, Mr. SPEAKER, the most natural remedy which occurred was the scheme for Confederation of the English Provinces or continent, and as the opponents of the r—men who have thrown all their power and perseverance into their or have never moved any other, it is the only one which found acceptance. The scheme has not had the effect I fear in my mind, as it has in the hands of those who have spoken before me. At the examination, I have arrived at the conclusion that it is practicable. I am well satisfied that it will be more in fact, for there is a new régime, as it can be made use of not only in the advantage for the Parliament and local legislatures, Provinces, but also in the supreme courts which will be re-instituted in the country. I obtain what I desire when that time arrives—that is to wit, when the Confederation is established, we shall have a fuller use of our language. For what liberty have we in its use in this chamber? That liberty which the liberals have vaunted so highly, which cannot be touched without destroying it, in what way have we it here? Has it been conceded to us in the full acceptance of the word? By no means, Mr. SPEAKER; we have it, but it is as TANTALUS had the water—he was thirsty, but he drank not; though the water bubbled to his lips, the water receded as soon as he attempted to receive it. (Hear, hear.) In truth, what kind of liberty have we, who do not understand the English language? We are at liberty to hold our tongues, to listen, and to understand if we can. (Hear, hear, and continued laughter.) Under the Confederation, the Upper Canadians will speak their language, and the Lower Canadians theirs, just as we do now; with this difference, that they who count a large majority of their countrymen in the

itself into a political tribune promulgate principles which are seditious. Such conduct is condemned. I love to see the clergy those who characterise them; their hand is not the hand of the Parliament, but of the constitution. They ought to enjoy class privilege.

our public lands), has been the principal cause of that stupid mania in which all seem to be seized who have lived some time among our neighbors and returned to Canada. To give you an idea of that lamentable mania, I shall relate a circumstance in which I was one of the actors. Not two months since, I was on the platform at the station where the branch from Arthabaska to Three Rivers leaves the Grand Trunk, when two young men, dressed in the American fashion, came to the hotel. One, as he came in, called out in a loud voice, "Where is the ostler?" The man, who was a stout Canadian, soon made his appearance, and as soon as he set eyes on the gentleman, called out in his turn, "What! Joe, is it you?" (*Tiens! c'est toi, John!*) Of course our pretended American was taken aback, and for the moment dumfounded. Seeing his embarrassment, and willing, in pity to the poor victim of affectation, to relieve him from it, although it had its comic side, I called to the stableman and said, "Go and take the gentlemen's horses; don't you see they are Americans, and that they don't understand you." Well, Mr. SPEAKER, such scenes frequently occur; nay, those who move now and then from home may see them every day. So if we do not wish our beautiful language to lose its influence, we must not fail to discountenance the affectation of Canadians talking English when they hardly know a word of it. Otherwise we must take to talking English, and let our own language

disuse and oblivion. For our
 have no fears. The experience of
 guarantee for the future. We
 those times when Paradise
 reward of all who ill-treated
 different from their own.

ays in which wars and
 ons were begotten of
 world is too civilized
 h were then con-
 man is free to
 ases, and this
 be noted as
 n. True,
 the Eng-
 unfortu-
 rking

—

a

7

.

the other

be the ruin of

must confess, Mr.

that I am not one of those who

near and distrust of British domina-
 tion. As long as we live under the sway of
 free England, I have not the least doubt
 that our language will be fully protected,
 and that in fifty years from this present time,
 good Catholics will be allowed the exercise
 of their religion as freely, as safely and as
 piously as this day, and that the wicked will
 not be compelled to be more religious than
 they now are. (Hear, hear.) The hon.
 member for Bagot told us that there are a
 great number of Catholics in England, and
 that they are perfectly at liberty to exercise
 their religion at their pleasure, but that they
 are not represented in the English Parliament.
 This, far from being a proof of intolerance,
 I take to be a proof of their tolerant
 character, since, although able to oppress
 the Catholics, they leave them at full liberty
 to fulfil the pious exercises of their religion.
 I repeat it, Mr. SPEAKER, there are fau-
 tics in all religions; happily for humanity, they
 are but a small minority, and men of good
 sense hold them in contempt. (Hear, hear.)
 Our institutions are secured to us by our
 treaties with Great Britain; our laws by the
 articles of Confederation. What coercion,
 what restraint or opposition have we to ap-
 prehend from the Mother Country, when the
 subject of the British Government is acknow-
 ledged throughout the whole world to be of
 all men the most free? Most free in the

exercise of his rights as a citizen; as free in
 speech and action as he is secure in his per-
 son, wherever he may find occasion to assert
 his rights, to uphold them and defend them.
 I say "wherever," because the English peo-
 ple can, with as perfect freedom and perfect
 confidence, state their grievances before any
 tribunal and all authorities, from the highest
 to the lowest, as they can in the bosom of
 their families or in a circle of intimate
 friends. We, moreover, possess one infalli-
 ble means—based on the laws of Nature
 herself—of preserving to the French-Can-
 adians in all their purity their language, their
 religion, their institutions and their laws;
 and that means is education—the education
 which we receive first from the authors of
 our existence in our childhood, and which is
 afterwards continued in our elementary
 schools and our seminaries; that education—
 Christian, moral and religious—which is so
 carefully, wisely and anxiously instilled into
 us in our youthful days by the masters and
 tutors of our colleges; that practical educa-
 tion which we acquire in the course of our
 dealings and transactions with men of busi-
 ness. That education it is, Mr. SPEAKER,
 which renders nations prosperous, rich and
 great, which elevates them to the rank of
 which they are worthy, and maintains them
 in it. It never fades from the mind on
 which it has been impressed—it remains
 fixed on the memory, like the characters
 which we engrave on the bark of a
 young tree, and which are found long
 years after, when it falls under the wood-
 man's axe. As the representative of
 the city of Three Rivers, I may be allowed
 to say a few words relative to the advantages
 which Confederation will bring to that dis-
 trict. Every one knows that it possesses
 immense tracts of land not yet opened out
 to the settler, magnificent forests of timber of
 all kinds, and mines of inestimable value.
 It is beyond question that Three Rivers
 yields the best iron in the country. This
 was proved at the Great Exhibition at
 London, where the first medals were awarded
 to the Radnor Ironworks Company for the
 best iron-wheels, in respect of durability,
 elegance and quality. The St. Maurice has
 been grossly neglected by the various Ad-
 ministrations which, during the last ten
 years, have held office, although the district
 yielded a revenue of \$30,000 or \$40,000 to
 the public chest, which might have entitled
 it to some compensation. Nevertheless, the

district of Three Rivers is not behind other districts in the country, either in industrial success or in the energy and enterprise of its inhabitants. The Arthabaska Railway, which it was said would not pay running expenses, is at present more productive than any part of the Grand Trunk Railway. We need colonization roads and railways, and I am convinced that under the Confederation, when we shall have the management of our own funds without the interference of Upper Canada, we shall build railways in all parts where the requirements of trade and industrial pursuits call for them. We shall then offer to the settler well-made and well-kept roads, and the district of Three Rivers will derive precious results from them, as well as other districts of the country. (Hear, Hear.) We have a proof of the rapidity with which the district of Three Rivers would grow, if it were encouraged. This is found in the parishes of St. Maurice, St. Etienne, Ste. Flore and Shawinigan. It is nearly twenty-five years since St. Maurice was a mere forest; now it is a large, rich, and beautiful parish, of which the district of Three Rivers has reason to be proud. It numbers upwards of five hundred voters with the parish of Mont Carmel, which is an offset from it. The extensive trade in timber which is carried on in the valley of the St. Maurice, and which employs thousands of laborers, is an important element in the commercial business of the country, exporting to a great amount the lumber which is taken from the extensive territory—if I may be allowed the expression—belonging to the district of Three Rivers; and these vast tracts which await the settler, those iron mines so rich and so well known, those mines of other minerals still hidden in the mountains and valleys of the St. Maurice, those riches of all kinds which abound there await only the hand of man to render the district and city of Three Rivers an important part of Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) The Ministers of the Crown in Canada have been accused of bringing up the question of Confederation only as a means of retaining power and increasing it. The Hon. Attorney General for Lower Canada has been accused of moving that measure only that he may become Lieutenant-Governor of Lower Canada. Well, Mr. SPEAKER, I am thoroughly convinced that that honorable Minister has too much energy, is too laborious, to seek or to accept an office

in which he would have nothing to do. (Hear, hear.) For my part, I make a present to the Opposition of all the profit I am likely to derive from places or dignities under Confederation, when we have it. I repel the idea that Canadian statesmen allowed themselves to be influenced by paltry notions of personal interest, when they set about devising means to extricate us from the difficulties in which we were involved. They had in view only the interests of the nation, and never had a thought, as some have insinuated, of delivering the country up to ruin and desolation. I conclude, Mr. SPEAKER, by declaring that I am in favor of Confederation, and opposed to the appeal to the people, because I believe it to be perfectly useless. An hon. member who spoke yesterday told us that the clergy are not qualified to form a judgment on the project of Confederation. Now, I ask you, if the clergy are not qualified to form a judgment on such a question, how the people can form one who have not the necessary education? How can they comprehend the aggregate and the details of the scheme, and ascertain whether it would be beneficial to them or not? I repeat that I am in favor of the project now under consideration—first, because I declared myself favorable to the measure when I presented myself to my constituents; and, secondly, because I think it necessary and even indispensable, and calculated moreover to promote the interests of the country in general, and those of Lower Canada and the district of Three Rivers in particular.—(Cheers.)

MR. GAGNON — Mr. SPEAKER, the scheme of a Confederation of the provinces now before this House is one too deeply interesting to be received in silence. If I rise to speak on this occasion, it is for the simple purpose of justifying my opinion on the subject, by stating my reasons for entertaining it; and as I am not in the habit of making speeches, I crave the indulgence of the House. It is the opinion of members on the other side of the House that the country will derive great advantages from this union; but those advantages depend, as most people think, on the contingencies of an unknown future, and by others, are looked upon as the doubtful results of a hazardous and dangerous speculation, which will involve the ruin of our credit. Not only, Mr. SPEAKER, do we risk our capital, which will be lost in the execution of this great scheme;

not only do we ruin, by this new union, the credit of our country, but we Lower Canadians risk everything that is dear to us, even our nationality, while knowing that we can gain nothing by the change. As an inducement to Lower Canada to accept this scheme, we are promised a railway to open up an intercourse of commerce with the Lower Provinces, and we are given to believe that this great commerce to be opened up by the grand line of communication will be a vast benefit to us; but those who will take time to reflect may come to a different conclusion, without any danger of being mistaken, for those provinces have nothing to exchange with us. We have the same productions as they have, and in greater abundance than any of them. They have nothing but coal which we do not possess, and that is not transported by railway. This railway will, as a matter of course, lead to the expenditure of enormous sums for building it, and will afterwards cost us a great deal in repairs and working expenses, and after all, will only be of use as a substitute for a few schooners which carry down our produce to the Gulf Provinces every season. This, Mr. SPEAKER, will be a dear price to pay for the complete destruction of our little inland navigation, which ought rather to be protected. The amount of expenditure involved in the building of this railway, if wisely applied to the opening of colonization roads, to the improvement of roads and bridges, and the clearing of the public lands, would be much more beneficial to the people of this province, who would find in these things a degree of satisfaction and happiness which would enable them to do without Confederation, which would be no cure for our political troubles. A little more good-will and calmness in discussing the question, would have stifled the cry for representation based on population, and our country would have been able to go on under the actual union, which is less dangerous and less expensive than that which is now proposed by the Government. I should have had other remarks to offer, Mr. SPEAKER, but I am obliged to postpone them, as hon. members must be worn out with their long sittings, and the lateness of the hour. (Cheers.)

HON. MR. HUNTINGTON said—I do not intend, Mr. SPEAKER, to occupy the time of the House in any lengthened remarks; and yet as a member representing a constituency of this country, I do not feel

disposed to give a vote on this question, without saying at least a word upon it. And it occurs to me—and I say it in the best spirit, and with no intention to cast a reflection upon honorable gentlemen opposite—that if there is so great a desire as appears to exist to-night on the part of honorable members to express themselves upon this question—many of them who are favorable to the scheme as well as opposed to it—and if it is found that the opportunity is curtailed, the responsibility does not at any rate rest upon this side of the House. (Hear, hear.) I do not, as I have said, propose at this late hour to enter at any considerable length into a discussion of this measure; but there are points that present themselves to me as possessing considerable importance, that have not, I believe, been brought out during the progress of the debate; and if an opportunity is subsequently given for remarking upon them, I may avail myself of it. But I cannot forbear remarking now, in reference to the announcement made by the Government the other night, that in a certain sense I consider it was a step in the right direction. I believe it was then stated that a mission would be sent to England to consult with the Imperial Government with a view of arranging definitely the question of the defence of this country, and the proportion of the cost of defence to be borne by the respective countries. Now, without desiring or intending to occupy the time of the House by raising a debate upon this point, I cannot help observing that it was desirable, before this scheme of Confederation was adopted at all by the Conference, that this arrangement should have taken place with the Imperial Government—that it should have been preliminary to the plan of union proposed, and that the Conference should have taken upon itself to arrange with the Imperial Government the proportionate expense which is to be borne by the two countries in relation to the defence of these provinces; for, let it be borne in mind that this question has been forced upon us in Canada as the only means of preparing the country against the aggression of our neighbors; and yet we are asked in adopting this scheme, to go to a great extent in the dark. We are asked to adopt it, and at the same time it is known that the result must be a change in respect to the proportion of defence we in this country will be called upon

to bear. It has been said that the disposition in England to take part in our defence was owing to the fact that Canada had manifested a disposition also to make provision for defence. Now, supposing we should fail at any time hereafter to bear what may be considered in England a fair proportion of this cost, what would be the consequence? Why, we might be placed again in precisely the same position in which we find ourselves to-day. England might withdraw her troops from this province, and refuse to engage in any defensive works, unless we undertook more than in the opinion of the people of this country we are able to bear; and hence it is my opinion that if it was desirable that this question of Confederation should be submitted to the people at all for their adoption, the first and indispensable step to have taken was to arrange with the Imperial Government the terms and conditions as regards the question of defence upon which we are to enter this new state of political existence. In this sense I do not regret that the scheme, as far as the Lower Provinces are concerned—judging from recent events in New Brunswick and the utterances of public men in the other colonies—is likely to be delayed in its accomplishment; and I am not sorry that the Canadian Government, by this action of the Lower Provinces, will be compelled to consult with the Imperial authorities and arrange with them the proportion we are to bear of the cost of maintaining the defence of the country. (Hear, hear.) It may be almost providential that we are compelled, by the force of circumstances in the Lower Provinces, to take this step now; and I must say that heretofore there has been a disposition manifested on the part of the Government to keep the people in ignorance upon this subject; but I trust that when these negotiations shall have taken place with the Imperial Government, we shall know precisely what the Government has done and what it has agreed to do, and that the exact proportion of expense that we are expected to bear will be laid before this House and submitted to the opinion of the people of this country. (Hear, hear.) I make these remarks, sir, merely because to me the point appears to be a very important one, and because I believe the fullest information will be indispensable to this House in the future discussions that may take place upon this subject. (Hear, hear.) There is another point that has suggested

itself, to which, perhaps, I may be permitted to allude in a few words. I wish to do so without reflecting upon any hon. member of this House; but I cannot help feeling and expressing extreme regret, as a Canadian and a British subject, at the spirit that has characterized this discussion upon Confederation and defence on the part of those hon. gentlemen who support this scheme. Sir, in a British Legislature, where it is proposed to build up a great monarchical constitution on this continent, on the model which has flourished in England, I regret that any honorable gentleman should have found it necessary to charge a seditious and disloyal intention upon all those who cannot agree with them in supporting this scheme. (Hear, hear.) For myself—I say it sincerely and earnestly, though I have boasted less of my loyalty and attachment to the British Crown and Constitution than some hon. members of this House—I think I may say there is no one who loves more than I love the British constitutional system, no man who desires more than I desire to see copied here that British constitutional-monarchical system, and no man who believes more firmly than I believe that it would give to the people of these colonies that greatness, prosperity and freedom that have distinguished the people from whom we have sprung on the other side of the water. (Hear, hear.) But if this debate is considered to be of sufficient importance to have a place among the records of the country—to go down to posterity as the serious utterances of our public men, I think it is a cause of deep regret that hon. gentlemen opposite, in view of that great patriotism of which they have boasted so much, and which they affirm has induced them to sink minor considerations of party and personal antagonism for the sake of carrying a principle of which they profess to be the disinterested and self-denying exponents, have not seen fit, in the discussion of this question, to discuss it like statesmen, and not brand as infamous, traitorous and rebellious those who differ from them in their view of it. (Hear, hear.) I think the people of this country, whether belonging to the Conservative or the Reform party, will feel a deep regret at this; and if there is one thing more than another that indicates that the present like past coalitions is going to result in advantage to the Conservative at the expense of the Reform party—if there is one thing more than another that makes me fear that

the Reform members of the Government, for whom I have a strong political as well as personal sympathy, will be overwhelmed by their conservative colleagues—it is this cry, this bugbear, this *bête noire* of annexation raised by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. Why, sir, it is only a few months since we had the great Constitutional party organized in this country, and baptized with an amount of eloquence and parade such as never attended the birth of a party in any other country. We were told by the leaders of this great Constitutional party that the British Constitution in this country must be defended; that the country was divided into two parties—the Annexation party and the Constitutional party—and that the reformers composed the former, while the conservatives desired to perpetuate British connection. My hon. friend the member for Lambton was singled out for attack, and told that he and those with whom he acted desired to hand the country over to the Americans; that he was unfaithful and untrue to his allegiance; that he carried the sign of democracy on his face; and the whole Reform party was branded last summer by the Conservative leaders as annexationists, who desired to uproot and overthrow the British institutions of this country. Well, sir, what do we find now? We find the same charges hurled at the minority in this House—my hon. friends who sit around me—by the leaders of this same great Constitutional party; and we find the Honorable Provincial Secretary, the Honorable Postmaster General, and the Honorable President of the Council—for all of whom, I confess, I yet feel a strong political sympathy—sitting silently by, while their old friends and former colleagues are suffering the same abuse that was dealt out to them by their present colleagues only a few short months ago. Have they suddenly turned to view these charges as just, or do they still think, as they thought last summer, that they are unfair and unfounded? If they were unfair then, is it right now that, without a word of expostulation, they should allow them to be hurled at us without a word of expostulation from the great Liberal party of Upper Canada, that has suffered with us from these disgraceful, foul and slanderous imputations? (Hear, hear.) Is it liberal, is it just, is it fair, is it manly, sir, that they should now sit silently by and see the handful who compose the minority in this House—honorable gentlemen with whom, but a short time

since, they acted and in whom they had confidence—branded, as they themselves were branded six months ago, with the name of annexationist and democrat? (Hear, hear.) I have thought, as I have heard these charges reiterated, that they might have interposed; I have thought they might have pitied us a little for the sake of former associations. I have thought that the great Liberal party of Upper Canada might have come a little to the rescue of their former colleagues, and said to those who uttered these false accusations—“Don’t hound down these men too much; we know and have acted with them: they are not annexationists, they are not rebellious, and we know that your accusations against them are unfair and ungenerous.” But, sir, throughout this debate these members of the Government have listened to attacks of this kind—the great Reform party of Upper Canada, which only yesterday, as it were, was smarting under the lash that is now cracked over our heads, which only yesterday writhed under the odium of these false representations—sat silently by, without a word of expostulation, without a word in defence of their old friends, whom they know to be unjustly and slanderously accused. (Hear, hear.) Now, why I speak of this matter is because I fear that these gentlemen, who have long been the exponents of that great Liberal party, which has gained for us responsible government and everything worth living for under the political system we now enjoy, will be overwhelmed by the preponderance of conservative feeling in the Government and conservative influence in the country. I know that they do not feel comfortable under the present state of affairs. I know how the McKELLARS, the MACKENZIES, who have been so long the victims of conservative sneers, and others who have long fought the battle of reform, must feel; but I fear that the conservative leaven is about to leaven the whole lump.

MR. RYMAL—Except me.

HON. MR. HUNTINGTON—My hon. friend, in the able speech he made upon this subject, excepted himself, and there is no need for me to except him. I say, sir, it is but yesterday since the organs of hon. gentlemen opposite, who lead the Constitutional party of this country, denounced us all as Americans and annexationists; and I warn the hon. members of the Liberal party, who sit quietly by while these charges are still made against the minority, that the measure which

is meted out to us now, and to them last summer, may again be dealt out to them without mercy. (Hear, hear.) I repeat, sir, I have, since this Coalition took place, seen no sign so perfect and so convincing to me, that the conservatives have had the best of the bargain, as this—to see those hon. gentlemen sitting tamely and silently in their seats, and not rising to say a word while the old cry under which they had writhed for so many years is fulminated against their former allies, and we have no indication from them that they are not the party which they once were. With these remarks, and reserving to myself the right of speaking more at length on the scheme, which I would be glad to discuss somewhat fully if time had been allowed, I have simply to say that the constituency which I represent is not disposed to permit me to vote for this scheme. I say this from knowledge, having been compelled to be a good deal among them while attending to my business. In the Eastern Townships, both among the French and English, the general opinion is strongly against this scheme. I have had such opportunities of learning the views and wishes of my constituents with reference to this matter, as few other hon. gentlemen have enjoyed for learning the opinion of those whom they represent, and I come back to this House very much strengthened in the conviction that in the Eastern Townships, and especially in the constituency which I represent—

MR. POPE—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. HUNTINGTON—The hon. member says "Hear, hear," but I think I may speak in behalf of a large number of petitioners in the county of Compton—(hear, hear)—there is a large majority of the people opposed to this scheme. I have felt it to be my duty, as no one had risen to speak from the point of view I have taken, that I should say a word for those who were opposed to the scheme, and that as there was no one here to speak for the Eastern Townships, where so strong a feeling pervaded the masses against the scheme, I would but discharge my duty in rising to state what I found to be the feeling in those townships. (Hear, hear.) I have no doubt that the Conservative party have large following in the Eastern Townships. I have no doubt that a great many of those who follow the hon. member for Sherbrooke are disposed to follow him in supporting the scheme; but I speak for the Liberal party

of those townships, with whose opinions I have had an excellent opportunity of becoming acquainted. I do not say that the hon. member for Compton is not supported by that party in the position which he has taken, but I do say that those people in the Eastern Townships, as a general thing, who sympathize with the Liberal party, are opposed to the scheme in the circumstances under which it has been presented to the people. I was not a little surprised by a remark which fell from my hon. friend the member for Richmond and Wolfe (MR. WEBB). I know perfectly well the hon. gentleman's sincerity, and therefore I was singularly struck with the position he took. While he seemed to admit the general feeling of apprehension which prevailed, and the unpopularity of the scheme in the Townships, yet he would vote for the whole scheme, reserving to himself the right to deal with details. The scheme having been adopted by this House as a whole, there is no probability whatever of the honorable gentleman getting a chance to vote upon the details a second time.

MR. WEBB—The resolutions have not been adopted, nor yet concurred in by the other provinces.

HON. MR. HUNTINGTON—Well, I am speaking of them as if they had been adopted. It makes no difference whether they are adopted or not in the other provinces for some time to come. So far as Canada is concerned, the scheme will be carried before this House rises, and there will be no further opportunity of dealing with its details. But suppose we should get the opportunity hereafter of voting on those details, in what position would be my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe, or my hon. friend from North Wellington (DR. PARKER)—in what position would they stand when they rose to move amendments to resolutions which they had only so short a time previously voted for? Would they not be reminded by honorable gentlemen opposite that they had swallowed the whole bait, hook and line, bob and sinker! (Laughter.) They say they will oppose the details in future; but if the details are incorrect, and they believe so, and they say they do, why not oppose them now? It was said by the honorable member for South Grenville (MR. SHANLY) that we ought to carry the whole scheme, let the details be ever so unsatisfactory, trusting to the Federal Legislature to detect and remedy them hereafter. Now I think that Canada

has had some experience in that way of doing things. Those details become vested right, and the sections benefited by them claim them as such, and tenaciously cling to them. (Hear, hear.) Mr. SPEAKER, I have not time to go into this subject at this point, and show how objectionable are many of the details; but I maintain the position that it is most absurd and illogical to ask us to accept the scheme as a whole, and leave such objectionable details to be regulated hereafter. When the union of these provinces took place in 1841, the discussion in relation to it in the British Houses of Parliament showed that the framers of the Union Act expected that any difficulties that might grow out of it would be easily regulated by the united Parliament of Canada—that, such questions as representation by population could be dealt with at any time. But what happened? Why! Lower Canada treated equal representation as a vested right, and stood firmly on that right. This being the case, there was no process provided by which the evil could be regulated. The result was that a great struggle came on, the difficulties arising out of which, honorable gentlemen opposite tell us, have proved our Constitution to be a failure. From this experience of the past, we ought to learn that it is very bad policy to deliberately put errors in our Constitution and trust to the future to remedy them. If you speak of a union of all British North America, nobody objects. Everybody is in favor of a union, provided the details are satisfactory; but providing imperfect details and trusting to the future for rendering them what they ought to have been made at the outset, reminds me of an incident a friend related the other day. A carter was about to take a friend of mine with his baggage to the railway station, when my friend observed that one of the tugs was nothing but a piece of rope. Says my friend, "You are not going to take me through these twenty miles of woods with that string, are you?" "Oh! never mind," says he, "I have more strings in my pocket with which I can regulate that on the road." So hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches ask us to follow them in their rickety concern, assuring us that they have a pocketful of strings with which they can regulate things on the way. (Laughter.) But, sir, they will find no little difficulty in bringing their pocketful of strings into operation. They will find almost insurmountable difficulties in the way of removing the vested rights that will grow up

under any system that may be established. I believe that a number of circumstances connected with this scheme, a discussion of which I cannot now go into, render it the general opinion of those whom it is my business to represent on this floor, that in its present shape this scheme ought not to be carried into effect. First of all, so sweeping a measure as this—one for sweeping away our entire Constitution and substituting a new one unknown to the British flag—ought not to be carried out until it is submitted to the people; and, secondly, the multitude of details which it embraces ought to be calmly and critically considered, with a view to their amendment, where found defective, before being incorporated in our Constitution. I do not say that this is the feeling of the Conservative party of my own constituency, or of the Eastern Townships; but I do say that even among that party there are grave apprehensions of difficulty growing out of such a jumble as is presented for our adoption, when no time is to be allowed even for their consideration, to say nothing of their amendment. And many of that party have no hesitation in giving expression to those feelings. I have not met with a man, conservative or reformer, during my absence from this session of the House, who has not been ready to contend that it was the first duty of the Government to provide for consulting the people, and ascertaining from them, in a definite manner, whether they desired the change proposed or not. (Hear, hear.) Having thus briefly expressed my views, Mr. SPEAKER, in order not to weary the House at this late hour of the night—or rather of the morning, for it is now after three o'clock—I will conclude by stating that I feel it my duty, as a true representative, to record my vote against the resolutions. (Cheers.)

MR. COWAN—Mr. SPEAKER, the honorable member for Shefford says that he and his friends sympathised with the Reform party of Upper Canada when they were branded as rebels and writhing under the charge of disloyalty, and blames us for not extending the same sympathy to him and his friends when laboring under a similar accusation. I don't deny, sir, that the reformers of Upper Canada have often been branded as rebels, but I do most emphatically deny that they ever *writhed* under the false accusation. Conscious of their fealty to both their Queen and country, they treated with the most sovereign con-

tempt every such foul, unfounded imputation against their loyalty. And I would advise the hon. member for Shefford to keep equally cool under similar provocation. If he and his friends are really loyal—and I have no doubt they are—all such aspersions of their loyalty, instead of affecting them, will only recoil on the heads of their accusers.

MR. T. R. FERGUSON said—Feeling and knowing as I do, Mr. SPEAKER, the great desire that is felt by the honorable gentlemen on the Treasury benches, and also, I am ready to admit, by the large majority of the honorable members of this House, that discussion should not be continued unnecessarily, and that no obstructions should be thrown in the way of an immediate decision on the question before us, I beg to state that it is not from choice but from necessity, that it is not from any desire of self-gratification, but from a deep sense of duty, that I rise to say a single word upon this occasion, particularly as so much has been said, and as the night is now so far advanced. I hope, therefore, that as I have remained silent during the debate up to the present moment, the House will hear with me while I briefly express my views on this all-important matter, and assign a few of the reasons that induce me to record my vote in the manner which I design. Sir, I would say that I stand here in a different position from that of many honorable members who submitted the resolutions embodying the Confederation scheme to their constituents, and who held public meetings on the subject, and who received from them positive instructions as to how their vote should be recorded. I received a circular from the Government, marked "Private," but took no action to ascertain public opinion on its contents, so that I am, I regret to say, without a single word of advice as to how I should act in the matter. I may say, sir, that after reading the resolutions over again and again, I found many things in them that I could not endorse. I felt that they were not that which we had expected from the Government, when we gave our assent to the Coalition that was formed for the purpose of bringing down some proposition for the settlement of our sectional difficulties. I had expected that if a union of the colonies took place at all, and a change of our Constitution in that direction was proposed, we would not have had a Federal but a Legislative form of Government. It has been stated, since we had the pleasure of meeting together in the present session, that the honorable gentlemen who went to the

Conference to represent Canadian views, and engage in preparing a scheme of union, could not obtain that union without its being based upon the Federal system. Sir, I feel that this is very much to be deplored, as I believe that with a union based on the Federal system, we shall have constant dissension, and before very many years, if this scheme goes into operation, we shall again have agitations for constitutional changes of various kinds, and that the ultimate result must be a perfect union under one Legislative Government for the whole country, and that now was the best time to settle the matter finally. If in the end, however, that should be the result of the long discussion we have had upon this Constitution, then I shall feel that though no amendments have been allowed on the floor of this House, yet the discussion has been productive of some good purpose. (Hear, hear.) I had resolved upon offering amendments upon various points in the scheme before us, but the motion for the "previous question" has shut them out, which I very much regret. It is too late now to enter into an explanation of these several amendments I was about to move, or to state what I contemplated accomplishing by proposing them. It is sufficient for me to say that the previous question having been proposed, I feel that there has not been that opportunity for the full consideration of the scheme in all its parts that was expected, or that ought to have been given to this House, in view of the fact that the people are not to be consulted in any other manner than by a vote of their representatives. (Hear, hear.) Being one of those, sir, who earnestly sought for a constitutional change, and who joined in the very just complaint of Upper Canada that she was compelled to labor under great grievances—the lack of equal rights with Lower Canada on this floor, man for man, while she also contributed much the larger proportion of the revenue—it is needless for me to say that I earnestly desired some change, that I sympathized with the prevailing sentiment of Upper Canada, and used my best endeavors, in the House and out of it, to assist in bringing about a remedy for our political and sectional ills. But, sir, we found we could not get representation according to population; and since the present scheme was announced, and knowing the strong feeling which exists against it on the part of many of the Lower Canada members, I endeavored to ascertain, on coming down here, the opinion of hon. gentlemen

from Lower Canada, and I found that, notwithstanding their opposition to the scheme of Confederation, which they were willing to do almost anything to defeat, they were still persistent in denying to Upper Canada a single shadow of a hope that her grievances would be redressed, if this scheme were rejected, by the granting of representation according to population. (Hear, hear.) Before coming here, too, I entertained the opinion that those honorable gentlemen from Upper Canada, who had fought so long and so uselessly for representation according to population, would join with me in endeavoring to get an amendment to the scheme before us adopted, giving us a Legislative instead of a Federal union. I soon found out, however, that there was little hope of getting such an amendment carried, because nine-tenths of them were determined to accept the scheme as it stood, simply because their leaders were in the Government. (Hear, hear.) My hon. friend the member for Shefford (Hon. Mr. HUNTINGTON), complains of this measure being forced upon the country; but if there is one hon. gentleman more than another chargeable with bringing about this state of affairs, it is that honorable gentleman. He once held a high and honorable position in the Government of this country. He is possessed of great ability, and being highly popular with his constituents, could well have afforded to have lent a helping hand to those who were desirous of having the union as it was work satisfactorily. I am satisfied that when he held the reins of power, if he was so anxious for the good-will, as well as for the reputation of the great Protestant and Reform party of Upper Canada, and so desirous of maintaining and protecting the rights which he now desires to have given to his friends, he would have used his power in the Government and his eloquence in the House to obtain even-handed justice for Upper Canada, and to relieve his friends in that portion of the province from the difficulties under which they labored. But, instead of doing that, he joined a Government that denied its members the privilege of voting for representation according to population—a Government that made it a close question, and which, instead of dealing with it as they ought to have done, or even giving us reason to hope well of the future, took such a course in relation to that great question as left a dark and dismal future before those who had been struggling for their rights on that question. As regards the position of that Government, after it was reconstructed, I believe I

am right in saying it was thoroughly understood that its members were not to vote for it.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—No; they were to vote as they liked.

MR. FERGUSON—Well, whatever may have been their privileges, we all know that there was nothing done in the matter, although they might have seen that it would be better to come out honestly and say that even-handed justice should be done to both Upper and Lower Canada. As this was my impression, Mr. SPEAKER, and seeing that no change could be made in the Constitution that would benefit Upper Canada, I felt I had a duty to perform—I felt that if they would not give us a change in the mode we desired, it was not for me to say that I would play the part of the dog in the manger. I feel it would be better to have almost any scheme, than to endure the difficulties we had labored under for so many years past; and I told the honorable gentlemen from Lower Canada that if that were the course they were to pursue, they would change my mind to a considerable extent. Another thing which had a peculiar effect on my mind, was the report of Col. JERVOIS on the defences of our country. It is impossible for me to deny that the speeches which have been made in the English Parliament, expressive of a want of sympathy with the Canadian people, and of a desire to get rid of Canada, have not been pleasant to me; and although I think I have a loyal heart, and am bound by powerful obligations to maintain British supremacy, I find it hard that English statesmen should express a willingness to shake us off and leave us in the power of a foreign nation. (Hear, hear.) But Col. JERVOIS was sent out to ascertain what defences were necessary, and what could be done to defend this country if at an unfortunate moment a difficulty might arise. When I see that his report declares that we have a difficult country to defend—that it would take a large number of men to put us into a condition to defend ourselves—and when I see that the British Government, true to its real instincts, is resolved to aid us in our defence—this, I say, has a great effect upon my mind, and makes me think it would not be my duty, under the circumstances, to refuse assent to the Government measure at a moment when I feel that the lives and property of my constituents, 30,000 in number, are open to an attack at any time from the powerful armies a foreign people might choose to bring up against them. (Hear.) The scheme seems to me to be an expensive and trouble-

some one; but I do not think it would be right for me to reject any measure calculated to ensure to us that assistance of which we stand so much in need. The United States are, perhaps, more willing to injure their neighbors than other countries are, owing to the universal idea that they must carry out the Munroe doctrine of complete domination over at least the American continent. They are at this moment a war-making and a war-loving people. For four years they have been practising the art of war upon their own flesh and blood, and have shown little sympathy with those who have been in congress with them and jointly concerned in every great enterprise—who grew with their growth, and strengthened with their strength; and I feel that they would have very little sympathy indeed with us in the event of any trouble arising either between us and them, or between them and the Mother Country. We are in a very difficult position. The Americans have done a great deal to provoke the wrath of England and to insult Canada. At this moment they want to abrogate the Reciprocity treaty, and talk of doing away with the bonding system. They lately imposed a passport system, which has only just been removed. Well, seeing that there was no redress for the grievances of Upper Canada, one Ministry falling after another without doing anything, and viewing our condition relatively to the United States, I feel it my duty to forego opposition to this new arrangement. When I saw the telegraphic despatch, too, relating to the debate in the House of Lords a few days ago; when I saw that there people were so interested in Canadian affairs, that on the question being put in the House of Lords it was declared by the leader of the House that no steps should be taken respecting the Hudson's Bay Company until some information should be received from Canada respecting the Confederation system; when I found that they were willing to be with us in peace and with us in war; when they said "Help yourself and we will help you"; when they said, in language stronger than words can convey, "Not a hair of your head shall be touched without returning the injury tenfold," I felt that we must support these new resolutions. (Hear.) I do not think, with my honorable friend who spoke to-day, that in three years there will be a cry for annexation. I think that in three years we shall be a stable people—that in three years we shall have sufficient defences to resist aggression—that in three years

we shall have risen in the estimation of England and the world at large—that our boundaries will extend from Canada to the Red River and the Saskatchewan. I agree with another honorable gentleman who has spoken to-day, and do not desire to see the young men of this country sent away into another country, when we have spacious limits of our own. I desire to keep our young men among us, and our old men too, as long as they live. (Hear, hear.) When I think that England is going to do much for us in other respects, I think she will be willing to open up that country; she will not be an unkind mother to us, and demand from her children that, when she has placed us in a position of difficulty, we should bear all the burdens. I believe, however, that we ought to put our shoulders to the wheel and do something for ourselves. That is the true spirit of Britons; for if we did not, we should be open to insult—and insult is worse than injury. Rather than have to bear with it, I am willing to risk the consequences of even a larger debt than we yet have—to give some of the means that I possess; and in saying and acting thus for myself, I am speaking and acting for my constituents too, who sent me here without any other pledge or bond than that I should do for them the best I could. I have made this the land of my adoption, and it is evident that any injury I impose on their children I impose on my own too. (Hear.) Whatever may be the result of the scheme—and I trust it will not turn out so badly as some honorable gentlemen seem to expect, and which I much dreaded myself—I trust we shall have such arrangements made with the Maritime Provinces, if arrangements are made with them, that we shall have a real union—not union mixed with disunion. (Hear, hear.) I believe that in the course of the summer we shall see millions of British capital spent here for our defence, and I see clearly that we shall have to contract debt for this purpose ourselves. But we have another duty to perform: we have to prepare the strong-hearted yeomen of this country to man our fortifications. England cannot supply us with all the men and money necessary to defend the province—that is the duty of our young men, and our middle aged men too. If we do not perform this duty, we shall not be worthy of the name of a people, not be worthy of the rights, liberties and privileges we enjoy. I will not detain the House much longer; but I must say that one remark I heard addressed to this Chamber to-day, seemed to me very

uncharitable. This House will believe me when I say that I was as much astonished as others to see a Government formed, composed of men of different parties; but, sir, I came to the conclusion that the state of parties at that time, and the conduct of some so-called friends of the Ministry then in power, led to such an event; and I do not blame the Conservatives who were in that Government for taking in other gentlemen, if by that course they could advance the interests of the country. I have heard it said that some members of the present Government were actuated in entering that Government by the greed of office, its emolument and its power; but I will not be so uncharitable as to make such an accusation against them. I believe they suffered a good deal personally in making the arrangement, and I should be sorry to say they did it for any other object than to satisfy the obligations of their conscience. Their object, sir, was, no doubt, the good of the country, not the small gain or the temporary pleasure of holding for a few years the position of Ministers. (Hear.) I trust they will discharge their duty as Ministers in such a way as to enable the people of the country to regard their advent to power with satisfaction—not to condemn them for wrong-doing as traitors to their country. (Hear, hear.) I think, sir, there are Ministers in the Cabinet who could make far more money in the pursuit of their various avocations than in governing the country, and I trust they will be as economical as they can in all their expenditure, while not losing sight of one great aim—that the people of this country must be prepared to defend themselves, so as not to be afraid of the threats and alarms that reach us every day. If in the end we arrive at a union of the colonies, good results will flow from it. I think we have no evil results to fear, though I would at this moment, if I could, remedy some of the faults in these seventy-two resolutions. I am sorry, for instance, for one thing—that the clause relating to the general education of the people of this country was inserted in its present shape into the resolutions. I am sorry the separate school system is to be retained for Upper Canada. I am sorry that bone of contention is to be incorporated into the permanent Constitution of this country. Though 52,000 Roman Catholic children in Upper Canada attended school in 1863, no more than 15,000 of them ever availed themselves of the separate schools.

A VOICE—You are wrong.

MR. FERGUSON—No, I beg the honor-

able gentleman's pardon, I am not wrong. I take the figures of the Superintendent of Education, Dr. RYERSON. And of my own knowledge, in places where separate schools have been established and are still existing, the Roman Catholics have grown weary of them, and I am satisfied they would now be willing that their children should get their education along with the children of the rest of the community, without any fear that their respect for their own religion would be interfered with, or their consciences injured. (Hear, hear.) I trust the day will come when they will all take the right view of it, and the question with them with reference to education may be—not what church they belong to—but how their children may receive the best education, and grow up with other youth in peace and harmony. I regret that the subject is mentioned in these resolutions. I had a resolution prepared on that matter, as well as another with regard to our canals, and I am sorry I have not had an opportunity of moving them. I trust, however, that the assurances given by the Honorable President of the Council will be carried out, and that a canal and a direct and unbroken communication from Lake Huron to Quebec will be an accomplished fact at no distant day. The people of Western Canada will be dissatisfied and bitterly disappointed if the honorable gentlemen on the Treasury benches neglect this; and if they do, they may rest assured that another cry will come, by and by, from Upper Canada which will remove them from their seats, as others have been removed from those seats before. (Hear, hear.) While money contributed by the west is spent in the east, we insist that the improvements necessary for the prosperity of Upper Canada should also receive the attention of the Government; and there is not a man in Upper Canada who does not see the necessity of having our navigation improved and a sufficient channel for sea-going vessels made to the seaboard. If this is attended to, there will not be so much to complain of about the Intercolonial Railroad being built, although we should like to have it built at a cheaper rate. In conclusion, I would say, that notwithstanding all the objections I may have to details—yet, in view of the relations in which we stand to the neighboring country—the urgency of the defence question, and the threatening aspect generally of our present position, I take upon myself, though with great reluctance, the responsibility of voting for this scheme. (Cheers.)

The House then divided on the motion for the previous question, "That that question be *now* put," which was agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS—Messieurs Alleyn, Archambeault, Ault, Beaubien, Bell, Bellerose, Blanchet, Bowman, Bown, Brousseau, Brown, Burwell, Cameron (Peel), Carling, Attorney General Cartier, Cartwright, Cauchon, Chambers, Chapais, Cockburn, Cornellier, Cowan, Currier, De Boucherville, Denis, De Niverville, Dickson, Dufresne (Montcalm), Dunsford, Ferguson (Frontenac), Ferguson (South Simcoe), Galt, Gaucher, Harwood, Haultain, Higginson, Howland, Irvine, Jackson, Jones (North Leeds and Grenville), Jones (South Leeds), Knight, Langevin, LeBoutillier, Attorney General Macdonald, MacFarlane, Mackenzie (Lambton), Mackenzie (North Oxford), Magill, McConkey, McDougall, McGee, McGiverin, McIntyre, McKellar, Morris, Morrison, Pope, Poulin, Poupore, Rankin, Raymond, Rémillard, Robitaille, Rose, Ross (Champlain), Ross (Dundas), Ross (Prince Edward), Scoble, Shanly, Smith (East Durham), Smith (Toronto East), Somerville, Sturton, Street, Sylvain, Thompson, Walsh, Webb, Wells, White, Willson, Wood, Wright (Ottawa County), and Wright (East York).—85.

NAYS—Messieurs Biggar, Bourassa, Cameron (North Ontario), Caron, Coupal, Dorion (Drummond and Arthabaska), Dorion (Hochelaga), Duckett, Dufresne (Iberville), Evanturel, Fortier, Gagnon, Gaudet, Geoffrion, Gibbs, Holton, Houde, Huntington, Huot, Joly, Labreche-Viger, Laframboise, Lajoie, Macdonald (Cornwall), Macdonald (Glengarry), Macdonald (Toronto West), O'Halloran, Pâquet, Parker, Perrault, Pinsonneault, Pouliot, Powell, Rymal, Scatcherd, Taschereau, Thibault, Tremblay, and Wallbridge (North Hastings).—39.

The question being put on the main motion (of Hon. Mr. Attorney General MACDONALD), it was agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS—Messieurs Alleyn, Archambeault, Ault, Beaubien, Bell, Bellerose, Blanchet, Bowman, Bown, Brousseau, Brown, Burwell, Cameron (Peel), Carling, Attorney General Cartier, Cartwright, Cauchon, Chambers, Chapais, Cockburn, Cornellier, Cowan, Currier, De Boucherville, Denis, De Niverville, Dickson, Dufresne (Montcalm), Dunsford, Evanturel, Ferguson (Frontenac), Ferguson (South Simcoe), Galt, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gibbs, Harwood, Haultain, Higginson, Howland, Huot, Irvine, Jackson, Jones (N. Leeds and Grenville), Jones (South Leeds), Knight, Langevin, LeBoutillier, Atty. Gen. Macdonald, MacFarlane, Mackenzie (Lambton), Mackenzie (North Oxford), Magill, McConkey, McDougall, McGee, McGiverin, McIntyre, McKellar, Morris, Morrison, Parker, Pope, Poulin, Poupore, Powell, Rankin, Raymond, Rémillard, Robitaille, Rose, Ross (Champlain), Ross (Dundas), Ross

(Prince Edward), Scoble, Shanly, Smith (East Durham), Smith (Toronto East), Somerville, Sturton, Street, Sylvain, Thompson, Walsh, Webb, Wells, White, Willson, Wood, Wright (Ottawa County), and Wright (East York).—91.

NAYS—Messieurs Biggar, Bourassa, Cameron (North Ontario), Caron, Coupal, Dorion (Drummond and Arthabaska), Dorion (Hochelaga), Duckett, Dufresne (Iberville), Fortier, Gagnon, Geoffrion, Holton, Houde, Huntington, Joly, Labreche-Viger, Laframboise, Lajoie, Macdonald (Cornwall), Macdonald (Glengarry), Macdonald (Toronto West), O'Halloran, Pâquet, Perrault, Pinsonneault, Pouliot, Rymal, Scatcherd, Taschereau, Thibault, Tremblay, and Wallbridge (North Hastings).—33.

The House then adjourned.

—o—
MONDAY, *March 13, 1865.*

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—When the House was about to adjourn on Friday night, it was arranged that we should finish 3-day the proceedings connected with the Address. I therefore now move:—

That a select committee, consisting of Hon. Messrs. Attorneys General MACDONALD and CARTIER, and GALT and BROWN, and Messrs. ROBITAILLE and HAULTAIN, be appointed to draft an Address to Her Majesty on the resolution agreed to on Friday last, the 10th instant, on the subject of the union of the colonies of British North America.

HON. J. H. CAMERON—Before that motion is carried, I propose to move—as I think this is the proper time—the resolution of which I gave notice some days ago. I therefore now desire to put into your hands, Mr. SPEAKER, seconded by Mr. M. C. CAMERON, that resolution, which is as follows:—

That all the words after "That" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof: "an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency, in view of the magnitude of the interests involved in the resolutions for the union of the colonies of British North America, and the entire change of the Constitution of this province, will be pleased to direct that a constitutional appeal shall be made to the people, before these resolutions are submitted for final action thereon to the consideration of the Imperial Parliament."

I understood the other day that it was the intention of the Hon. Attorney General West to raise a question as to the propriety

of moving this resolution at the present stage of the proceedings. I desire to know whether it is still his intention to raise that objection, because, if it is, I should confine myself in the first place to arguing that point.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—I do object. But I do not mean to enter into any argument, but merely to ask the decision of the Speaker on the point of order.

THE SPEAKER—Having learned that the point of order was to be raised, I have looked into the matter, and decide that the resolution is in order.

HON. MR. CAMERON—Then, I will proceed to offer to the House the observations which I think it necessary to make, as well on the general subject as on the particular matter embraced in this motion. And as the House is aware that I very rarely trouble it with a speech on any matter, unless I consider it to be one of importance, and that when I do I seldom detain hon. members at any considerable length, I trust they will bear with me in those observations. Considering the length of time that the subject has been discussed, and the great desire that exists in the mind of every one to have this subject brought to a conclusion as rapidly as possible, I promise on this occasion to be brief. I have already, so far as my own individual vote in this House is concerned, done exactly what I would have done if I had only been an elector called upon for his vote. We have pronounced upon the resolutions submitted to the House, and I have shewn my own conviction of their propriety by having voted in their favor; and if I were to exercise my franchise as an elector, I would do outside the House what I have done inside the House, and declare in favor of those resolutions, though not satisfied that the scheme for the Confederation of the provinces would be so advantageous as the larger scheme of a legislative union. But I have always felt that if you desire to obtain something which you believe for the benefit of the country, you should not insist upon that which is impossible—that which cannot be carried, but should endeavor to obtain that which you can fairly reach, and by and by you may get that which, at a far distance, seems impossible. (Hear, hear.) I believe the Confederation of the colonies will lead hereafter to a legislative union. The only difficulty I have felt is, that I believe it would have been infinitely

better if all the powers given to local governments should also be given to the General Government, so that when the time came—when all those smaller stars should fall from the firmament—the General Government would possess all those powers, and there would be no necessity then for framing a new Constitution. This subject, I think, may be fairly considered under three aspects. First, as regards the necessity of a change in the Constitution at all. Secondly, as regards the nature of the change proposed, and how it will affect the interests involved in it. And, thirdly, as regards the propriety of the measure being submitted to the people, before it is finally enacted by the Imperial Legislature. As to the first point—the necessity of a change—I believe there are very few people in the country, in whatever part of it they may be found, who will be prepared to say that some change in the Constitution of the country has not become necessary. I believe we are all satisfied that things cannot go on as they are now. I believe we are all satisfied that the people are looking out for some alteration, by which they hope a greater amount of prosperity may come to the country, than that which has been around it and about it for some years past. I am firmly convinced in my own mind—against the opinions of one or two hon. gentlemen, who stood up here the other night—that there has not been, since the union of these provinces, a greater amount of depression, a greater want of feeling of prosperity throughout the whole western portion of Canada, than exists there at this moment. I believe that into whatever part of the country you go, you will find that a succession of bad crops, and the difficulties which have arisen from large sums of money having been borrowed at high interest, and the necessity of large remittances to England—that all these have pressed heavily on the energies of the people, and tended to paralyse them; and they are looking out, therefore, in every direction, with the best hopes they can conjure up, for some change or alteration, such as they believe will place them on a better footing than that which they have hitherto occupied. (Hear, hear.) The Hon. President of the Council for many years past, with a great number of those who have always been in the habit of acting with him, has believed that if we obtained, in the western portion of Canada, represen-

tation by population, it would have great influence in stimulating the energies of the people, and placing them on a much more satisfactory footing than that on which they now stand. I am satisfied, with that hon. gentleman, that it would have had this effect to a very great extent. But we know very well the antagonisms which existed between the two sections, and that that measure, while pressed by Upper Canada, was resisted by Lower Canada. We have felt—and no doubt many in Lower Canada have felt—that this Confederation of the British North American Colonies would probably not have reached the point it has reached, had the demands—the just demands—of Upper Canada been conceded by Lower Canada; had we been placed in that position on the floor of this House, which we thought the interests of the western portion of Canada required at the hands of the Legislature. (Hear, hear.) But we have not found that that was done. Lower Canada felt that if representation by population were conceded, there would have been dangers incurred to her own institutions, which she was not willing to place in the hands of the increased number of representatives from Upper Canada. I think the people of Lower Canada were mistaken in that feeling. I do not believe that her institutions would have been dealt with in a way unsatisfactory to her people. The people of Upper Canada, I think, have always been prepared to do what was fair and just towards the people of Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) I have no doubt, however, that the people of Lower Canada would be much more ready to take up such a scheme as this, which would give them a Local Legislature to manage their own local affairs, rather than adopt a measure which would place them in what they might conceive to be an inferior position in point of their numbers on the floor of this House, and an inferior position in respect of power—supposing representation by population in the united Legislature of Canada were carried. There can be no doubt that the idea that there is a necessity for change has not only grown up from the feeling to which I have referred, but from the circumstances connected with our relations to the neighboring republic during the last three or four years. The Reciprocity treaty was passed ten years ago, at a time when the value placed upon the Canadas by the neighboring country was very

different from that now placed upon them—when the statesmen of the United States believed the effect of that measure would be gradually to ripen the pear of this country, until it would be prepared to fall into their hands. And, unquestionably, the views of many of those who consented to the Reciprocity treaty, at the time of their consenting to it, were that they expected that its effect would be gradually to facilitate the passage of these colonies into the arms of the United States—to create a feeling in favor of annexation, and to check the feeling which was springing up of an entirely opposite character. But now there is no doubt that the disposition to abrogate the Reciprocity treaty has not arisen alone from angry feelings against England by the people of the United States, and in consequence of the fancied raids from this country—but also from the fact that there has been a great pressure of taxation upon themselves, and the necessity of raising the tariff, and from the belief that if a tax were placed upon the produce coming in to them from Canada, an increased revenue would result. All these circumstances have given rise to the desire on the part of the people and the Government of the United States to place this question on a different footing from that on which it has stood for ten years, and to repeal that treaty which they represent to be entirely in favor of Canada, though in point of fact it is very largely in favor of the United States. (Hear, hear.) Another reason why a change is necessary, is—as we cannot conceal from ourselves—that our position as a colony has been greatly altered by the events which have taken place in the United States. We cannot now expect that we can sit with our arms folded, praying that Providence may be good to us, though we do not prepare to defend ourselves. We cannot expect that England will be prepared to take on her shoulders almost the whole of the burden, and that we are to be neither the hewers of wood nor the drawers of water. We must be both. And if we obtain, as I hope, through the resolutions which have been passed, when the proper time comes, we will obtain—if we get the name and *status* of a nation, we should not be afraid also to take the responsibilities of a nation; and the course most likely to save us from attack is that we should learn in the time of peace to be prepared for the exigency of war, and to put ourselves—a people of four millions, as we will be when united together—in a posi-

tion to defend our liberties from whatever quarter they may be attacked. (Cheers.) We cannot therefore help seeing that a necessity exists for this change, a necessity urged upon us, both by our political position, with reference to the state of the representation in Parliament, and by the position in which, in common with the colonies below, we stand with reference to the probabilities of hostilities from the United States, and the placing of the country in a proper state of defence. The necessity of change then being admitted—and I believe there is scarcely one honorable gentleman on either side of the House who does not admit it—some think that change should be brought about in one way, some think that it should be brought about in another way. Some think—and the Hon. President of the Council at one time apparently was of that opinion—that the most desirable change would be the smaller scheme of the Federation of Canada, divided into two or three provinces—that that would be the best way of averting the evils which threaten us. Some believe we can go on as we are now.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD — Hear! hear!

HON. MR. CAMERON — And others think that the only way by which we can get into a satisfactory position, would be by a union of the colonies, either in accordance with this scheme, or by a legislative union. I would like to know how many there are who believe that we can go on as we are now.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD — Hear! hear!

HON. MR. CAMERON — I believe there are not a half a dozen members of this House who believe that, with the difficulties of our position, we can work the union on present terms. If we cannot, then we have the alternatives of the dissolution of the union—going back to the old position we occupied before the union, which no man would entertain for a moment—or a Federation of the Canadas—or this larger scheme of a union of all the British North American Colonies. If any one for a moment will consider all those projects in the true view in which they ought to be considered, he will see that with reference to the second branch of my subject—the nature of the change, and the magnitude of the interests involved in it—this scheme is the one to which the Legislature and the people of this country must

necessarily come. (Hear, hear.) We are desirous of assuming a position on this continent, which will place the whole of these feeble colonies under one united government. And when that united government is formed, when that union does take place, we shall then stand in a position which, according to the facts and figures that have been used from time to time in this debate, will establish us as a power on this continent, and enable us to assist in working out the three problems presented by the three governments—the despotic government of Mexico, the republican government of the United States, and the constitutional government of these colonies. (Hear, hear.) I trust the result would be, that we should see the government of these colonies standing longer than any of the others, inasmuch as we believe it is based on the more free exercise of the true will of the people, and carries out institutions which in the Mother Country have stood the test of time, toil and wear, until they have become more firmly cemented now than at any former period of their existence. (Hear, hear.) And I cannot help feeling that if there is that necessity for a change, the nature of the change proposed must commend itself to every one who is a true lover of his country on this side of the Atlantic. (Hear, hear.) We are five colonies with a population of 4,000,000, and we shall have a debt of about \$80,000,000, or about \$20 for each inhabitant. In the neighboring republic, from a statement made at the close of last year, we learn that the debt in that country, on the first of July next, will be no less than about \$150 on the head of every inhabitant. Hence our young nation, with a debt of only \$20 upon each inhabitant, will stand in a position, in reference to debt, far different from what the people of that country will stand. Let us take a glance over the whole of the British Colonial Empire. England has thirty-eight colonies, containing ten millions of people. Six millions of these are white and four millions are black. Of the six millions of white people, four millions are inhabitants of these British American Colonies. We have for Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, no less than five millions of tons' capacity of sea-going vessels, and on the lakes seven millions, making a total tonnage of twelve millions, which, in point of tonnage, places us as the third power in the world. No other nations but England and the United States possess a larger tonnage than that.

Nova Scotia itself has a larger tonnage than the great empire of Austria. If this is to be our position in relation to our population, our debt and our tonnage, one cannot well help seeing that we must strengthen ourselves by coming together in a political and commercial union. We have now five independent, and I may say hostile tariffs—a different one in each of the colonies; and we have five different governments. We will then have one strong independent government, and one system of customs taxation. Although we shall not have the same concentrated power that we would have in a legislative union, still we shall have a power that will hold over this country that great force that must be possessed to enable it to bring the whole military force of the country to bear in case its defence becomes necessary, and which will place us in a much better position than ever before. Look at the whole of the colonies of England, and let us inquire whether, in point of the magnitude of the trade they bring to England and the amount of English goods they consume, compared with the expenditure that England is called upon to make, there is really any valid foundation for the position taken by those political economists of England, of the Manchester and Birmingham school. Take the whole of the exports of England to the colonies, and her imports from those colonies, and what do we find? The exports of England last year amounted to nearly £100,000,000 sterling, while the exports from the colonies to Great Britain amounted to £40,000,000 sterling. Place the colonists, man for man, with foreign countries, and you will find the trade of the colonies is of much more advantage to England than that of foreign nations, independently of all those other great interests which are involved in the retention by England of her colonial possessions. Take the fact that the whole of England's expenditure is £40,000,000 sterling, exclusive of the interest of the national debt, while her expense for colonial purposes annually, exclusive of India and of the casual expenses arising from sending troops to colonies where hostilities are taking place, was only some £2,000,000 sterling, of which amount Canada only had but little more than £500,000 sterling. When these things are taken into consideration, I say it will be found that the colonies are of much more value to the Mother Country than is generally supposed, and much more than the school of politicians to which I have referred would have

people believe. If what the Mother Country obtains from our connection with them is of so little importance as to give currency to the doctrines of that school, I do not think it would be hard to shew that what we get from our connection with Great Britain is of no very great importance to us, except in the matter of defence. If we desire to live under the glorious old flag, and to maintain the honored name of British subjects, is it right for our brethren in England, who are "free from touch of spoil," to say that unless we provide for our own defence, we shall be cast off? We should be looked upon as disloyal if we took the same stand, and declared that we would choose our own connection if we provided the whole expense of our defence. (Hear, hear.) Sir, I think we should be able to tell the Mother Country that we are prepared to do all in our power for self-defence. When I have stated that the debt of Canada is only \$20 per head, and that that of the United States will soon be, if it is not now, \$150 per head of the population, I am ready to say that I would most unhesitatingly be willing, for the purpose of completing our connection with the seaboard, of building the Intercolonial Railway, and avoiding the liability we now labor under, of having our connection with Great Britain cut off. I say I would be willing to place \$10 additional upon every inhabitant of the country, in order that we might be placed on the true footing on which we ought to stand in the estimation of the people of England and of the world—that of a people who do not consider the mere sacrifice of money as anything to be compared to the duty of defending themselves. (Hear, hear.) Sir, I think that when a delegation of our Government goes to England, those who compose it ought to be able to say what we are prepared to do for our defence. They ought to be able to say to the English Government that although we were a young and a comparatively poor country; though we have a rigorous climate and are shut out from the sea for a great portion of the year, yet we are a people that have shown more than once that our liberties could not be taken away from us by force of arms, and we are not prepared that they shall be taken in any other way, but that we are ready to take our just share in any scheme that the Mother Country may adopt; but we are not prepared, and cannot be expected, to take the whole burden of defending this exposed portion of the British Empire upon

ourselves. Look at our bonds in the English market. The British public are under the apprehension that we may at any moment be invaded by the United States, or that the views of the Manchester school may prevail, and our 5 per cents stand at 80. The position of the United States along our long exposed border is such that in their present excited and ready-armed condition we might be plunged into hostilities at any moment, and therefore our Government ought to say to the Imperial Government that it was absolutely necessary to make arrangements for defence on a large scale—that we are prepared to do that which we ought to do, but you cannot expect us to go to the whole of the expense which would be entailed by the depreciation of our bonds in the market. If we are to do so, or even to go to any large expense, you must guarantee our debentures. With the knowledge that you are our security, we need not care whether the United States is going to cross our border with hostile intent or not. If our neighbors know that any requisite amount will be given us either upon your loan or upon endorsement, so that our bonds will stand on the market at par, they will have reason to think twice before attacking us. When the English Government are prepared to back us in that way, then I say we ought to go forward and coöperate with them in carrying out an extended system of defensive works, bearing at least the principal portion of the burden. We do not care for their spending £50,000 a year in dribbling up a few fortifications at Quebec, while we put another small sum out in patching up earth works in the west, just to invite the Americans over when the works are half built, forming a trap for ourselves in which we may be more effectually caught. I am sure every member of this House, and every citizen of Canada must have been surprised at the position taken by English statesmen in reference to Canadian defences, and at their speaking of there being only a few days in the year in which men could work, in this climate, in building fortifications. I read the other day, that it had been stated in England that there was only a month of the year that men could work out of doors to advantage. Although it is true that for about half the year our communication with the sea is cut off by the formation of ice, yet men can work out of doors in Western Canada all the year round, and during the other half in Eastern Canada, and with the exception of

a few very stormy days, at one or another branch of the work required in erecting fortifications. But so far as guarding against attack from the United States is concerned, the great thing is to let them know that, whether we spend the money immediately—this summer—or not, we have it to spend. It should be known that both the Imperial Parliament and the Provincial Parliament have voted the money, and that it would be put into the most approved fortifications as rapidly as it could be. The people of the South soon built fortifications, behind which to fight for their liberties, and we too should be prepared to fight for our liberties. It is to the money they spent in fortifications that they owe their existence as a formidable power at the present time. The idea should not go abroad that we are about to spend a little matter of fifty or a hundred thousand pounds in doing a little plastering here and a little mason work there, but we should proceed as rapidly as possible to show that we are prepared to expend in effective works all the money that may be necessary to put ourselves in a condition to resist invasion, even with a handful of troops, until more can be sent us. As we are at present, the Government of the United States feel that we are at their mercy, and that they can deal with us as they please. To-day they impose an obnoxious passport system upon us, and to-morrow they relieve us from that source of annoyance. To-day they threaten us with a repeal of the Reciprocity treaty, and to-morrow will, perhaps, be prepared, if we are good children, to continue its operation. To-day the bonding system is to be repealed; to-morrow we hear no more of it. Next we hear of their intention of placing a force of gunboats on the lakes, and then we hear that the intention has been abandoned. What are all these fair promises they indulge in, and good feelings they endeavor to call up, but blinds of their real purpose? Does anybody believe that it is not in their hearts to do all those things with which they threaten us, and is it not our duty to be prepared to meet the consequences of their threats being carried into execution? They now see that we are being aroused in this country, and they begin to treat us more mildly, until they come to some settlement with the South. They begin to see that they have acted aggressively against this paw of the British lion a little too soon—that the British lion is in danger

of being waked up. (Hear, hear.) And, Mr. SPEAKER, I think it would be a good thing if we were a little more aroused in this country by the events that are transpiring about us, and that the people of England should become a little more in earnest, so that the people of the United States should not fall into the habit of regarding the British lion, as the Paris *Charivari* called it, as a stuffed lion. I sometimes wish the British lion would roar—(laughter)—as it has roared in times past, and as it roared when it made the Emperor of all the Russias tremble in his shoes. (Hear, hear.) I am afraid our neighbors are getting into the very false notion that it is only the skin of the animal that we have now—(laughter)—and that if the voice were heard, it would not be a roar, but a bray. But they must not trust too much to this idea, or they will be rudely awakened some day by finding the bones, and the blood, and the muscle of the mighty old animal of yore. I feel, sir, that we cannot do our duty to the Imperial authorities, nor they to us, unless we become united into one Confederation, instead of remaining in the scattered position in which we now stand. What would be our position if we were thus united? The opponents of Confederation say we should only get a more extended frontier to defend, and have no more men to defend it with; that the frontier we should acquire would be more difficult to defend with the addition of men we would acquire, than our present frontier would be to defend with our own force; that Canada might be called upon to send troops to the Lower Provinces, thus leaving our own frontier exposed, or they would have to send their militia force up here, leaving their borders open to attack. But, in reply to that reasoning, I would say that it is not likely we should be attacked at all points at once. We might be compelled to withdraw entirely from one portion of the territory in order to defend more important portions, or to obtain more defensible positions; but no man can hesitate to agree that it is infinitely better, for all purposes of defensive action, that the whole militia force of the country should be under the control of one executive head, who could grasp the whole force in one hand, than that they should be scattered over a wide domain of exposed territory, under the command of different executives, all of whom would have to be communicated with before any concentration could take place. The true position

in which we should stand before the world is, that the whole militia force should be understood to be under the control of one Central Government; for in that way, common sense ought to tell everybody, they would be of far more value in defense than they could possibly be if divided, and the moral effect produced upon a foreign power contemplating attack would be very greatly enhanced, were it understood we were one united people, instead of being a divided community. Our entire population would be four millions of people, which, at the ordinary rate of computation, would give us an available militia force of five hundred thousand men. If we believe that our people are really and truly a loyal people, warmly attached to the Constitution of the good old land, because believing that the engrafting of the institutions of that country upon the soil of this continent offers the best and greatest security for every man who desires to enjoy the blessings of a free country and free institutions, then we would, if united, have not only this sentiment of attachment to the English Throne, but we would have the machinery, which this great Constitution provides, in our hands by which we could carry out and defend our liberties and our people in the enjoyment of their free constitutional government. (Hear, hear.) Our opponents say we are hardly ripe, hardly of age fit to enter upon a new nationality. Why, sir, there are none of the lesser powers of Europe, except Belgium and Bavaria, that have a population of four millions. If we cannot establish a nation when we have four millions of people, what shall we say of Greece with its population of only one million? If we are ever to form ourselves into a nationality—and few will deny that it is our destiny to be united at some time—what better time will ever be likely to present itself for handing down to posterity the boon of a united and free nation—the greatest boon that a government and people can transmit—than the opportunity which the present favorable state of affairs presents to us? It is offered to us freely and openly in the face of the world, and we hope to convince the world hereafter that of the three systems of government now in existence on this continent, ours is the best. We have the despotic throne of the MONTEZUMAS filled by a foreign prince, and propped up by foreign bayonets; we have the republican government of the United States, based on the principle that all men are free and equal

and that the will of the majority must govern and be right; and we have the responsible government provided by the British Constitution, under which the English nation has existed so long, and beneath the protection of which her colonies have spread out, until upon their wide expanse the sun never goes down. (Cheers.) This latter form of government we believe to be the best we can adopt for present purposes, and for the purpose of transmission to our descendants upon this continent. Mr. SPEAKER, if we have institutions, population, wealth and territory of such extent and of such immense value to protect, and have the opportunity of uniting for their protection so freely given us, then is the end sought to be accomplished by the change that cannot but commend itself most clearly and distinctly to the mind of every one who desires to see a united and happy people inhabiting the territory of British North America, and stretching from ocean to ocean, under the protecting ægis of the British Constitution, the British form of government, and the British Crown. We have, in my own humble opinion, but two future states of existence to choose for ourselves. We have, on the one side, the opportunity to make ourselves a nation, able and willing to protect ourselves, with the aid of the Mother Country, and to grow wealthy and prosperous under that form of existence. On the other hand, we have the certain prospect of absorption, at no distant period, into the United States. There is no alternative. (Hear, hear, ironically.) We must either adopt the one or make up our minds to submit to the other. I have no doubt but that an immense number of the people would not be willing to remain and submit to the latter alternative, but like the old U. E. loyalists, would even abandon all they possessed rather than cease to have the protection of the British flag, and bear the name of British men—men in whom loyalty is not a mere lip sentiment, but in whom it forms as much a constituent element of the blood as the principle of vitality itself. (Hear, hear.) I am satisfied, sir, that there is no other alternative—no choice for us between the endeavor on our part to concentrate British power and British feeling on this continent, and falling into the open arms of the republican government of the United States. (Hear, hear.) And, Mr. SPEAKER, when we examine the extent of the domain open to us, when

we reflect that we would rest with one foot upon the broad Atlantic and the other upon the Pacific, and remember the vast, fertile and salubrious territory that lies between us and the Rocky Mountains—those rich valleys of the Saskatchewan and the Assiniboine, the fertility of which are said to be far superior, and are certainly equal to any portion of this country—when we think of them and of the vast number of people that could be poured into them from the old world to develop their resources and bring their treasures down the lakes to our marts—I say when we see all these things, we see a future arising for us which is to me, and ought to be to others, so bright that no man should hesitate to accept that rather than the only other alternative—drifting in small provinces into the United States, where we cannot but be borne down by their burden of taxation. (Hear, hear.) But some people say we will escape taxation by going over to the Americans; that they would take us in to-morrow, and agree to put no taxation upon us for their war debt; but is not that idea chimerical, when they entertain no doubt that they can overrun and conquer us at any time, and force us to share in their debt, as well as discharge our own? With regard to our prospects in the way of settlement and the extending of our population and wealth, look at what we could do towards attracting emigrants from the old country to our lands. But here I must refer to one feature of the scheme that has been adopted by this House that I hope to see changed. I believe it is a fatal error to place the wild lands in the hands of the local governments, who may thereby enter into regulations for immigration that will be antagonistic, and that will tend to retard rather than promote the settlement of this country. All those lands ought to have been placed in the hands of the General Government, in order that one comprehensive system of immigration might be adopted. When we look at Upper Canada, and ascertain that of her eighty millions of acres there are only thirteen and a half millions in the hands of proprietors—an average of nine acres to each inhabitant—when we see the vast quantity of land in this country available for cultivation, not yet turned to account, we cannot help coming to the conclusion that we have a vast field for immigration to fill up, and which ought to have been placed under control of the General Government—

not left to be speculated upon by the local governments. Now, sir, when one sees all that, and feels and knows that the great change which will be brought about by this union will give us so many things that are desirable, I say the magnitude of the interests that are involved ought to recommend to us, in the strongest manner, a change of the character of which I have been speaking—a change that would tend to place this country on such a footing that none can fail to see that we would eventually become the members of a great community, and that in a much shorter space of time than many people imagine. (Hear, hear.) Allow me for a moment, sir, to allude to the history of the United States, to see the position in which that country once stood. In 1792, the United States, with a population, at that time, of nine millions of people, had a revenue of a little over four and a-half millions of dollars, while in Canada, in 1863, with a population of two and a-half millions, we had a revenue of fourteen millions of dollars. In 1821, when their population had greatly increased, the whole of their exports and imports amounted to ninety-eight millions of dollars, while ours, in 1863, with a population of only two and a-half millions, was no less than eighty-nine millions of dollars; that is, within nine millions of the entire imports and exports of the United States in 1821. It is true that since that time all those facilities which have made the United States a great power on this continent—the construction of railways and telegraphs, the application of steam power to all kinds of machinery, and other inventions of the past two or three decades—have sprung into existence, and they have reached forward to greatness with railroad speed. But, still, it is nothing against the argument to say that as we have, within the memory of man, risen so rapidly not only in population, but in everything that tends to place Canada on a footing that ought to be satisfactory to every well-wisher of his country, there is any reason to imagine, for one moment, that all the changes have been made that will be made, and that with the enterprise and exertions of a common and enlightened people, we will not be in a position to continue the prosperity that has sprung up within so short a time, and which has increased until within the last three or four years, when, from natural causes and the war in the United States, it received so

serious a check. We shall find ourselves, in my opinion, so soon on the highroad to prosperity, by means of the union now contemplated, that we shall not care to envy the progress of any nation whatever. (Hear, hear.) Now, sir, when I have stated my reasons for believing that there is a necessity for such a change, and having endeavored to show the nature of the change proposed, I shall now proceed to show why the resolution which I hold in my hand, and which I offer for the adoption of this House, is one that ought to be accepted. I have said, sir, that I, as an individual member of the Legislature of Canada, had not hesitated to take upon myself the responsibility of voting in favor of the resolutions respecting Confederation, although they had not been accepted by the people of this country in any constitutional manner. I said that I did so upon the same principle as I would have done if I had been voting upon them outside of the House instead of inside. I would have voted for them as an elector, because I believe they form a just basis for the contemplated union; and, sir, I desire to offer exactly the same opportunity to every elector to pursue the same course that I would pursue, and I make the same claim on their behalf that I would make to this House on my own. I think that they are entitled to have this matter submitted for their consideration before the resolutions that have passed this House are finally acted upon by the Imperial Legislature. (Hear, hear.) Now, sir, it has been said that the effect will be to postpone the accomplishment of the union for an indefinite period, whereas the pressure of circumstances are such that no time should be lost in placing ourselves in such a position of defence that we should be able to meet and hold back any force that might be sent against us. Well, sir, there is nothing in the resolution I have proposed that would, in my judgment, interfere with the immediate carrying out of the project. The Government have told us that they propose to prorogue Parliament in a few days, and they have also told us that we are to be called together again in the summer. What is to prevent us from considering the subject at the summer session? It is to be presumed that the Imperial Government will endeavor to come to some conclusion upon the resolutions which have been framed by the Conference, and which have been laid on the tables of both Houses of the English Parliament, and I see nothing to prevent the Im-

perial Government from declaring their views upon the subject. I think there would be nothing whatever to prevent our Government from going to England, and offering these resolutions for the consideration of the Imperial Legislature, allowing that Legislature to act upon them as they might think proper; but, at the same time declaring that the law to be passed ought not to come in force in the different colonies until it had been accepted by the legislatures of those colonies. There would be no time lost. It would be as easy for this Parliament to be dissolved and to meet together again in time to take up the consideration of the measure, which Great Britain had in the meantime passed, as it would be to meet again in the summer, and go through the same process. Why is Canada to be treated upon an entirely different rule from that which has been adopted in the other provinces? The Legislature of New Brunswick was dissolved in order that the people might be appealed to on this question. The Hon. Attorney General of Newfoundland has declared that it is the intention of the Government of that colony to appeal to the people upon it, and that nothing will be done until their opinion is obtained. (Hear, hear.) In Nova Scotia, too, the Government do not, as I understand, make it a government question. It is not to be put in that position, and if a difficulty arises in having it adopted by the Legislature, the Government of Nova Scotia are prepared to dissolve their Legislature too. I do not say anything about Prince Edward Island—its acceptance or rejection of the scheme would be of very small account. But their Legislature will, no doubt, also be dissolved, in order that the people may have an opportunity of expressing their opinions upon it, if their House of Assembly is found hostile,—a step which, no doubt, our Government would have taken if this House had shown itself hostile to the measure. Because this House is not hostile, and because Ministers found themselves strong enough to carry it by a large majority, they declared they would take the course they have adopted, although in the other provinces the case has been put on an entirely different footing. (Hear, hear.) Now, sir, let us consider why we should be placed in the same position in which the legislatures and people of the Lower Provinces are placed. We hear it stated on all sides of this House that the whole country is in favor of this measure.

If so, why should there be any hesitation about asking the country to confirm by an election that which is so clearly advantageous and which is so sure to be carried? But, sir, I hear it said, inside of this House and outside of this House, that the people of Lower Canada are opposed to this measure. If that be so then—if they are so strongly opposed to it as has been represented—is it a wise step for us to force it upon them against their will? (Hear, hear.) We are arranging to adopt an entirely new state of governmental existence, and are proposing to embrace a large area of country under this new form of government. We are claiming for it, and desire that it shall have its best and safest foundation in the hearts of the people. And, sir, will you not find it stronger in the hearts and more deeply rooted in the estimation of the people, if you appeal to them and obtain their sanction to it and their support in carrying it out? (Hear, hear.) In proposing that it shall have the sanction of the people, I do not contemplate the absurdity, unknown to our form of government, of asking them for a direct yea or nay upon it. No such thing as that has ever been entertained in my mind. I propose to have it done in a constitutional manner. My whole political history would have shown any man acquainted with it, that there could have been no such democratic idea harbored by me as to go without the walls of the Constitution in order to do an act which could be better done within it. Therefore, any one who had for a moment the belief, that while I was endeavoring to build up, I was at the same time putting forth what may be called a sacrilegious hand to pull down, was very much mistaken as to the course I was to pursue—the only proper and safe course that could be pursued. If you wish to erect this monument of a new nationality on the true feelings and hearts of the people, you must erect it upon an appeal to them. You should not be afraid of it. You may say that difficulties will arise—that other questions will be raised—that the elections will not always turn on the direct issue—for Confederation or against Confederation. But I tell you that it will, if the people are so much in favor of this project as you say. (Hear, hear.) The merits or demerits of the candidates will be passed to one side, and the vote will be taken on the true merits of Confederation—otherwise the people are not worthy of

having that appeal made to them. An appeal has been made to history, and it has said that appeals to the people on questions of this kind are unknown under the British Constitution. The cases of the union between England and Scotland, of the union between Great Britain and Ireland, and of the union of the Canadas themselves, have been referred to; and it has been asked if in any of those cases an appeal was made to the people, and an answer given in the negative. I am not prepared to accept that answer as altogether correct in point of fact. In the first of those cases, where the resistance was perhaps the greatest, an appeal was made to the people. It was not until long after the matter was first mooted that the union between England and Scotland was brought about. It was questioned at that time—just as afterwards, in 1799, with reference to the union of Ireland—whether the Scottish Parliament had power to deliver up the franchise of the people into the hands of the English Parliament. With reference to the union of Scotland with England, the matter was brought before the people—not in one, or in two, but in many ways. There were commissioners appointed, and conventions, and various attempts to bring about that union before it was finally consummated. It was attempted in JAMES the First's time, in CHARLES the First's time, in CROMWELL's time, and again in the reign of King WILLIAM, and finally carried out in the reign of Queen ANNE. The proclamation summoning the Scottish Parliament of 1702 declared that among other things, it was to treat of the union of Scotland with England. (Hear, hear.) We have still extant in the books the very words of that proclamation, which declared that that Parliament was summoned in Scotland for the very purpose of treating of this question. That Parliament did not finally decide upon the matter, but the following Parliament did, and the union was consummated. And that Parliament was in exactly the position of that of 1702, having been called together by precisely the same kind of proclamation. (Hear, hear.) That matter of the union between England and Scotland was, I believe, the only subject that was discussed. And, although subsequently the greatest hostility was aroused, and troops had to be sent from the north of Scotland, it was not until after that Parliament had been for some time assembled that petitions came in from any of the burghs against it. (Hear, hear.) We have been

told in this debate that there is now the satisfaction of content all over the province in reference to this measure. Allow me to tell you that in many localities, it is the deadness of apathy and not the satisfaction of content. This has arisen, not because the people do not feel an interest in the question, but because there has been a pressure upon them from many causes, and that they have had to contend with a great number of difficulties of one kind or another, resulting in an unexampled want of prosperity. (Hear, hear.) They are, therefore, looking out apparently for anything—they are not particular what—which they believe would tend to relieve them from the difficulties of their present position. I say this, although I should be glad that it was not apathy, or deadness, or death, but contentment, throughout the length and breadth of the land, which was leading to the general acceptance of this measure. I believe that in the western part of the country—I cannot speak for the eastern part, unless in so far as it is shewn by the petitions which have been sent in, and the opinions which have been expressed in this House by honorable members from Lower Canada—but in the western portion of the country, I am satisfied, from my own personal knowledge of the feeling existing there, that a large majority, equal to if not greater than that which voted the other night on the floor of this House, would be returned at another election in favor of this measure (Hear, hear.) And it is because I believe that, and would not leave it for any one to say that the people had not had an opportunity of expressing themselves, through an election, on a matter of such vital importance—that I claim that it should be submitted to them, in order that they shall declare by their votes whether they are in favor of this measure or not. (Hear, hear.) In speaking of the union of Scotland, of the union of Ireland, and the union of the Canadas, we must recollect that the same circumstances to a great extent existed. In the case of the Scottish union, there were those desolating wars between England and Scotland in which the best blood of both lands had been shed, and there had long existed a perpetual feud and hostility which had left the border country—now a smiling and fertile territory—a barren and desolate waste. Then again, when the union of Ireland with Great Britain took place, there was a rebellion just quenched—there were

40,000 troops in the country—there were one hundred and sixteen placemen in the House—and there may have been good reasons for the fact that a majority of some six or seven in the Irish Parliament against the union had dwindled down and disappeared next session, being swallowed up in a majority of thirty-five. In this country the same thing had occurred. The union was consummated when the embers of the rebellion of 1837–38 were still supposed to be slumbering in various parts of the land—and there were, therefore, strong reasons why, in the midst of disquiet and disturbance—when there might be a difficulty about elections being conducted with purity and freedom from Executive control—such a question should not be submitted to the people. But now we have no such cause. We are told that the people are happy, contented and prosperous, though desirous of some change—and there is, therefore, no exciting cause to prevent a free and full expression of the mind of the people by a general election—nothing to prevent the whole matter being placed on a proper footing before the people, and men being chosen with reference to their views on the subject of Confederation, and that alone. You have nothing to prevent this new system being inaugurated on the true and proper basis on which it ought to be inaugurated, namely, on the popular will, and receiving therefore, from the outset, that strength which the popular will alone could give to it, in its endorsement by those who have a right to send representatives to this House. (Hear, hear.) It has been said that a motion of this kind takes away, in point of fact, from the Legislature, the power which the Legislature has, by denying the right of the Legislature to make any such change. I do not say anything against the power of the Legislature. The Legislature has, within the limits that are assigned to it, all the rights which its charter gives it. But I cannot help feeling that when we are dealing with this question, we are dealing with it very differently from the manner in which it was dealt with, either by the independent Parliament of Scotland, or by the independent Parliament of Ireland. We are acting under a limited charter and constitution—having no right ourselves to deal with this matter finally by any act of our own—having only the right to deal with it by these resolutions, and not to enact it with the autho-

rity of law. (Hear, hear.) We, therefore, stand limited in our powers at the outset—so limited that it has been decided in Newfoundland, that the privileges which belong to the House of Commons and the House of Lords in England do not belong entirely to our legislative bodies—that these have grown with time, until they have become incorporated with the very existence of the Imperial Parliament—while we hold our privileges in a very different way, not having the same comprehensive grasp of them, as in the case of the House of Commons. It is clear that we have not the same power as the Imperial Parliament—otherwise we should not be obliged to go to that body for its sanction of these resolutions. And there are limitations of the power of the Imperial Parliament itself, to which we also are subject. We cannot make any act of ours permanent, any more than we can make ourselves permanent, because another Parliament has the right to repeal what we have done. We cannot of ourselves enact this measure into a law. We can offer these resolutions—we have the power to do that—and the Imperial Government and Parliament have, no doubt, the power to act upon them as they choose. But the question is—is it wise to give these resolutions the force of law; is it proper to do so; is it the most just course to take towards the people of this country, to declare that in a matter of this importance we will legislate for them, to the extent of introducing an entire change of the Constitution—of providing that the Upper Chamber, which they have declared to be elective, shall cease to be elective, and shall be nominated by the Crown, without consulting them? I do not mean to say, with regard to that change, that it is not a beneficial change. I was one of the few who stood on the floor of this Legislature battling against the change from nomination by the Crown to election by the people in the Upper House. I was one of those also who contended for resolutions, the effect of which would be to place the power of the people in the Lower House, by representation according to numbers in that body, with equal representation for the two sections of the province in the Upper House. And I recollect that some hon. gentlemen now on the Treasury benches—the Hon. President of the Council among others, through the columns of the influential paper he controls—declared that the idea embodied in those resolutions was absurd, and

could not be acted upon, although the very idea which the Government have now incorporated in this scheme, from a different point of view. (Hear, hear.) And the Hon. President of the Council voted, as I did, against the introduction of the elective principle, and in favor of the retention of the nominative principle—not, however, for the reasons I did, but for different reasons altogether, as he explained at the time. But the view he entertains now, in favor of a nominated Legislative Council, was the view he entertained then, and the change is one which I will be glad to see brought about. But it is a change of which the people at the last election had no idea. And the alteration in the minds of public men has been so great, within a short space of time, that I say we have a right to think and pause and reflect. (Hear, hear.) Look at the programme which was brought down on this subject by the constitutional committee moved for by the Hon. President of the Council. The part of the report of that committee which was most opposed was the Confederation of British North America. And it is well known that what the Government offered, at the time of its formation, was that the lesser scheme of a Federation of the Canadas should go first, and the larger scheme of a Federation of all the colonies afterwards. They were first of all to try to have a Federal Government for Canada alone, and then to extend that, as circumstances permitted, to the whole of the British North American Colonies. Well, in the short space of little over three months, men's minds were so changed that the Federation of the Canadas ceased to be talked of, and the Confederation of the whole provinces came up in its stead. That scheme for the Confederation of British North America, which a short time ago seemed to have but very few supporters, was brought suddenly before us with a large number of supporters. How do we know that there may not be a change again in a short space of time—that the whole system with which we are now dealing, and on which hon. gentlemen have placed their views before the country, may not be changed again, without the people, who are said to be so satisfied with this scheme, having had the matter placed before them for consideration, or the opportunity of voting for or against the scheme? Therefore I believe it would be wiser, better, and more for the interests of the whole of this country

—and that it would greatly strengthen the power which this Confederate Government would have—were it voted upon by the people in the constitutional mode of a general election, before it is finally resolved upon as the Constitution of these colonies. I believe that if you wish to root it in the minds of the people, you will remove the objection which may at any time spring up, and be made the means, in the hands of designing men, of creating dissatisfaction hereafter. And I say that for the sake of carrying this scheme in the Lower Provinces, it is desirable to take this course. What is the reason of the suspicion entertained with regard to this scheme by the Lower Provinces? They say that the Government of Canada is urging it so rapidly, that there must be some *arrière pensée*—that there is something in it which will place her in a better position—that they are therefore pressing it upon the people of Canada and of the Lower Provinces, without giving them an opportunity of considering it fairly. One of the things made use of in the Lower Provinces is that our interest in the matter is so great, and we are entangled in so many difficulties, that we wish the other provinces united with us in order that, on their credit united with ours, we may be able to incur greater liabilities, and carry out our views as to public works, the benefit of which we will gain exclusively, although the Lower Provinces assume their share of the liability. For the present, therefore, unless by a great stretch of power on the part of the Imperial Parliament, it will be impossible to force it on the Lower Provinces. They say that Canada, pressing it in that way, must have some ulterior object in view, which does not distinctly appear. Can we suppose for a moment that the position of the gentlemen going to England will be, that they will press the Imperial Parliament to pass this measure, *coûte que coûte*, whether the Lower Provinces like it or not, urging that as Canada possesses the larger population—two-thirds of the whole—if she desires to have it the others must have it, whether they will or not. If that policy were pursued, it would be necessary, first of all, to deprive them of their constitutions, and then to declare that they must unite with us—that the will of the majority should overrule the wishes of the minority, exactly as in the United States, where everything depends on the will of the majority, and the minority are presumed to have but few

rights, if any at all. But if you show that not only the majority of this Parliament, but the majority of the people also in Canada, are in favor of this scheme; and if you can show what the majorities in the Lower Provinces are at the same time—if you can in this way show what is the will of the majority of the whole of the people of these provinces, you will have your hands much strengthened, when you go to England, if you wish to say that because Canada asks it, and the majority of the whole people of these provinces asks it, the Lower Provinces must be compelled to come in. The passage of this resolution, in my judgment, would not imperil the passage of the scheme at all. It would not prevent the gentlemen who go home from taking such steps before the Imperial Parliament as they would think it desirable to take, or as they might be instructed here to take by the Government of which they are members. Let the Imperial Parliament pass the measure, according to the views of the delegates, confirmed by the action of this Parliament—but let them say that the measure shall not come into force in all these colonies until each Parliament has voted upon it. And let each Parliament be elected by the people, with special instructions to declare whether this new Constitution shall be the Constitution of these colonies or not. Every one who is a well-wisher of his country—who desires to see it go on and prosper—who believes that the concentration of power in one Executive over all these colonies will place us in a position to assume the name and *status* of a nation upon the earth—will be glad to find our power in that way consolidated. And if we base the structure, as it ought to be based, on the expressed will of the people themselves, then I think we will be offering to those who come after us, as well as to ourselves, a heritage which every man should be proud of—and which will bring to our shores, from Great Britain and other parts, people who will be desirous to obtain here, along with all the favorable circumstances attendant upon the settlement of our lands, the advantages of the free Constitution which we have made, as nearly as possible, a *fac-simile* of that of the mother-land. But though I am myself in favor of the Confederation resolutions, and anxious to see them carried out, I am desirous that they shall be carried out in a manner which will be con-

ducive to the best interests of the country, based on a heartfelt expression of opinion by the people, by means of a general election. I promised I would not detain the House, and having presented such arguments as seem to me to require the passage of this resolution, I resume my seat. (Cheers.)

MR. M. C. CAMERON said—I have great pleasure, sir, in seconding the resolution which is now before the House, because I think it is very desirable that before any such a change as that which is proposed should go into effect, the people, who are to be affected by the change, should have an opportunity of pronouncing upon it in a more decisive way than they can through their representatives in this House, who have been sent here for an entirely different purpose than that of making a change in the Constitution. It would not signify to me if the circumstances attending the union of Scotland with England, or of Ireland with England, had furnished no reason for contending that an appeal to the people was proper. They were entirely different from those under which we are existing. If there had been no precedents whatever, I say that at this enlightened day, when the people interfere and have a right to interfere in the management of their own affairs, no such a change as this should take place without their having a voice in it. I do not feel, with the proposer of this resolution, that it is absolutely necessary that a dissolution of this House should take place for the purpose of obtaining an expression of the popular will. I do not see why the taking of a direct vote—yea and nay—would be an unconstitutional proceeding. (Hear, hear.) I have found that by the legislation of this country a precedent has been established that the people who are to be affected should have the right of voting upon certain measures relating to their financial affairs. We find that in those bodies which the people are empowered to create, and which are as much representative bodies as we are, the township and county councils—whenever a debt is to be created over a certain amount, affecting the communities over which those councils exercise control, the question must first be left to the people to pronounce upon it before it can become law. The people send their representatives to those bodies to legislate for them in a similar man-

ner to that in which we are sent here to legislate for the country at large. The only difference is the difference between a small legislative body and a large one. They are just as much representatives of the people as we are. When we provide that they shall submit by-laws to a direct vote of the people, can it be said that it is a violation of the Constitution, or even an unjust or improper course to take a vote in a similar way, when so much larger matters are at stake? I do say, sir, that if there were no example for it—if our Legislature had not shown that it was the people's right to have a voice on all matters affecting them largely—we should now proceed to make that precedent. (Hear, hear.) I do not mean to say, however, in speaking thus, that I am adverse in the slightest degree to there being a dissolution of the House; but it strikes me that we will have a great many side-issues in a contest of that kind, and cannot, therefore, arrive at the direct sense of the people so closely as we should be able to do by a square vote of yea or nay. Nevertheless, it is of very great importance that before advancing to the end of the proceedings that we have contemplated by passing these resolutions, they should first be submitted to the country in some way. I am in favor of the resolutions going to the people in any way rather than the scheme should be carried out without such expression; and I am also desirous that the public should be awakened from that apathy which has been alluded to by the hon. member for Peel, and which I am also satisfied exists among the people upon this question. The honorable member for Peel has asserted that there could not be half a dozen gentlemen found on the floor of this House who would say that this country could go on and prosper—but I say it could prosper for the next decade as it has prospered during the past, without any change whatever. I believe I am one of those, few though they may be, who so think; but I am also one of those who thought that it would be very desirable to have a change in the representation of the different sections of the province, on the floor of this House. I thought that Upper Canada contributed so much more towards the revenue of this country than Lower Canada, that she ought to have a larger voice in the disposal of that revenue. Therefore a change of the Constitution, in this respect, has been agitated by men entertaining that opinion, but I never did

feel that the people of Lower Canada considered themselves on the eve of a revolution, or that the people of Upper Canada had arrived at that point, that they felt it absolutely necessary to resort to revolutionary measures to obtain justice. While I feel that we have now arrived at that stage that we can have a union with the Lower Provinces that would give us a strength and a stability that we cannot acquire by the resolutions we have just passed, yet I do not desire that any change should take place without the people of this country having the fullest and freest opportunity of expressing themselves upon its desirability. I desire that the people should have this scheme presented to them, side by side with the proposal for a legislative union, that we may ascertain whether or not they would adopt a Federal union, in preference to a Legislative union. I have been charged with having advanced arguments in discussing the resolutions, which were as applicable and favorable to a Federal as to a Legislative union, and that I said nothing more favorable to the one than to the other. Well I admit that if you take three or four isolated points of a man's argument, you can make them support exactly the opposite of that which his whole course of argument was calculated to uphold, and when you put all of my remarks together, you will find that they bear strongly in favor of the legislative form of union. This much will be found, that every argument which I advanced that could be said to favor Federation, was also an argument in favor of a Legislative union; and, in addition, I brought prominently to view the greater economy connected with the working of the latter. I consider that argument a strong one, in view of the circumstances at present existing in this country—the suffering in consequence of the failure of crops, and the depression of trade owing to the war in the United States, the position of this country is such that it is not able to bear additional heavy burdens; and if we are going to make a change in our Constitution, that change should be of a character that would lessen those burdens instead of increasing them, if possible. And if we must incur a heavy burden for defensive purposes, let us have as much saving, in other respects, as we can effect, so that there will be as little expenditure as may be for the mere machinery of government, and then we shall have a

form of union that will meet the approval of the people, and be perpetuated. Looking at this change that is considered so necessary, let us enquire what events have brought it about. Let honorable gentlemen on the Treasury benches answer for me, and we will find that it has been the cry that retrenchment was absolutely necessary—that if we did not have retrenchment, or give to Upper Canada that fair control over the expenditure of our income that she ought to have, in consequence of her contributing so much more to the revenue, there would be a revolution. That was the way in which the Hon. President of the Council, for party and political purposes, chose to discuss this matter while he was in opposition. Not that there was really any danger of revolution, but because there was justice in the cry, they used strong language to give effect to their argument. Now, I would like to understand and I have not yet been able to understand from any member of this House who has been advocating representation by population—whether there was any reason for believing that we could not have got that constitutional change just as well as we can get this one. It was party feeling that kept the people apart, yet that party feeling was swamped in a moment when the leaders of the parties brought their heads together, and declared that it should no longer exist. They united for the avowed purpose of remedying the difficulties under which the province labored, and for the purpose of giving the people of Upper Canada their rights; and they say this is to be accomplished by a Federal union. They might as well have formed a union for a more economical object—for the purpose of forming a Legislative union between the provinces. It may be said that hon. gentlemen of French extraction from Lower Canada were so determined to resist the demands of Upper Canada, that the rights of that section of the province could never have been obtained, unless by a Federal union of the colonies. I think, however, that they are men of intelligence, and that if they found Upper Canadians were true to their determination to contend for their rights until they should be obtained, the result would have been very different from what it has been. Hon. gentlemen from Lower Canada, of French origin, must have seen that they were liable to be swept away at any moment that there should be a union between the British of Lower and of Upper Canada. If the issue had been

placed fairly and equally before them; if they had been brought to see that matters had arrived at such a state that it was absolutely necessary that some change should take place—the people of the Eastern Townships and of the eastern part of Upper Canada standing ready to be banded together against them—they would have seen that the elements on the floor of this House were such as would force upon them either a legislative union with the Lower Provinces, or representation by population in Canada alone. Whether a legislative union, with representation by population as a basis, could have been obtained from the Lower Provinces or not, I am not prepared to say; but I am given to understand that the people of the Lower Provinces advocated a legislative union as strongly as those of Upper Canada, and that they were about to carry out a legislative union among themselves. Now, if Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland were willing to go into a legislative union with Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, I do not see why the proposal to bring in an additional province should have effected so complete a change in their views. I am satisfied that if the gentlemen who represented the interests of Upper Canada had set themselves about trying to get that which would have been best for their people, and had endeavored to enforce the rights of Upper Canada, they would have accomplished that which would have been of more service to the people of the united provinces, and which would have placed beyond chance or possibility those contentions which will necessarily result so soon as you have individualized those provinces by giving each a Local Legislature. By this scheme you will have increased the burdens of the people, and in so doing will have increased their opportunity for discontent. You have given to the general and local legislatures coördinate jurisdiction, or at least have given them the right to legislate on the same questions, and, in thus placing in their hands an element of contention, have shewn that you are not building up a firm and stable government. (Hear, hear.) Now it is said that one of the strongest reasons for union is found in the necessity of placing our common country in a position of defence, but I do not see why we cannot make arrangement for a defence under our present government. Let us be told what it is that is required of us, and see whether the different legislatures will not vote the

money necessary. If we can get the money through the Imperial Government, then let us show them that we are prepared to make it good, that we are prepared to raise the money upon our own paper, if they will guarantee it for us. If they will do that, they will find that these provinces are willing and ready to make all due provision for their defence. This province is only one of a number which are equally bound to defend themselves with us, as I believe they have the spirit and inclination to do. I fancy you will find as much loyalty in the Lower Provinces as in Canada, and you will find that when we are ready to aid the Mother Country in defence of this portion of her territory, they will be ready too; and as they are now united to the Mother Country as well as ourselves, we could be in no better position for defence through the contemplated union. The union cannot make us stronger, when we have to look to the Imperial power as the bond that keeps us together under any circumstances. It is to them we shall look for orders when the time comes to act. I am not one of those who like to look at the idea of the severance of the bond between this and the Mother Country, but yet I feel that if Upper Canada is burdened more heavily than she has been by the additional burdens which this Federal union must impose to sustain its costly machinery, there will be great danger of the same state of things being brought about which rendered some change necessary at the present time. It cannot but be felt that this scheme has not been brought forward with a view to more economical government, or with a view to providing the best means of union that could be obtained, but that it had its origin in expediency and compromise. The people of Canada felt compelled to seek some change, and the people of the Lower Provinces, if they adopt the measure, will in a sense have it forced upon them by the people of Canada. A scheme has been adopted which it is thought will prove the most expedient for the time being, but which must be changed in the course of a few years, after leading us into contentions and strife, such as we have had for the past ten years. Why not pause and discuss the measure more thoroughly, and have it weeded of its defects, so that we may accomplish at once the construction of a Constitution that shall be a lasting one, and not risk the formation of a union on a Constitution that will tumble to pieces, and drive a large por-

tion of the people to look for relief in a union with the neighboring republic—a union that I for one should regard as the greatest curse that could befall this Canada of ours. (Hear, hear.) Now, Mr. SPEAKER, that the measure should be submitted to the country before it is carried out, is a matter that is rendered the more necessary by an article that I will read from the *Globe* newspaper, which paper is the organ of the Government at the present time, and has always been understood to express the views of the honorable member for South Oxford (Hon. Mr. BROWN), now the Hon. President of the Council. It is in reference to the Intercolonial Railway, which so many people now think may be built without detriment to the interests of the country, if we are to have all the benefits supposed to be derivable from this union. Here is what was said by that newspaper when the former negotiations for building the Intercolonial Railway were in progress:—

Upper Canada has not, it appears, suffered enough in the estimation of Upper Canadian members of the Cabinet, from being tied to one poor eastern province—it must have three more added to its already heavy burdens. One legislature is not a sufficiently cumbrous, unwieldy and expensive body, but we must add to it the representatives of three other communities, each section with varying local interests, and all pulling at the same purse. And to show what we may look for in the future, we are to pay four-twelfths of the cost of a railway to unite us to these new allies, and to keep the road running besides. Truly a charming scheme to be proposed by a retrenchment government—(hear, hear)—whose sole aim was to be the reduction of expenditure and the correction of abuses in administration! Now, burdens of an enormous amount are to be imposed upon the people of Upper Canada, a railway job to be undertaken, likely to be as disastrous and disgraceful as the Grand Trunk, and an already unwieldy political system to be encumbered three-fold; all that Messrs. SICOTTE and SANDFIELD MACDONALD may get rid of the difficulties with which their Government is surrounded.

AN HON. MEMBER—What paper is that in?

MR. M. C. CAMERON—The *Toronto Globe*.

HON. MR. BROWN—What is the date?

MR. M. C. CAMERON—I do not know the exact date; I find it as an extract in another paper. It was written about two years ago.

HON. MR. BROWN—Oh! that is out of

date; it does not apply to the altered circumstances of the case.

HON. MR. HOLTON — The extract speaks of that scheme having been proposed by a retrenchment government. It should be remembered that this Government is not a retrenchment government.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—I will read another extract from the same paper, of a similar date:—

There is a refreshing coolness in the demand that Canada shall pay for the construction of a road, which is professedly designed to draw away trade from its great estuary. We have been building up the navigation of the St. Lawrence at immense expense, and have had very hard work to compete with the Hudson and Erie canals. According to the views of the late Hon. Mr. MERRITT, steamship lines were alone needed to secure the object we desire. The Ministry propose, however, to withdraw the steamships from the St. Lawrence! If this could be done, it would be an act of suicide in Canada to take part in the scheme. As it cannot be done, it is simply an absurdity.

It may be difficult to escape from pledges given to the representatives of the Lower Provinces, but the members of the Cabinet may rely upon it, that they will have their reward for the abandonment or postponement of the measure in the approbation of their constituents and of the province at large.

(Hear, hear.) Now, Mr. SPEAKER, looking at that article, and assuming that the writer of it really was a man who had the interests of the country at heart, and assuming that it expressed the sentiments of the Honorable President of the Council, I would like to know what really has taken place within those two years which renders it so absolutely necessary that this road that would have been so disastrous to the interests of Canada, if built at that time, should be commenced now? Is the only change that has taken place the elevation of the editor to a seat at the Executive Council Board? He found that it would not do for him to coalesce with that very respectable old corruptionist who sits along side of him, and who compared the Upper Canadians to so many codfish in Gaspé Bay, unless he had something as a basis of excuse for the Coalition that would make it look plausible and sound well; and so they got up the idea of a "new nationality," which was to crush out all former cries and hide from the people of Canada their true interests, by declaring that no matter how extravagant a government may be, if you can get

a union of this kind, you can afford to spend your millions annually in excess of your income in the construction and maintenance of a road calculated to injure our trade, and all for the sake of adding to our population some 800,000 inhabitants. (Hear, hear.) Under these circumstances, it strikes me that before a change so great as this is made—a change that has been condemned and its leading feature, the Intercolonial Railway, so strongly denounced by the Reform press generally of Upper Canada—before such a change as this is made, the people should be consulted. It may be that the reasoning then adopted and given expression to through the columns of the *Globe* has taken a deep hold upon the minds of the people, and that they have not, like the Hon. President of the Council, obtained the new light which seems to have broken in upon his mind. We are now told—no railway, no union; but if this railway was so complete a curse that it was not to be built when we had only to contribute five-twelfths of the expense, we ought to have some greater reason given than has yet been furnished, why this union should take place, involving as it does the construction of that Intercolonial Railway, at a cost to us of ten-twelfths of the work. What great difference is there in the circumstances of the country now from what there was then, to make up for the great mischief that the railway was to do if constructed two years ago? The Honorable President of the Council does not choose to answer these questions. He finds that he has got an excellent body of followers in this House at the present time, who are carried away with the idea that some change is necessary, and they are prepared to run into anything where the Honorable President leads, for the sake of the novelty; for it is said that if you get a little novelty to tickle the people for a season, they may be kept quiet, little heeding the storm that will come after the calm. When this House first met, I observed a great many opponents to this scheme; but somehow or other the opposition of a great many of them very soon subsided. Some people say that several hon. members had axes to grind, and they were only holding on to the handle until they were sure the edge was sharp. (Laughter.) Soon after the meeting of the House, it was observed that the Hon. President of the Council had taken a trip around among them, and the next thing we knew they had wheeled right about. Mr. SPEAKER,

the breath of the Hon. President of the Council must have been exceedingly pestilential, for hon. gentlemen who had prepared themselves with speeches of two hours' duration, on standing up to deliver them, found themselves so weak in the knees that they were only able to stand for a few moments, and what they uttered was totally different from what they had prepared, and all in consequence of the breath of the Hon. President of the Council. (Laughter.) From the exceedingly detrimental character of that breath, I would strongly advise my hon. friends to keep at a safe distance, and not allow the Hon. President of the Council to come near them, for fear of a similar almost fatal result. (Hear, hear.)

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair until half-past seven.

After the recess,

MR. CAMERON, continuing his remarks, said—When the House rose at six o'clock, I had remarked upon the singular effect the breath of the Hon. President of the Council had upon many hon. members of this House; and in connection with this matter, I would like now to observe that there seems to be a practice growing into favor, which, according to my judgment, is deserving of every condemnation. It is for hon. members of the Government to address themselves privately to particular members, and give them reasons for their action, which reasons are not made known generally to the hon. members of this House. Now, I understand that every honorable member on the floor of this House represents a portion of the people of the country, and the portion of the people which one represents is as much entitled to consideration and to information in possession of the Government as the rest of the people or the constituencies of every other hon. member of the House. If the Government gives to some that information which in certain cases it has not communicated to those hostile to certain measures, it places those hon. members in a false position, makes them act contrary to what they would, perhaps, if all the facts were in their possession, and is a proceeding that is opposed to the best interests of the country. (Hear, hear.) If reasons were privately given by a Minister to me which he withheld from other hon. members of the House, I would think he was endeavoring to deceive me; for, according to his oath of office, he is bound to preserve the

secrets of the Cabinet, and if he betrayed them to me, I would conclude that he had some sinister end in view, and was endeavoring to make me proceed in a course contrary to that which would be dictated by my honest convictions. (Hear, hear.) Now, in reference to the Hon. the President of the Council, I had hoped that when he had cried a truce and buried the party hatchet, brushed off his war paint and smoked the pipe of peace with his political enemies—(laughter)—we would have no more misrepresentations going to the country through the medium of the newspaper organ which he wields. I did not expect, therefore, to find that that organ would have devoted a whole column to a humble individual like myself, who happens to express views contrary to those now held by that hon. gentleman. That paper, in referring to the recent debate in this House on the Confederation resolutions, makes an attack on me, by representing that I have betrayed my constituents by acting, as it says, contrary to the pledges I gave them previous to my election. Now, I presume my constituents know what pledges I did make to them, and it is not necessary that any communications should be made through the channels of the *Globe* to let them know that I have betrayed those pledges, for they are as well able to judge as that paper whether I violated my promises or not. If any argument I used to justify the position I took in regard to that question was bad, it might have been pointed out; but it was quite unnecessary to tell them that I had broken my pledges, when they were as competent to judge upon that point as any one else. Yet that is what the organ of the hon. gentleman is doing, showing that the old party leaven leavens the hon. gentleman still, and that all the elements of party discord and strife are just as rampant now in this House as they were before the present Coalition was formed. (Hear.) Now, the Hon. Attorney General West, in that amusing and interesting scene he had with the hon. member for Carleton the other day, made a declaration which, according to my sense of political morality, is not exactly one that should have been made by a Minister of the Crown holding the position of the hon. gentleman. He declared that it was the bounden duty of the members of his party to follow their leader in all things—not exercising their own judgment in reference to any matter that may come before the House, but sub-

mitting themselves to him, in the belief that when he made any proposition, no matter of what character, he had some good object in view.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—No, no.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—When the motion for the previous question was sprung upon the House, the Hon. Attorney General West rather rated the honorable member for Carleton, because that honorable gentleman chose to express an independent view on the matter, and then he stated that the follower ought always to obey the leader, because it was to be supposed the latter would not take any particular action without having good reasons for it. (Hear, hear.) Now, it seems to me that we have not been sent to this House by the people to follow the leaders of a party, but to represent the constituencies according to the best judgment we possess; and we are not, I think, required to give up that right of judgment upon all questions that come before this House, to the leader of a party or anybody else, but to exercise it properly ourselves. (Hear, hear.) The leader of the Government, in introducing any measure, ought to be able to satisfy honorable members of this House of the goodness and wisdom of that measure, and he should not ask or receive support any further than his ability to give such satisfaction. (Hear, hear.) The doctrine laid down by the Hon. Attorney General is, therefore, in my opinion—because it takes away the right of private judgment of honorable members of this House—pernicious and injurious to the best interests of the country.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—In what respect?

MR. M. C. CAMERON—In inducing honorable members of this House to act in any matter contrary to their own judgment, because the leader of the party to which they belong tells them to do so.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—No, no. I did not say that.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—I understood the honorable gentleman so, when the honorable member for Carleton and himself had that pleasant altercation the other day; and if that was not his meaning, I am sorry that I imputed it to him. (Hear, hear.) Now, I have contended that this measure of Confederation ought to be submitted to the people before its adoption. I have already

given from the *Globe* newspaper reasons why it should. I do not, sir, bring forward these extracts from that paper for the mere purpose of placing the Hon. President of the Council in an awkward and unpleasant position; but my design in doing so is to lead honorable gentlemen to reflect and think upon the probable effect of the votes they may give. If the *Globe* newspaper advocated measures formerly which met with the approbation of the people, and if its influence was so wide spread as is asserted, and as it undeniably is, the leaven with which it leavened the country by those articles advocating certain doctrines remains there still, and has not been removed by any new arguments it may now advance. It would be well for honorable gentlemen, therefore, to reflect well before making up their minds that the old leaven of the *Globe* has gone abroad—has still a hold of the public mind—and may affect them very seriously when they next present themselves at the polls. Now, I will read another extract showing what was the opinion held by the *Globe* on a subject which is viewed quite differently now by the Hon. President of the Council and the Government:—

We have a debt of seventy millions, and a deficiency of three or four millions, created by undertaking works which have failed to pay any return for the cost of construction. But no enterprise, the burden of which we have assumed, comes anything near the Intercolonial in the poverty of its promised results. It will not secure the profitable settlement of an acre of land; it will not help our trade; it will not pay its own running expenses.

The few barren acres at the east are to get \$50,000 a year of our money, while half a continent to the west is to get a few words addressed to the Colonial Minister.

Now, here is the doctrine, in reference to this matter, held by the *Globe* and the Hon. President of the Council only two years ago; and if these views were correct then they ought to be correct now, and the people should have an opportunity of pronouncing upon them, and saying whether that railway should be built, especially when, under this Confederation scheme, we are to pay upwards of three millions annually for the maintenance of the local governments. If the railway was objectionable then, surely it is more objectionable now, when the annual expenditure in connection with it will be at least double what it would have been had it

been carried out at that time. (Hear, hear.) Well, perhaps the people will see that this great scheme of Confederation, which has made the lion and the lamb lie down together, as the Honorable President of the Council has said, is something that has made them forget that prudent economy that had a large place in the feelings of the people of Upper Canada—a place created, perhaps, chiefly by the Hon. President of the Council himself; and if it is true, as that honorable gentleman urged in his paper, it is still more true and essential now that the people should have an opportunity of pronouncing upon it. And, sir, I adopt the view of the hon. member for Peel—although starting from it, he arrives at somewhat different conclusions from myself—if you force this scheme upon the people without asking for their consent, and if they wake from the apathy which they feel now, to find that they are saddled with burdens which they never contemplated, you make them opponents of the union, and worse opponents than if you asked them now whether they approved of it or not; and so you will have a dissatisfied people laboring under burdens which I fear will eventually create serious discontent throughout the length and breadth of the land. (Hear, hear.) And there is this additional reason for referring the question to the people, now that the other provinces have rejected the scheme, and I presume their governments will not dare to press it forward in opposition to the wishes of the people. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite, when they introduced this scheme, and said they could suffer no amendments to be made in it, put it on the plea that it was absolutely necessary, to keep faith with the Lower Provinces, that they should carry it in its entirety. I am glad to find that the Hon. President of the Council is not so willing and anxious to break faith with those provinces as he was two years ago in reference to one of the essential ingredients of this scheme—the Intercolonial Railway. (Hear, hear.) I admire, sir, the principle of keeping faith in any engagement; but I do not think it was necessary, in order to keep faith in this matter, that it should be treated as the Government proposes that this House shall deal with it. All the Government had to do to carry out what it undertook with the governments of the Lower Provinces, was to bring the scheme before Parliament, as those governments have done, and allow Parliament to deal with it as it saw fit.

There was no necessity for saying to the House that it must reject it or adopt it in its entirety. All the Government had to do—its members not being delegates to the Conference chosen by the people at large, nor even appointed by Parliament for that purpose, but going there, as it were, with the tacit understanding on the part of the representatives of the people in this House, to see whether any arrangement of union might be made that would work beneficially for the interests of the whole provinces—all it had to do was to settle upon some plan which it would report to this House for action; but it had no power whatever to bind this Legislature absolutely and irrevocably to the scheme adopted by the Conference, so that it could not dissent from or alter it. (Hear, hear.) Well, we find honorable gentlemen who advocate this scheme say that it is not a perfect measure, that it is not what any one of the provinces would desire or accept of itself, but that it is necessary to have this patch-work of a Constitution, because there are difficulties which it is necessary to get over and remove; and yet, while it is admitted to be imperfect, to tell us that we should not have an opportunity of saying whether its provisions are right or wrong, is, to my mind, to insult the intelligence of this House, and to commit a wrong which I think honorable gentlemen will have cause to regret hereafter. (Hear, hear.) Many honorable gentlemen have advocated this measure with great warmth, with a feeling of earnestness and truthfulness, and with what I believe to be a sincerely patriotic desire to accomplish something that will work for the best interests of this country. There is, for instance, the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. MORRIS), who years ago, in one of those day-dreams of youth which most of us experience, conceived the idea that a union of these provinces would be exceedingly beneficial to the people of all of them; and having got that idea somewhat in advance of his fellow-men, he thought that it was absolutely necessary for our prosperity that it should be worked out; but he forgets that in order to secure its smooth working it is necessary to have perfect joints to the machinery, and instead of getting that which will work well for the people, he gets that which has the name only of union, and few indeed of its advantages. If that honorable gentleman had his choice, he would no doubt have chosen something strong and stable, and not

something delusive and perishable; for, as the honorable member for Peel and other honorable members who advocate this measure say, it is only a temporary expedient to tide us over our difficulties—a scheme of union to serve for the present, and not intended to endure for all time. (Hear, hear.) We are not, in fact, building up the frame-work of a Constitution that is to stand for ever, but something that we will have to tinker up from time to time, till we at length succeed either in destroying it altogether or making it a passably fair erection. (Hear, hear.) It appears to me, sir, that when this country was given responsible government—when the people of Canada were taught the lesson that they were henceforth to exercise the right of thinking for themselves—it is a sort of rude interference with that right when a certain number of gentlemen from Canada enter into a contract with certain other gentlemen from the Lower Provinces—thirty-three in number altogether—sign that contract, and then declare that the representatives of the people in these provinces shall first be bound by it, that the people themselves shall next be bound by it, that neither representatives nor people shall have the power to alter or amend it, and then that if we do insist upon our right to alter it, we shall be thrown back into that state of difficulty which has been held up by some honorable gentlemen as a bug-bear to frighten us into submission, the country being represented as having been bordering on revolution, into which it would assuredly be thrown if this measure were not accepted in its entirety. (Hear, hear.) I think that this proposal will not go down—that it will not meet with that full acceptance which honorable gentlemen imagine. The people have too much intelligence to intrust the arrangement of so important a subject as this, which so intimately affects their future prosperity and happiness, to the hands of any set of men, however able and talented they may be; and if this scheme is carried without giving the people a chance of pronouncing their opinion, honorable gentlemen will be told, when they go back to their constituents, that the people have rights to be respected, that they like to be consulted about the character of the Constitution under which they are to live, and that before it is adopted finally, they like to have a word to say in regard to it, as well as those who assume to speak for them.

HON. MR. MCGEE—They have a word

to say. They say ditto to our action. (Hear, hear.)

MR. M. C. CAMERON—Well, I should like them to have a full opportunity of saying ditto or not as they pleased, and I fancy if they had, the ditto would not be so strong as honorable gentlemen opposite seem to think. (Hear, hear.) I have been told that I have violated my pledges in opposing this scheme, and that my constituents sent me here because they thought me to be in favor of it. Well, I have that yet to learn from them; for I have heard no complaint from them against my action, and have had one letter fully approving of it, and it so happens that it was written by a warm friend of the Honorable President of the Council in the old time. (Hear, hear.) I am not aware that the people anywhere approve of the scheme and say ditto to it, as the Honorable Minister of Agriculture tells us; and when the next election takes place, I presume we will have the ditto in some shape. Now, the Honorable President of the Council may think that I have some personal feeling against himself.

HON. MR. BROWN—Not at all.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—If the honorable gentleman does think that I am actuated by personal motives in my strictures upon him, he is very much mistaken. I have not the slightest personal feeling against him; and as far as I personally am concerned, he may remain in the Ministry and work through with his colleagues just as long as he can, and I promise he will find no factious opposition from me. (Hear, hear.) If I understand myself at all, I desire to promote the interests and advance the prosperity of my country; but I do not believe those interests or that prosperity advanced by the adoption of this scheme. (Hear, hear.) I believe a scheme of union could be devised which would be serviceable to all of these provinces, but I do not believe that Confederation is that scheme. I do not think it is desirable to adopt this, and then trust to the chance of obtaining a change afterwards. Honorable gentlemen from Lower Canada are only postponing the time when they will stand like other men in the community, having voice for voice with the rest, and nothing more. But if we change the Constitution now, is it wise or prudent to make the change only of such a character as to require future amendment, and give rise to future agitation? and is it not better that we should endeavor to make the Constitution

right in the first instance? (Hear, hear.) And as there are elements by which a union of the provinces could be formed that would be lasting, and that would serve the best interests of this country, honorable gentlemen on the Treasury benches would have better shown their patriotism by waiting a little longer to accomplish it.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—Accomplish what?

MR. M. C. CAMERON—A legislative union of these provinces.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—I thought my hon. friend knew that every man in Lower Canada was against it, every man in New Brunswick, every man in Nova Scotia, every man in Newfoundland, and every man in Prince Edward Island. How, then, is it to be accomplished?

MR. M. C. CAMERON—I did not understand anything of the kind; but I did understand that it was asserted here that that feeling existed in the Lower Provinces. I do understand, moreover, that there are enough members on the floor of this House—in the Parliament now assembled—who are ready and willing to give us representation by population.

HON. MR. MCDOUGALL—Why have they not said so?

MR. M. C. CAMERON—Because an opportunity has not been given them to do so. And I think I can show that the people of the Lower Provinces are in favor of a Legislative union, rather than a Federal union—(hear, hear)—for they appointed delegates to meet at Charlottetown for the purpose of establishing a Legislative union among themselves.

HON. MR. BROWN—The hon. gentleman is, no doubt, sincere in the opinion he expresses. It is true there was a union of the Maritime Provinces proposed, but it was not stated what kind of union it was to be.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—Well, all the sentiments and feeling I have seen expressed on the subject leads me to the conclusion that it was a legislative union they proposed; and when the delegates to the Quebec Conference spoke to their constituents, they put forward the idea that a legislative union would have been better than the one proposed. At any rate this scheme has been rejected in one of the provinces, and if carried into operation, it will have to be forced upon the people of one or other of the provinces. Well, if you are going to force a Constitution upon any part of the people, it

would be better to force upon them that which would, according to your own expressed opinion, be better and of greater service to the country than the scheme under consideration. (Hear, hear.) The people of Lower Canada presented the appearance of being against representation by population; they thought that it would be the annihilation of their peculiar institutions—that by its adoption their laws would be interfered with, their language extinguished, and their religion destroyed; and yet how readily did they concede the principle in this Confederation scheme. They granted representation by population in the Lower House of the Federal Legislature. (Hear, hear.) And why had they done so? Because, they say, under the Local Government our local affairs and interests will be safe in our own keeping—our laws will be safe, our language will be safe, our religion will be safe. Now, if they were assured that all these interests would be equally as safe and well protected under any form of government that might be chosen for the good of the whole country, can any hon. gentleman assume to say that they would be opposed to that form of government? (Hear, hear.) It is well to understand that hon. gentlemen representing Lower Canada constituencies and the people of Lower Canada have been educated to fear aggression on the part of Upper Canada, especially if representation by population were granted; and they have been so educated in consequence of the manner in which the Hon. President of the Council, his organ, and the organs of his party, have agitated that question in times past; but when the people of Lower Canada understand that there is an opportunity of conceding that which they have hitherto refused, and at the same time of securing the enjoyment of those rights and privileges which they all hold dear, I cannot believe that they will longer oppose that which all of them cannot fail to see must come sooner or later. (Hear, hear.) They must see that it is better for them to make terms now when they may; for I apprehend that they would not carry their resistance to a just principle to the length of a revolution; for it is quite clear that they could not be successful in any such movement, or set themselves up as an independent power in this country, while Upper Canada and the other provinces remain a part of the British possessions; nor could they become a part of the United

States, for under that government their laws, their language and their religion would be far less secure than they would be if the government were entirely in the hands of Upper Canada. I feel satisfied, therefore, that hon. gentlemen from Lower Canada would have yielded representation by population, if it had been shown to them by the representatives of Upper Canada that they could accept of no change which would increase our difficulties and add to the burdens we have to bear, as this scheme does; for that was the charge made over and over again at the polls in Upper Canada, that we were laboring under heavy burdens which had been cast upon us by successive governments, owing to the influence of the Lower Provinces. (Hear, hear.) Sir, I cannot conceive it to be possible that any body of men sent here by the people under the Constitution will make changes in that Constitution which were not contemplated by those who sent them here, without submitting those changes first to the people. They have not been agitated at the polls, and the people seem to think that they should be considered, and there is an apathy amongst them that does not prove that they are well disposed towards the scheme. It is true that the boast is made that they are all in favor of it, and a recent meeting at Toronto is pointed to as showing what their feeling is upon the subject. Well, of course, the hon. member for Lambton and the hon. member for Kent were at that meeting, and they said, and no doubt believed that those who composed that meeting were very distinguished individuals. (Laughter.) And because these distinguished individuals were present, and resolutions were carried in favor of Confederation, then it was at once assumed that the whole country was in favor of the scheme. But it ought to be recollected that that meeting was got up by a number of young men—talented and able young men, no doubt, but still young and enthusiastic—associated together to form or reorganize a Reform association, and that it was attended only by them and those friendly to them and their views, and not by the citizens of Toronto, assembled for the purpose of determining whether the scheme should be adopted or not. It cannot be assumed, therefore, that a meeting of that kind truly reflected the opinion of the people of Toronto; nor would this conclusion be arrived at when it is remembered that when a gentleman got up and moved that the scheme of Confeder-

ation should be submitted to the people, he was laughed at. Is it likely that if the meeting was not composed entirely of those in favor of Confederation, a proposition of that kind would be received with a laugh? (Hear, hear.) And if you read the reports of the speeches delivered at that meeting, you will find that hardly anything was said at all in reference to the true merits of the scheme, but that there was a great deal of that "highfaluting" talk which you hear in this House about the great and glorious results that this scheme is to bring forth. (Hear, hear.) As to its probable actual working and the benefits it will confer upon the people, or as to its disadvantages, there was not a word spoken in sober language, and in this House you find hon. gentlemen debating in just the same extravagant style as was exhibited at that meeting. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. McDOUGALL—I have understood from the several speeches delivered by the hon. gentleman upon this subject, that he feels quite convinced that a legislative union would be better, and that he would vote for it.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—Yes.

HON. MR. McDOUGALL—Well, then, I should like to know what authority he would have to vote for that rather than a Federal union, and from what he draws the inference that the people are in favor of it? (Hear, hear.)

MR. M. C. CAMERON—When I said I would vote for a legislative union, I did not say I was ready to adopt it without submitting it to the people. (Hear, hear.) Now, it has been said that the Lower Provinces are not in favor of and would not accept a legislative union. An hon. friend has just put in my hand a report of a speech delivered by Dr. TUPPER of Nova Scotia, in which that gentleman expresses himself in favor of a legislative union.

HON. MR. BROWN—I suppose it is exceedingly likely that at a meeting held in Halifax to consider a union of the Maritime Provinces, the people of that city were in favor of a legislative union, because Halifax was to be the capital, the central place of the proposed union, the other provinces giving up their individuality. I have no doubt that there may be some in all the provinces who are in favor of a Legislative rather than a Federal union.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—Now, in the correspondence laid before this House on

the subject of a union of the Maritime Provinces, the words used, as I recollect them, were a "Legislative union," and you do not find that the people of those provinces desired a Federal rather than a Legislative union. In the correspondence laid before the House on the subject, I think that the words used are those of a Legislative union. You do not find the words "Federal union" in it; and I think that is the kind of union which those gentlemen who desired the best interests of this country ought to have striven to have had. But because some fifteen or sixteen gentlemen, who patched up this Constitution with so many discordant elements in it, did not choose to give it to us, is no reason why we should not have it. All that we desired was that we should have a strong government, and they should have been satisfied to have gone on with the government of the country without any change. (Hear, hear.) But hon. gentlemen who were brought together in this Coalition had said so many hard things of each other, that it was found necessary to make people forget these by putting before them some great scheme, and I hope it will be a lesson to the Hon. President of the Council not to say such hard things of people in future. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

HON. MR. DORION—MR. SPEAKER, I do not intend to discuss the motion proposed by the honorable member for Peel; I merely desire to explain to Lower Canadian members that the object of that motion is to ask that any measure passed by the Imperial Government may not be put in force in Canada without being submitted to the people of this province. Those who are of opinion that the Legislature ought not to pass a measure of such importance—which is nothing short of a revolution in our Constitution—those who consider the measure of sufficient importance to induce them not to ask England to carry out that revolution without consulting the people, must vote in favor of this motion. (Hear, hear.) Even supposing that the people were in favor of Confederation, it would still be of great advantage to submit the question to the electors. The question is not yet understood. The newspapers have said, on the one hand, that it was a good measure, and on the other that it was a bad one; but in reality there has been no serious discussion, and it is perfectly clear that the people are not yet acquainted with it. (Hear, hear.) Members of this House undertake a very

serious responsibility in voting for this measure without consulting the people; and the advantage of an appeal to their electors—even supposing the result to be favorable to the scheme—would be to relieve them of that responsibility. (Hear, hear.) And if the measure be neither understood nor approved of by the people, you run the risk, by voting it in that position, of creating prejudices which would perhaps be removed by discussion. Therefore, in the interest of the measure itself, as well as of honorable members of this House, it ought to be submitted to the people before it is finally voted, and for my part I shall vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Peel. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. EVANTUREL—I should like to ask my friend the honorable member for Hochelaga, and all the honorable members of the Opposition, who constantly repeat that Confederation is now defunct, and that we have nothing more to do but to bury it, why they desire to submit it to the people? I fail to see the necessity, if it be true that the scheme is already defunct. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

HON. MR. DORION—My answer is, that we desire that it should be submitted to the people, in order to shew that it is unpopular. The hon. member thought to place me in a dilemma, but he was mistaken. He thinks the measure will be passed in England as it stands at present, and it is to avoid that contingency that we desire an appeal to the people.

HON. MR. EVANTUREL—No, no.

HON. MR. DORION—The hon. member for Quebec is then in hopes that it may be amended?

HON. MR. EVANTUREL—I do not believe it will be passed in England as it now stands.

HON. MR. DORION—Well, if it can be amended in England to our advantage, it may also be modified in a contrary sense. But that is not the question. I say that we ought to submit it to the people, in order that if the verdict should be favorable to the measure, it may go to the Imperial Government with the sanction of the people and of Parliament; and if the people are opposed to the scheme, the delegates must not be left in a position to say that public opinion in Canada is favorable to the measure. (Hear, hear.)

MR. DENIS—I believe, MR. SPEAKER, that the fears of the honorable member for Hochelaga are entirely unfounded. In order that an appeal to the people may be of use,

the scheme should be known as a whole, for how could the people form a sound judgment if we were to lay before them only a vague plan of Confederation, that is to say, the resolutions as they stand at present, unless they were also put in possession of the constitution of the local governments, and all the other details of the measure which most deeply interest them, and with which they are entitled to be made acquainted? Let us wait until the plan is known, and the people will be consulted when the proper time comes. (Hear, hear.)

MR. J. B. E. DORION—Really, Mr. SPEAKER, if the honorable member for Beauharnois meant what he said, he has given us something new. But I do not believe he is really serious when he tells us that we should wait until the constitutions of the local governments are submitted to us, before judging of the merits of the resolutions now before us. However, supposing him to be perfectly in earnest, and that he had no intention of trifling, as he sometimes does, does he fancy for one moment that we are going to accept the reasons he brings forward to induce us to vote against an appeal to the people? If so, he is very much mistaken. (Hear, hear.) I can easily understand that he is embarrassed, and that he should shield himself even under weak arguments in voting against the motion in amendment, for he promised at two electoral meetings to vote for an appeal to the people. (Hear, hear.) He says he will not vote for an appeal to the people, because he is not acquainted with the details of the measure; but why, then, does he vote on the main motion without knowing these details? He knows that the Government have told us that we must vote Confederation before they bring down the constitution of the local governments, and that they intended going to England to secure the new Constitution, without submitting to us the plan of the local constitutions. It will be too late when the delegates return, and after England has given us a new Constitution, to submit the present resolutions to the people. (Hear, hear.) And if we can judge here of this grand scheme of Confederation—as the hon. member says—without having before us the details of the organization of the local governments, why should not the people, in like manner, be afforded an opportunity of recording their opinion of the scheme? The reasons advanced by the honorable member are utterly futile. (Hear, hear.)

MR. GIBBS.—Before the vote is taken

on this motion, I feel it to be my duty to make a few remarks explanatory of the vote I intend to give. When I addressed the House the other evening, I stated that I had given a pledge to my constituents that when the motion came up in this House for submitting the scheme of a union of the Provinces of British North America to the people of this province, I would feel it to be my duty to vote for it. The language I used was something like this, that although I was in favor of the Federation of the British North American Provinces, yet that as the measure was to affect not only those now inhabiting these provinces, but others to follow us, I would insist upon it that the question should be submitted to the people before going into effect, while upon the canvass in my riding, I stated that I looked upon the resolutions submitted in the light of the basis of an agreement that might have been entered into by a number of individuals desirous of going into a partnership, which no one could alter without the consent of the others. I was, therefore, not at all surprised to hear the Honorable Attorney General West, at the opening of the discussion, say that we could not change that treaty, that we must vote on it in this way—either accept or reject it as a whole. It was said that if the people sent me to the House as their representative, I would be found voting for their resolutions as they were, without seeking to amend them in any respect. Although I believed that the resolutions would be presented and pressed as they stood, I did not believe that no amendment would ever be made to them; and although the Parliament of Canada has been told that it cannot alter the scheme, I am not without hope that when the delegation proceeds to England, certain necessary amendments will be introduced by the Government of Great Britain. Now, sir, I consider that to a certain extent the members opposed to the details of the scheme, but who are disposed to favor the general principle, have put their political consciences in the hands of the honorable gentlemen on the Treasury benches; therefore I am in hopes that the resolutions will not pass into law exactly in the shape in which they have been presented to this House. Being sent here to represent the people, and feeling the matter to be a very important one, affecting very materially the Constitution under which they live, I consider it my duty to vote for such an amendment as that which has been submitted by the honorable member for Peel. I was strengthened in that view of the case by the words of Lord DURHAM on the subject of

the union of Upper and Lower Canada. The noble lord had recommended the adoption of a general legislative union of all the British North American Provinces, and also the submission of the question to the people of those provinces for their approval. He said, "But the state of the lower province, though it justifies the proposal of an union, would not, I think, render it gracious or even just on the part of Parliament, to carry it into effect without referring it to the ample deliberation and consent of the people of those colonies." Now, sir, I take it that what is alluded to here is the consent of the legislatures of those provinces. If this House should be dissolved, and the measure passed in England be of a permissive character, it would, when returned, either be accepted or rejected by the House, and in the meantime the constituencies could be consulted in reference to it. (Hear, hear.) The necessity for this has been proved by some of the remarks which have been made by honorable gentlemen who have addressed the House on the subject. Several honorable members, who advocated the measure, stated that they had already placed it before their constituents, and that they had their endorsement in voting for it as they intended to do. That is right as far as it goes, but it only shows that these honorable gentlemen deemed it necessary to take that course and consult their constituents, thus fortifying themselves by securing beforehand their approval. (Hear, hear.) It is said that doctors disagree, but I think the same may be said of lawyers; for we find the honorable member for Peel saying that it would be unconstitutional to take the course advocated by the honorable member for North Ontario. But I concur rather in the mode of appeal to the people proposed by the honorable member for North Ontario, "yea" or "nay," than in that of the honorable member for Peel. The principle has been acknowledged by the Parliament of Canada, and it has been introduced into our county councils, so far that any sum exceeding \$20,000 cannot be levied without the consent of the people having been first obtained. I believe that we should support Federation, or the fears entertained by many may be realized, that its rejection may have a tendency towards annexation. I did not hesitate to give my adhesion to the resolutions of the Conference, believing as I do that their adoption is calculated to benefit these provinces, and also to strengthen the connection between this country and Great Britain. My attachment to British institutions is not

mere sentiments, but a principle which has grown with my growth and strengthened with my strength. (Hear, hear.) I fear if this scheme be not adopted, and matters continue as at present—let the just rights of Upper Canada be denied her—let the Reciprocity treaty be abrogated—we may hear a cry throughout the province that will alarm if not astonish us. One thing has struck me as rather singular in passing through the country—that not one individual whose proclivities were supposed to be in favor of American institutions had expressed himself as in favor of the scheme now before the House. I look upon that as a strong argument in its favor. As I have already stated, sir, although I am in favor of the measure, I think it but right that it should be submitted to the people, for their approval, before being carried into effect, and therefore I deem it my duty to vote for the amendment of the honorable member for Peel. (Hear, hear.)

MR. JACKSON—I have only a word or two to say, MR. SPEAKER, before the vote is taken on this motion. I cannot reconcile the conduct of the honorable member for Peel in voting that an Address should be presented to Her Majesty in favor of the scheme, and then move to have it submitted to the people. The honorable member for Peel has made out a case for the resolutions which have been adopted by this House. He stated that the people of Upper Canada were in favor of it; he has no objection to it himself; it meets with his hearty concurrence. I can easily conceive how my honorable friend from North Ontario can vote for this resolution; but I cannot understand how an honorable gentleman can vote that an Address shall be presented to the Queen, asking Her Majesty to submit the scheme to the Imperial Legislature, and, after that has been voted, turn round and vote that the scheme should be submitted to the people. I cannot understand that. If I voted for the motion now before the House, I should think I was acting in opposition to the vote I gave before. (Hear, hear.) I stated the other evening that my constituents were in favor of the House adopting this measure, and that they did not consider an appeal to the people necessary. In accordance with their decision I gave my vote, and I shall now vote in opposition to the motion of the honorable member for Peel. If it was necessary, I think I could show to the House that if it were submitted to the people, side issues would be raised, irrelevant altogether to the main question, in order to

promote some local object or interest, and we would have no united expression of opinion. I think that every honorable gentleman who supported the resolutions must vote in opposition to the motion of the honorable member for Peel. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. BROWN—I do not rise to detain the House from the division beyond a very few minutes. But I think it would not be desirable that the debate should close without a few words from this part of the House. And first, a word with reference to the speech of the honorable member for North Ontario (Mr. M. C. CAMERON). That honorable gentleman, in the course of his remarks, said he had no personal feeling towards myself. I quite believe that, and I am entirely willing that the honorable gentleman should enjoy all the little relief he evidently obtains from his fierce assaults on myself and the Hon. Provincial Secretary (Hon. Mr. McDougall). I do not think that any of the other remarks of the honorable gentleman require notice—(laughter)—as they were only a repetition of what had frequently come from other honorable members in the previous part of this debate. But as regards the honorable member for Peel (Hon. J. HILLYARD CAMERON), I do say that anything more extraordinary than the line of argument he took up here to-night, I never heard from any hon. member of this House. What was the position taken by the hon. gentleman from Peel? He commenced by saying that justice to Upper Canada required the granting of parliamentary reform, and that this scheme gave that measure of justice to Upper Canada. He said the province must be defended; that the question of the defence of this province was the most urgent and the most important question we had to consider at this moment, and that this measure provided the best way of meeting that question of defence. He said that the threatened abolition of reciprocity with the United States required to be met—that the best interests of this province would be imperilled by the repeal of the Reciprocity treaty—and that he conceived that this measure supplied the very best way of meeting that difficulty. He said also that we cannot go on as we are—that it was quite impossible that the state of things which has existed in Canada could continue—that there must be a change—and he conceived that what was proposed by this measure was a most desirable change. He said we had but one of two alternatives—a dissolution of the union, or the

adoption of the Federal principle—and that for his part he considered that a dissolution of the union was the last thing to be adopted, and that the Federal system is the best remedy that can be applied under our particular circumstances.

HON. J. H. CAMERON—I said I preferred the legislative union.

HON. MR. BROWN—At any rate, the honorable gentleman voted in the constitutional committee for a Federal union, and signed the report in favor of it, as the only measure that could be carried, and as one desirable to be carried.

HON. J. H. CAMERON—After having voted first for the legislative union.

HON. MR. BROWN—I cannot speak as to that. Then the honorable gentleman went on to say that on all these grounds this measure commended itself “to every true lover of his country.” Yet, after having passed this high eulogium on the measure, what does he say? Why, that he won’t have it now—that he won’t have it until it has been sent to the country, and the opinion of the electors has been obtained upon it! He says there is danger of annexation to the United States if these difficulties are not met—that annexation is hanging over us—that this measure will deliver us from that dire fate—and yet he is not prepared to apply the remedy now! And what are the reasons of the honorable gentleman for refusing to give effect to a measure of which he professes to be so enamoured? Does he, like the honorable member for North Ontario, deny the power of Parliament to pass such a measure? Not at all; he admits we have full power to pass it. Does he personally entertain any doubt as to the benefit from passing it now? On the contrary, he is enthusiastically for the measure, and declares that he would vote for it, just as it stands, as an elector at the polls. Does he want delay? On the contrary, he demands that the measure shall be urged on with all speed. (Hear, hear.) He says the sooner the members of Government are in England the better for the people of Canada—that this question of Federation, and the question of defence, and the question of American reciprocity, should be urged on the British Government without one hour’s unnecessary delay. He protests that on the fate of this measure some of the most vital interests of the province depend, and yet he will not have it until months of valuable time have been lost, until the country has been forced to pass through all the turmoil and

confusion and uncertainty of a general election, and until a new Parliament has been summoned and given its sanction to the measure. And the most curious part of it is, the honorable gentleman does not want the appeal now—he will take it by and by.

HON. J. H. CAMERON—My argument was entirely the contrary. I said there should not be a day's delay in appealing to the country; that as the Government had told us they were to meet Parliament in July, there would be no reason to prevent this Parliament being dissolved, and a new Parliament being summoned by that time.

HON. MR. BROWN—Yes; but the honorable gentleman most inconsistently told us in the same breath that the deputation of Ministers must go at once to England. Does he fancy a general election would be brought on during the absence from the country of the leading members of the Administration? If he does, I tell him he is mistaken. But does the honorable gentleman pretend there is any doubt as to the feeling of the people of Canada on this measure? Not at all. On the contrary, he is quite confident that if submitted to the people there would be a vast majority in its favor—a complete sweep over the country. Nay, strange enough, he gives this very fact of the certainty of approval as the chief argument in favor of an election. He says, "Send it to the people; there is no fear of the result. The very men who now sit here to-day, or others who think as they do, will come back and adopt it!" Could anything more absurd than this be imagined? Is not the argument clearly in the opposite direction? Should not the honorable gentleman have said—"The people approve of this measure; their representatives approve of it; if you had an election, the same men would be sent back, or others like them; a vast sum would be uselessly expended; much valuable time would be lost; partisan broils might be revived; don't, then, lose a moment, but put it through at once." (Cheers.) But I confess the honorable gentleman did suggest one argument in favor of an appeal to the people, and a very strange one it certainly was coming from such a quarter. The hon. member for Peel says he has not a doubt as to the feelings of the people of Upper Canada; he is quite certain that an almost unanimous verdict would be rendered by them in favor of this measure. But he says he has some doubts as to what the people of Lower Canada might think about it; they might possibly like to give the measure a death-blow,

and he is in favor of giving them a chance to do it! Now, sir, I did think that a very peculiar style of argument from one so enamoured of this measure, and from one, too, who has been supposed not to be very closely allied with the majority of Lower Canadians on matters of public policy, and especially on this particular question. (Hear, hear.) Who could have expected to find the hon. member for Peel assuming the rôle of an exponent of popular feeling in Lower Canada, and constituting himself the guardian of the rights of the French-Canadians? (Hear, hear.) It did strike me that the honorable gentleman might very properly have left the Lower Canadians to speak for themselves. (Hear, hear.) In view of the vote recorded on this measure at our last sitting—considering the fact that a majority of twelve on the Lower Canada vote was then recorded in favor of the measure, I do think the hon. member for Peel might have been well content to accept the votes of Lower Canadian representatives as the best index to Lower Canadian feeling. (Hear, hear.) There were three Lower Canada members absent, on Saturday morning, from the division; but had they been here, there would have been a majority of thirteen on the Lower Canada vote in favor of the measure.

HON. MR. DORION—No; Messrs. DUNKIN, ABBOTT and DAoust would have voted against it.

HON. MR. BROWN—I believe Mr. DAoust and the Hon. Mr. ABBOTT have declared in favor of Confederation. Mr. DUNKIN would probably have voted against it. As for the honorable member for Argenteuil (Hon. Mr. ABBOTT), I see he is now in his place, and can answer for himself. With Mr. DUNKIN voting against the measure, there would have been a Lower Canada majority of thirteen in its favor. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—The hon. member for Argenteuil would have voted against it.

Cries of "Ask himself!" and laughter.

HON. MR. BROWN—The honorable gentleman is of age, and can speak for himself. I could not pay him such a poor compliment as to fancy for a moment that he could vote against this measure. I have no doubt he would have voted on the right side. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—I am sure he would, but not with you. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. BROWN—Ah! I repeat that in the face of that Lower Canada majority of thirteen, and a French-Canadian majority of

five, the one argument of the honorable member for Peel in demanding the turmoil and delay and expense of a general election was his tenderness as to the feelings of the Lower Canadians. (Hear, hear.) And yet, sir, the honorable member for Peel has seen the sort of agitation that is being carried on against this measure in Lower Canada; he has heard the way in which petitions against it have been concocted in this character, and sent broadcast over this country with urgent entreaties to have them signed by men, women and children; he has seen these petitions come back here with hardly a genuine signature appended to them; he has heard the arguments and the cries on which this agitation has been based. (Hear, hear.) I ask him if it is to aid and strengthen such an agitation against this measure that he demands a general election? I ask him if there has been one argument against the scheme which, in his opinion, supplied any reasonable foundation for the agitation sought to be excited in Lower Canada; if there has been one cry attempted to be raised against it that honestly went to the true merits of the question? If there has been, I have yet to hear it. (Hear, hear.) But, Mr. SPEAKER, the most curious part of the proposal of the honorable member for Peel is the attitude he would have us occupy in addressing the Queen. We have already adopted an Address praying Her Majesty to pass an Imperial Statute giving effect to the resolutions of the Quebec Conference; and the hon. member for Peel now asks that we shall pass a second Address praying that the said Imperial Act shall be subject to the approval, and shall not be law until it obtains the approval, of their high mightinesses the one hundred and thirty gentlemen who may happen to sit in the House of Assembly of the next Canadian Parliament. (Hear, hear.) He would have us approach the Throne saying—"May it please Your Majesty—Here is the Constitution which has been adopted by the Governments of the five British American Provinces; we declare to you that this is the new Constitution we want for British America; we pray Your Majesty to give effect to it; we pray that the Imperial Parliament may pass an act enforcing this new Constitution on all these provinces, and that Your Majesty will assent to it. But at the same time we ask Your Majesty to do this only on one condition, namely, that the Legislature of Canada—not the present one, but the next Legislature that may be chosen—shall have the opportunity of criticising and dis-

secting the work of the Imperial Parliament, and of kicking Your Majesty's Bill out of the chamber on the first day it meets." (Hear, hear, and great laughter.) The hon. member for Peel will permit me to tell him that if he fancies this would be a decorous mode of approaching the Sovereign, he has a strange idea of the respect due from loyal subjects to the chief magistrate of the Empire which it is their happiness to form a part. (Hear, hear.) And I further tell this honorable gentleman and any other honorable member who may think with him, that if they expect honorable gentlemen to go to the Imperial Government and say—"We ask you to take all the trouble of preparing this measure—to assume it as your own—and to carry it through both Houses of Parliament against all opposition; but at the same time we ask you to put in a clause that the Legislature of Canada shall be above the Imperial Parliament, shall be above the Sovereign, and shall deal with your Act just as it pleases,"—then, I tell the House that parties must be found to convey that message, who are destitute of self-respect, and who have not a proper sense of the respect due to those holding the highest dignities of the realm. (Cheers.) I do say that a more direct insult to the Crown could not be offered than that now proposed by the honorable member for Peel. But another most singular part of the proposal of the honorable member for Peel, is that while he is trying to pass this vote of want of confidence in the Government—for if it is not that, it would, if carried, be at least a direct defeat of the policy of the Government—he professes at the same moment an immense desire to strengthen the hands of the Administration. (Hear, hear.) He fancies, or professes to fancy, that if this motion of his were carried, the Government would take their dose placidly, and go meekly to England with the record of their defeat in their hands. He tells us in effect,—"I don't want you, notwithstanding this vote, to hesitate about going to England—not at all. Your presence is wanted in England as quickly as possible. You ought to go immediately; you ought to talk strongly to the Imperial Government; you ought to tell them how they are to settle the defence question, how the reciprocity question, and so on. You must speak for the people of Canada in a bold and firm tone, that will do justice to the people of this country." It is the honorable gentleman's idea that we should go very strong to England, and his way of strengthening us is by passing upon

our policy a direct vote of censure the hour before we start. (Hear, hear.) He wants us to go home strong—with an Address to the Sovereign in one hand, and a defeat by the people's representatives in the other. (Hear, hear.) If the hon. gentleman thinks he is sustaining the Administration by his present motion, I can only say that I for one do not thank him for his support. (Hear, hear.) The hon. gentleman may carry his resolution if he can, but I tell him that in that case no mission will go to England with any such insulting message from this Government as now constituted. (Hear, hear.) The House may perfectly comprehend that if any Address is to be carried to the Queen by the present Government, it must be the Address we have submitted to Parliament. The hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. M. C. CAMERON) says that we are attempting to dictate to the House—that we are endeavoring to take away from them the rightful powers of the members of this Legislature. We do nothing of the kind. The members of the Legislature may act as they deem right; they may reject our Address, or amend it, or couple it with anything they please—all we say is, that we cannot be the bearers of a message shaped in the way the hon. member for Peel proposes. But if this House says there shall be an appeal to the people, it will get an appeal to the people at once—to-morrow—(hear, hear)—and that without the mockery of going home to the Imperial Government with an Address asking in one breath that the bill may be passed into law, and in the next that it may not be passed into law. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member for Peel has said that the legislatures of the other provinces have gone, or are going, to the people—and why not we? The hon. gentleman ought to know that the other legislatures were in a different position from that which we occupied. As regards the New Brunswick Legislature, its term expired, I think, in May—they had not been for four years before their constituents—they were going soon at any rate, and they came to the conclusion that it was well to go at once. And so also it was in Newfoundland—the period when a dissolution must take place was rapidly approaching, and they took the same course. The honorable gentleman says that if the Legislature of Nova Scotia do not approve of the resolutions, the Government will advise a dissolution. So probably would we under such circumstances. If this Legislature had not approved of the scheme, we would undoubtedly, with His Excellency's assent, have

appealed to the country against the decision of this House. And otherwise what necessity is there for a direct appeal to the people? Here we have been discussing the question for years—

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—Oh! oh!

HON. MR. BROWN—The honorable gentleman may cry "Oh! oh!" but I tell him that the people throughout the country generally understand this question just as well as the members of the Legislature. Those who are most difficult to be made to understand are those who don't want to understand. Even the honorable member for Cornwall once understood this question, and if he does not now it is because he has forgotten it. (Laughter.) If there were any doubt about public feeling, there might be propriety in going to the people. But is there any doubt about it? I am not opposing the honorable gentleman's resolution on constitutional grounds. I am not denying the rights of the people; if I had any doubt whatever about what would be the verdict of the people, I should be the first to say that we ought to go to the people. But it is simply because I am satisfied there would be a sweeping verdict of the people in favor of the measure, that I think it unnecessary to take it to the country. What would be the verdict of the people may be judged from what has been the vote of their representatives here, who are responsible to them. Never has there been such a verdict in this Parliament on any matter of grave importance as we have had in favor of this measure—in the Upper House a majority of three to one, and in the Lower House also a majority as nearly as possible of three to one. And of the six honorable members who were absent from the vote—the SPEAKER, and the five honorable members who were absent—five would have gone for it and only one against it—the House being divided, 94 for to 36 against. And as regards those 36, more than one-half of them have risen in this House and declared themselves in favor of the general principle, and only opposed to some of the details. I say there never has been such a unanimous verdict from any Parliament in favor of any great constitutional change. And since the policy of the Government has been announced, no fewer than 50 out of our 180 constituencies have been appealed to by elections, for the one House or the other—and in the whole of these, only four candidates offered themselves in opposition to this policy, and but two got elected—and I think one of those two did actually vote

in favor of the measure. (Hear, hear.) I am told that the hon. member for South Wentworth (Mr. RYMAL) made a statement to which I would call his attention—as I certainly did not notice that he made it—while addressing the House. I was remarking that I had not heard one member from Upper Canada declare that a large majority of his constituents were not in favor of this measure, and I was told that the hon. member had stated so with reference to his constituents.

MR. RYMAL—I did not say whether they were or were not in favor of the measure. I believe there is a great diversity of opinion among them.

HON. MR. BROWN—Ah! Well, Mr. SPEAKER, we have two hon. gentlemen, one in this House and one in the other, who have just come from their elections—one from the city of Hamilton, situated in the county (South Wentworth) represented by the hon. gentleman (Mr. RYMAL), and the other from the Legislative Council district, which includes the constituency of the hon. gentleman (Mr. RYMAL)—and both of them declare that they have not the slightest doubt as to the feeling of their constituents—that it is strongly in favor of the measure. I repeat, then, that I have not as yet heard one hon. member declare that his constituency was opposed to this scheme.

MR. RYMAL—With reference to the testimony of the hon. member for Burlington division (Hon. Mr. BULL) and the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. MAGILL), permit me to say that I know more of the South Riding of Wentworth than either one of those hon. gentlemen. Neither of them has ever had the confidence of the electors of South Wentworth. One of them was in a minority there, last fall, of 300. The other tried it some years ago, and had not the shadow of a chance.

HON. MR. BROWN—That may be true. But the hon. gentleman should have stated this also, that Dr. SMITH, the opponent of Hon. Mr. BULL, declared he was in favor of the general principles of this measure, and that if the details were satisfactory, he would go for it. So that in fact both the candidates for that constituency, including the whole of Wentworth and the city of Hamilton, declared in favor of the policy of the Government.

MR. RYMAL—I beg to say that I have heard Dr. SMITH say—not once, or twice, but

on different occasions—that he did not believe this scheme would work well.

MR. A. MACKENZIE—That was the reason of his defeat, I suppose. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. BROWN—It is quite possible that he may have said so since his defeat, but I can only say that I conversed with Dr. SMITH myself while he was a candidate, and heard a very different opinion from him. But I think it ill became the honorable gentleman to speak so disparagingly of the testimony of gentlemen as to the feeling of the county, simply because they were not strong in a particular contest. When he remembers how hard a fight he himself had at last election, and that he was only elected by a very small majority, he was hardly in a position to throw discredit on such a score on the statement of hon. gentlemen who have just come from the people, and, after putting the measure fairly and squarely before the electors, have got an almost unanimous verdict in its favor. The hon. member for Hamilton polled an immense majority, and it was not right for my honorable friend to indulge in a sneer because he may have been in a minority on a previous occasion. (Hear, hear.) Mr. SPEAKER, I might detain the House much longer in replying to what fell from honorable members who have spoken during this discussion. But I do not desire to keep the House from the vote. I would simply appeal to the members of this House, that if ever there could be a case made out for action—immediate action—it has been made out with reference to this measure.

HON. MR. HOLTON—After its rejection below?

HON. MR. BROWN—That does not affect us.

HON. MR. HOLTON—It affects the possibility of immediate action.

HON. MR. BROWN—The hon. gentleman will soon know whether or not we can get immediate action. He must recollect, that although the New Brunswick elections have apparently gone against Confederation, there is still a considerable number of members returned there in favor of Confederation, and that there is another large party who are not opposed to union, but only object to some of the details. And there is this to be considered also. It was presented there in a very different light from that in which it comes before us. We have been considering this question for many years. There

is not a point that can be taken against it which has not been thoroughly sifted before the country. We are, therefore, in a different position, and there is this hanging over us besides—as stated by the hon. member for Peel—we cannot go back, we must go forward—we must have some decision on this question—we cannot let things rest as they are. It is of no use for the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. M. C. CAMERON) to tell us that matters can go on as they have been doing for many years past. That was not the opinion of the hon. gentleman when he came here in 1862. (Hear, hear.) He came as a supporter of the Conservative Government then in existence, and yet the first vote he gave was in condemnation of his own friends, because they did not bring in a Ministerial measure to settle this question. If he looks at his own speech on that occasion, denouncing the Hon. Attorney General West and his colleagues, because they would not give representation by population, and because the feeling was so strong that not a moment should be lost in dealing with the question—he would find there an answer to his arguments now, when he tells us this thing may be shoved aside, and matters go on as before. (Hear, hear.)

MR. M. C. CAMERON—I did not state at the time referred to that there was any danger of revolution, or anything of that kind. I urged the question as a measure of justice for Upper Canada against my hon. friends who were not in favor of it.

HON. MR. BROWN—He urged it upon his friends on that occasion to turn them out, because they would not move; and now he urges it in the very opposite direction—namely, to turn them out because they do move. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—If the hon. gentleman would allow me to make a remark, I would say it appears to me the fallacy he has fallen into is in assuming that this measure is identical with the measure of representation by population, for which he has been agitating the country for some year past. It is not the same question. The question of Federation or Confederation has not been before the country. It was not before the country at the last general election. He knows full well that the party, of which he is a distinguished member, has pronounced over and over again, and through his own mouth, against this scheme of Confederation.

He knows that the Reform Convention of 1859 did so.

HON. MR. BROWN—No, it did not.

HON. MR. HOLTON—I say it did.

MR. A. MACKENZIE—Get the resolutions, and prove it if you can.

HON. MR. HOLTON—What were the facts? The Government of that day had proposed a Confederation of all the provinces as their remedy for the Canadian difficulty. The Liberal party did not accept that. If they had done so, the probability is that you would have had Confederation long ago, with the consent of the Lower Provinces. But the Reform Convention declared it was no remedy. It is true they put in a saving clause, that at some future day, in some remote contingency, after the settlement of the Canadian difficulty, but not as a means of settling it, the Federation of all the provinces might be taken up. But I merely rose to point out to my hon. friend the fallacy into which he has fallen—and it is a very close one—in assuming that this measure is identical with the measure for which he agitated the country so long, and which the hon. member for North Ontario advocated on the occasion to which he refers.

HON. MR. BROWN—I think the hon. gentleman has risen for a very poor purpose. And in place of accepting his explanation as correct, I dissent from it *to toto celo*. The position of the matter is quite the opposite of what he states. He says this is a different thing altogether. I totally deny that it is. I say this is simply what we asked for, only in another form. The measure we asked for was representation by population. We got that. (Hear, hear.) And the hon. gentleman is the last man to object to this, which is the very basis on which he agreed to go into the BROWN-DORION Administration—representation by population being the basis, accompanied by such checks and guarantees as might be shown to be necessary. (Hear, hear.) The hon. gentleman has stated that I have spoken against Confederation of the provinces. He will turn to no speech of mine since I entered Parliament in which, when I made any allusion to the matter, I did not take care expressly to state that I regarded a union of all the provinces as the grand future destiny of these provinces. But to those who offered us Confederation of the provinces as a present remedy for all the evils we suffered, I said I would not accept that. But I took care to say nothing directly against it, what-

ever others may have said or written. In the first place, I doubted whether we had strength enough to assume the burdens it would throw upon us. In the next place, I knew little about the sentiments of the Lower Provinces, how they would regard it. And I thought it likely that it would take years to accomplish. I would not consent, therefore, that any party should make this a stalking horse, and waste time in keeping us negotiating between the Imperial and the Provincial Governments, so as to stave off the practicable remedy which we sought.

HON. MR. HOLT—That is what you are doing now.

HON. MR. BROWN—The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. He will find there is no member of this Government who has any idea of shirking this question for an hour. (Hear, hear.) And he will see that that is the very basis of our present policy. In the original negotiations for this Coalition, while I admitted that it was a good thing and a desirable thing that we should look for the future of these provinces in the direction of provincial union, yet I contended there was a present remedy which we should have and could have of our own motion, until the other was obtained. The hon. gentleman will admit that we have been wonderfully, unexpectedly successful in the policy we initiated in July last; and I am prepared to say, as I have always been prepared to say, that if practicable, this measure is a better one than the smaller scheme. But so far from its being a different remedy from ours, I say it is but an extension of our plan—that we who have contended for representation by population for so many years, are getting all that we asked and something more. (Hear, hear.) It is true that our Lower Canada friends have obtained security for their local institutions. For my part, I am glad they have got it. (Hear, hear.) I have always been willing they should have it. I can appeal to my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Hon. Mr. CHAPUIS) whether I have not always yearly, for thirteen years past, said to him that I was willing to consider the position of Lower Canada with reference to her local institutions, and to give any protection for them which might be thought to be reasonable. (Hear, hear.) And I say this is an admirable compromise under the circumstances—and I say it will be a sad day for the people of Canada if anything should happen to defeat this measure. I do say that the man who looks

back upon the last twelve or fifteen years, and the agitation we have gone through, and who would risk throwing us back into that state again, is not—to use the language of the hon. member for Peel—a true lover of his country. (Cheers.) After such an immense vote—three-fourths of both branches of the Legislature—in favor of the measure, I look upon it as a most wanton attempt on the part of the minority to endeavor to have it brought into jeopardy by the sectional issues, and the various side issues which might be raised in different parts of the country, so as to make the result of a general election falsely appear to be a disapproval of the measure on the part of the country. Had any one risen in this House at the beginning of last session, and proposed this measure—and if it had been found that all the Upper Canadian members of this Chamber were in favor of it but eight, while the Lower Canadian members were in favor of it by a majority of thirteen, and that three-fourths of the Upper House were in its favor—I ask hon. gentlemen if the man would not have been regarded as insane who would have proposed that it should not be put through at once, but deferred for a general election? (Hear, hear.) And when the House gave its sanction last session to the Government going on with this project, and submitting a scheme worthy of adoption—I ask hon. members if they ever expected we could present a measure which would carry a vote of three-fourths of both branches of the Legislature? (Hear, hear.) We have been unexpectedly successful. And as to consulting the people, I tell hon. gentlemen that the people will laugh to scorn their pretended zeal for popular rights. The people want the kernel and not the shell. They want not, for the sake of a constitutional form, to risk the success of this measure—to risk the breaking up of the combination formed to carry it—and to risk the bringing back of all those discords and difficulties from which, by the maturing of this scheme, they thought we had happily escaped. (Cheers.)

HON. J. H. CAMERON—The honorable gentleman has misrepresented my position in this matter. I have voted for the resolutions on which an Address is to be based, and this resolution is simply in amendment to the motion for the appointment of a committee to draft that Address, and conveys no insult to any one. It does not interfere in

any way with Ministers going home with those resolutions—a copy of which is already before the Imperial Parliament—in their hands. The hon. gentleman must have misunderstood what I stated. I ask only that the people have an opportunity of doing that which I have done myself—that is, to vote for the measure. (Hear, hear.) The hon. gentleman says he does not thank me for my support. Sir, that hon. gentleman personally has never had my support. It is not to him I give my support, but to the Government as a whole, and to the cause which has called it into existence. The hon. gentleman knows well my political views have been so little in accordance with his, that nothing but the importance of this movement would have put it in his power to make me such a taunt, and that he has no occasion whatever to thank me for my support, which is given not because he is in the Ministry, but in spite of his being in that position. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. HOLT—I propose confining my observations to the motion now in your hands, Mr. SPEAKER. First, as to the point on which the hon. member for South Oxford allowed me to interrupt him. I charged the hon. gentleman with assuming that the question now before the House was specifically the one on which he agitated the country for several years, and upon which the hon. member for North Ontario voted in 1862. I happen to have placed in my hands the report of what took place when the subject of a Federal union was before the House, in 1858. HON. MR. GALT having put the resolution before the House, respecting the Federation of the British North American Provinces, HON. MR. BROWN moved his standing motion respecting representation according to population, as an amendment to it. There he put the two propositions in distinct juxtaposition, and yet to-night he endeavors to convince the House that this measure is substantially the measure which he was then contending for—endeavors to show insincerity on the part of the honorable member for North Ontario, because he voted against his own friends, in 1862, on representation by population, and now votes against this measure.

HON. MR. BROWN—I am sure my hon. friend does not wish to misrepresent; but I think he will find that that motion was proposed, and that there were two other amendments which were voted down. I

recollect that at the close of my speech I said I wanted representation by population—I am willing to take it alone; I am willing to take it with a Federal union; I am willing to take it any way so that we get it.

HON. MR. HOLT—The honorable gentleman is confounding what occurred in 1866 with what occurred in 1858. In 1856 he did signify his willingness to accept the proposition of a Canadian Federation, if it was concurred in by any considerable number of the representatives from Lower Canada. But what I now allude to is what took place in 1858, when, instead of accepting HON. MR. GALT'S proposition to Federate all the provinces, he put a motion in amendment to it, showing that in 1858, as in 1859, he was not willing to consider that question as a means of settling the Canadian difficulty. But I think the honorable gentleman, though he was more or less successful in answering the honorable member for Peel, utterly failed to meet the very cogent reasoning of my honorable friend from North Ontario. I hold as strongly as any member of this House to the doctrine of representation as contradistinguished from the doctrine of delegation. We are here commissioned by our constituents to do all that may be done under the Constitution under which we are sent here to legislate. But I hold that the change of the Constitution is something beyond our functions; that the representative elected to administer the existing Constitution has no right to vote for the subversion of that Constitution. (Hear, hear.) That is the doctrine which I hold, and I think honorable gentlemen will find it exceedingly difficult to controvert it. Then it has been said that there can be no possible occasion of appealing to the people, for they have already been appealed to and expressed their approval of the scheme. I do not know how many constituencies have been appealed to since June last.

AN HON. MEMBER—Fifty or sixty.

HON. MR. HOLT—Well, fifty or sixty. But the Honorable President of the Council has referred to the Hon. MR. BULL as being elected to support this measure, and a little further on he spoke of his opponent, DR. SMITH, and said that he too was in favor of the scheme generally, but that there might be some of the details of which, when it came out, he could not approve, thus letting out that the details of the scheme were not

before the people at all. When my hon. friend from South Oxford went to his own constituency for reelection, were any of the details before the people? (Hear, hear.) The general project of Federation was before the people, though prominence was then given chiefly to the lesser scheme of a Canadian Federation, but none of the details were known. He surely will not argue from the result of that election or of any of the elections, including those for the Legislative Council, except perhaps that for the city of Hamilton and that of the Hon. Postmaster General, which occurred after the publication of the resolutions, that the people have voted with a knowledge of the details of the measure. These elections, therefore, prove no more that the people are in favor of the scheme, than the election of the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Government in 1862—a Government formed upon the principle of retrenchment, pledged to the double majority system, and who made opposition to representation by population a close question, proved that the people were in favor of that system, or of making opposition to representation by population a close question. Then, sir, there is one other point to which I wish to refer. The Honorable Attorney General West, in the course of his conversation with the honorable member for North Ontario, said that the people of all the provinces were against a legislative union.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—I did not say so. The hon. gentleman was speaking of the different provinces as represented in the Quebec Conference. The delegates were all opposed to it.

HON. MR. HOLTON—The hon. gentleman, at all events, said this, that a legislative union could not be carried. I should like to ask him what position it places him in as to political sagacity, to confess to night that he has been wrong for the last twenty years. He has declared over and over again that he was in favor of a legislative union. At the very last meeting of the constitutional committee, or of the Brown Committee, as it has been called—a committee to which great importance has been attached, but which really possesses very little significance—last session, upon a motion for the adoption of the report, that hon. gentleman voted against Federation in every form. (Hear, hear.)

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—How does the hon. gentleman know that?

HON. MR. HOLTON—It was reported to the House, on the very day of the crisis which eventuated in the formation of this Coalition, that honorable gentleman voted in committee against the Federal principle, whether as applied to Canada or to all the provinces, he being in favor of a legislative union. He, the leader of this House, who sets himself up as the most sagacious politician of the country, who claims to be a leader of them, now admits that down to the 14th of June last, he himself was mistaken as to the possible mode in which a change of government could be effected in this province. (Hear, hear.) He was opposed to a Federal union, yet he now comes down as the leader of the Government, and says that it is absurd to talk of a legislative union; that he has been altogether wrong, and that it is utterly impracticable to carry out the views he held down to the 14th of June last, and affirmed down to that very day. Well, sir, that is all that I rose to say—to say that the Honorable President of the Council has not really met the point raised by this motion; that there had been no appeal to the people in these elections on the details of this scheme; that it was not in the contemplation of the electors at the last general election; that the whole Liberal party were opposed to it as a means of settling the Canadian difficulty; that it was never brought forward until the crisis of June last; that the people have consequently had no opportunity of pronouncing upon it; and that we have no right to dispose of it finally without an appeal to the people, involving, as it does, a subversion of the Constitution. (Hear, hear.)

MR. MAGILL—I had no intention of speaking on this subject, had my name not been mentioned to-night by some of the hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House. I have only to say that when the subject was brought before the electors of the city of Hamilton, there appeared to be but one opinion concerning it—they all seemed to be in favor of carrying out a Federal union. (Hear, hear.) I believe that the people were in favor of any change, and I think I would not be discharging my duty to my constituents if I did not stand up in this House and state my opinions as I expressed them a short time ago to the electors. I think that the people of Canada were highly satisfied with the conduct of the public men of this country; that they were proud of the manly, straightforward and self-denying spirit evinced by them in showing their willingness to set

aside personal or party interests, and unite as one man for the common good of this country. (Hear, hear.) They were willing to bury all past differences for the welfare and prosperity of the country at large. (Hear.) My honorable friend from South Wentworth (Mr. RYMAL) has spoken of the feeling among the people there. That honorable gentleman may perhaps know more of the people in that county than I do; but from what I know of them, I can say without any hesitation that the people there are strongly in favor of a union of all these provinces. (Hear, hear.) Then, as to the election of Hon. Mr. BULL, I think that nothing so much helped to secure his return as his promise to support the Government in this scheme. And I think that it will become the honorable member for South Wentworth, one of the eight Upper Canadians who oppose this scheme, to get up in this House and speak as he has done to-day. I believe that this scheme will be attended by the very best and most beneficial results. My honorable friend from South Wentworth (Mr. RYMAL), in furnishing an illustration to prove the impropriety of the scheme of union, compared it to adding joints to a fishing rod; but the comparison did not bear him out in his conclusions, as the people of Canada have at all times, and in every emergency, shown themselves to be possessed of that indomitable spirit which will never quail before a foe—and the union of such material cannot fail to give them increased power to resist aggression, and to maintain and hand down to posterity the rights and privileges which we so happily enjoy. (Hear, hear.) The fact of uniting strong men together is not going to make them any weaker. What is it that has given rise to the name England possesses all the world over? Why, it is union. That is the glory of the British Constitution. "Union is strength" the old maxim says, and I believe that it will prove so as regards the united Provinces of British North America. (Hear, hear.)

MR. JOLY said—MR. SPEAKER, I regret that this resolution was not brought up sooner; however, I am glad that it is brought up now, for it will explain to outsiders the manner in which this Confederation scheme has been carried through this House. When the people of the Lower Provinces and of England observe the reluctance which the Government has to allowing the people an opportunity to express themselves, by means of general elections, it will let them into the whole secret of the manner in which the

Government have obtained so large a vote for their scheme in the present Parliament. (Hear, hear.) Now, this is all the more important, because people who do not live in Canada cannot be expected to understand our affairs any better than we understand theirs. As an instance of how a people may be misunderstood abroad, we heard the Honorable Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. MCGEE), who professes to be well acquainted with the Lower Provinces, prophesying that the result of the elections in New Brunswick would be largely in favor of Confederation; but when he found his fine prediction destroyed, we then heard him trying to explain the result as being due to annexation tendencies and Americanizing influences.

HON. MR. MCGEE—Not all, but a good deal of it.

MR. JOLY—Now, in Canada, all those who oppose the Confederation scheme are accused of having the same annexation feeling as the people of New Brunswick are said to be tainted with. It is extraordinary how different people on the same side of politics will look upon things. I have just noticed in the *Daily News* of this city, a few lines of a rather startling character. [Having read a passage from the *News* of the 10th of March, with reference to the abolition of the passport system, Mr. JOLY proceeded:] There are two ways of looking at this. Here is a newspaper, supporting the Government, which says that if the Lower Provinces have not been relieved from the passport system, as Canada has been, it is certainly because their relations are not so friendly with the United States as ours. It is only since our relations became friendly with the United States—since we passed that Alien Bill, and voted that money stolen by the St. Alban's raiders—it is only since we have bowed down before them that we have obtained relief from the obnoxious system. The Lower Provinces having taken a firmer stand, the United States Government have refused to make the same concession to them as has been made to us. I think, therefore it is a mistake to say that it is American influence or annexation proclivities that have caused the defeat of the friends of Confederation in New Brunswick. The only transactions that we have taken upon ourselves to make, affecting any foreign state, have been the passing of the Alien Bill and the granting of that money for the St. Alban's banks. In this instance, it appears most clear that this province stands in a better, closer and more friendly relation with the United States,

through such action, than the Lower Provinces. Therefore it seems to me more reasonable to suppose that the American sympathizers in New Brunswick have been defeated at the polls, instead of triumphant. The Hon. President of the Council explains the difference between Canada and New Brunswick, as to the desirability of having new elections, by saying that there was a new election there because the term of the Legislature was about to expire. Well, this would have been our last session too, if the Confederation scheme had passed, and therefore supposing the Confederation scheme to have gone into operation as soon as the Government anticipated it would, we should have been exactly in the same position as New Brunswick in relation to a new election. The same reasons for having a new election there exist here, and there is no better reason to be assigned for refusing to allow the people of Canada to express themselves on this project, than there was for the Government of New Brunswick to refuse a dissolution of the Legislature of that province. But while we see the Government of that province willing and anxious to give the people an opportunity of expressing their will, how differently are the people of Canada treated! (Hear, hear.) The Hon. President of the Council has alluded to a majority of the French-Canadians being in favor of the Confederation scheme. I find by the vote that twenty-six voted in favor of it, and twenty-two against. Among the twenty-six were three members of the Administration who propounded the scheme, and were so interested in the result of the vote, that in all fairness they ought not to be counted. Deducting these, the figures would stand twenty-three to twenty-two.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—Well, if you deduct the members of the Government, you ought also to deduct the leaders of the Opposition. (Laughter.)

MR. JOLY—I think not, because they were not more deeply interested in the vote than other members on the floor of the House. Out of the twenty-six, there are at least half a dozen whose conduct has been condemned in the most direct manner by their constituents, in public assemblies duly held for the purpose of considering the Confederation question. I can instance the counties of Joliette, Rouville, Chambly, L'Assomption, &c. So if we take the French-Canadians and place the matter in a fair and equitable footing, we will find that they are about equally divided in this House, and that it is hard to tell whether the

majority of the people are for or against it by their representatives in Parliament. It is impossible to know what the opinions of the French-Canadians are at this moment, or to find out, except by giving them an opportunity to record their votes by means of the elections. The French-Canadians are nearly a million of people, and I think they are entitled to be heard on this scheme as much as any of the Lower Provinces; and if for no other purpose than to give them an opportunity of expressing themselves, there ought to be a general election. I say that we have been taken by surprise through the rapid manner in which this scheme has been introduced and carried through this House. We have been told that because our leaders would not agree to any arrangement by which the demands of Upper Canada could be met, either in whole or in part, the scheme has been imposed upon us. If that alternative had been presented to us at an earlier day, I think it would have been possible for us to have met our Upper Canadian friends in a scheme of conciliation, agreeing upon a measure which, if not satisfactory to all, would, at all events, draw us more closely to one another. For instance, the principal complaint is that Upper Canada pays two-thirds of the taxes, and is allowed to have control of only one-half the money contributed by those taxes. I will not say that I would grant representation by population rather than be forced to accept the Confederation scheme; but I can say that I find the claim of Upper Canada, in reference to the finances, perfectly fair and just, and I only rise to express my opinion, as one of the members of this House, to that effect. I would be quite willing to enter into some arrangement that would give to Upper Canada a greater proportion of the expenditure, in proportion to its population, and stake my chances of reelection upon that declaration. (Hear, hear.) I dare say that many in Upper Canada would not be quite satisfied with that; but for my part, I do not feel that I have a right to offer more. I merely wish to show that Lower Canadians are not so lost to all sense of justice as not to recognise the correctness of that principle, and are not so much opposed to the making of some concessions as many of the people of Upper Canada seem to imagine. If we had been informed as to what was coming, I think we certainly should have gone into some arrangement towards suiting the views of Upper Canada, by increasing her share of control on the revenue, rather than be compelled

to accept this Confederation scheme. The most pressing reason given for passing the measure now is, that the relations between Upper and Lower Canada have reached such a stage, that the Government of the country cannot go on in peace and quietness any longer. I do not think anything of the kind is the case. I do not think any honorable gentleman from Upper Canada is ready to rush into civil war. I do not think any number of people in Upper Canada has given up the hope of obtaining, by constitutional means, what they think is fair. I do not think any of them would think of coming down here and obtaining the rights of Upper Canada by murder, bloodshed and civil war. I think it is most unfortunate that the Hon. President of the Council should have attempted to frighten us by the use of such terms.

HON. MR. BROWN—The hon. gentleman must be mistaken. I never used such words in connection with the advocacy of Upper Canadian rights.

MR. JOLY—I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, but I have heard him use those terms several times on the floor of this House.

HON. MR. BROWN—Then it must have been of speaking of the war in the United States.

MR. JOLY—The hon. gentleman certainly told us in his speech at the opening of this debate, that our country was in danger of being plunged into civil war.

HON. MR. BROWN—It certainly was not me; the hon. gentleman is mistaken in the person. It was the honorable member for Richelieu who used words of that character. I have never used such language in this House in relation to our constitutional difficulties.

MR. PERRAULT—What I said was that the Constitution, as it stood, was sufficient to enable us to live under it for centuries to come, without civil war. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. BROWN—Now the hon. member ought to withdraw that statement with regard to myself, until he can prove it. It was not the Hon. Premier of the Government, but myself whom he charged with using the words "civil war" in relation to Canada.

MR. JOLY—I understand what is due from one hon. member of the House to another, and I very cheerfully withdraw the statement, because I cannot find the words just at this moment in the report of the hon. gentleman's speech; but I will call his at-

tention to the matter again, so soon as I am in a position to prove the statement I have made. But I certainly was always under the impression that he had used those words. (Hear, hear.) Well now, having withdrawn those words with reference to one member of the Administration, I have to make the same charge against another member, occupying even a higher position in the Cabinet. Here are the very words employed by the leader of the Administration, in addressing the Upper House. On page 9 of the *Parliamentary Debates on Confederation*, I find this passage in the speech of the hon. and gallant knight at the head of the Government:—"At the time these measures were resolved upon, the country was bordering on civil strife, and he would ask if it was not the duty of both sides to do all they could to prevent the unfortunate results which would have followed." Well, I see it is the term "civil strife" that is used instead of "civil war." (Laughter.) But it is used in the same sense as the term "civil war." The French version of our official reports has "*guerre civile*." I think it is most unfortunate to hear hon. members of the Government, who have in their keeping the fair fame of the country, letting it go to the world that Canada, which was always looked upon as such a happy, free and prosperous country, was on the eve of civil strife. It is all the more unfortunate that I was mistaken in reference to the person who uttered those words, for I find now that it is the Prime Minister of Canada, instead of the Honorable President of the Council. If that honorable gentleman had said anything approaching to what I charged him with, I am sure he would not have denied it in the manner he has, for I think he would have been willing to have considered the spirit of the charge more than the mere letter. I will not now take up the time of the House any longer. I simply wish to show the unfair means that had been used by the Government in carrying their Confederation scheme through this House. (Cheers.)

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—I think, sir, that my hon. friend who spoke last made a mistake in the construction of the English language, when he charged my hon. friend the Hon. President of the Council with alluding to civil war, and that his remarks were rather unparliamentary in so far as they alluded to the debate in the other branch of the Legislature. (Hear, hear.) He charged my honorable friend with stating that the

country was on the eve of revolution and warfare; but on trying to hunt up the proof, he finds that the words on which he based the charge were used in a speech delivered by somebody else in the other branch of the Legislature. The passage he quotes alludes to the country being in a state of civil strife. Well, Mr. SPEAKER, that is quite true. Sir, we have been in a state of strife for a great many years. An election is a civil strife, and a lawsuit is a civil strife, but warfare is a most uncivil strife.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—Does my hon. friend mean to class lawsuits under the head of civil strife?

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—Well, perhaps they are a little uncivil at times, but my hon. friend knows all about it, for he fattens on that kind of strife. (Laughter.)

MR. JOLY—Well, I would like to ask what the hon. gentleman calls the war in the United States; is that not civil strife? (Laughter.)

HON. MR. BROWN—No, no, no; that is civil war, because it is a war among the people themselves.

MR. JOLY—Well, I do not think there is anything wrong in calling it civil strife, and I consider the terms synonymous.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—The war in the United States is a most disastrous, and even barbarous civil war; but the word civil strife is not applicable to it. I have already explained the meaning of the term, and I hope now that my hon. friend sees the evil of his ways, he will abandon his opposition to the Government. (Hear, hear.) Mr. SPEAKER, for the sake of the character of this House, and for the sake of the public purse, I must protest against the current of the debate which has arisen from the motion of the hon. member for Peel. I thought we had got through with the discussion, and that as every hon. member had had the opportunity of speaking not only once or twice, but three or four times, we had finished the debate, and taken a vote which was rather satisfactory to the Government, by which the question had been introduced into the House, and that it was generally understood that the discussion of the propriety of the Confederation of the provinces was to end there. (Hear, hear.) But I find in the remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite a tendency to reopen the whole question, after it has been decided by this House, upon a motion made by myself for the appointment of a committee to draft an

Address in which the resolutions should be embodied. I say, sir, that this is an abuse of parliamentary privilege, a waste of the time of this House and of the public money, while it serves no good purpose, and I am sure that the good feeling and common sense of this House will not allow anything of this kind to go on. One thing connected with this subject I greatly regret. I very much regret that although the debate has been so long protracted, and although we have had an expression from almost every member of this House, we have hitherto failed in getting the arguments promised in the speech of my hon. friend from Chateaugay. (Hear, hear.) For some reason or other we cannot get that speech out. Just as MOSES went up to Pisgah's top and viewed the promised land in the distance, just so the hon. member gives us an occasional glimpse of the promised speech, but we have thus far been disappointed in our expectations of hearing it delivered. We have been promised it two or three times during the past month. The honorable member ought to remember that "hope deferred maketh the heart sick." I am sure I desire to have the pleasure and satisfaction of hearing from the honorable gentleman, and having the advantage of the information which the honorable gentleman is well known to be able of giving this House; for though young in years, he is old in political wisdom and in that political sagacity of which he denies me the possession. I say I am sorry, and this House must be sorry, and the country must be sorry, that the hon. gentleman has practised so much self-denial as to refuse to allow his radiance to shine forth upon this great question. The thing which so utterly destroys the hon. gentleman's utility is his extreme modesty. (Laughter.) Why, when he had to rush to the rescue of the disordered finances of this country, at great personal sacrifice, for the sake of saving the country from the ruin that hung over it through the lavish extravagance of my hon. friend the present Hon. Finance Minister, he looked, with the exercise of his great financial ability, down into the recesses of the public chest and speedily discovered the source of all the evils that had fallen upon the country, and yet the modesty of the hon. gentleman prevented him from making known the remedy. (Laughter.) And so it is even now. He has been promising to give us his views upon this great question; but four weeks have passed, and his speech yet hangs fire. And

to-day he told us, after drawing himself up with that righteous indignation which he can so well affect, that the Honorable Attorney General West had tried to stop the publication of the debates, and that he himself had yet to fire his speech on this great subject, because it was too late to do so on Saturday morning; and yet, when the honorable gentleman gets up, he says he will confine himself to this resolution. He did so, and confined himself very narrowly to it. (Hear, hear.) The hon. gentleman has somehow or other become the guardian of my political reputation. He has, on two or three occasions, warned me that although the course I took was, perhaps, that of a practical man—that of one who desired merely to keep office and become famous for political acuteness—yet it would never secure for me the fame of being a great statesman. Well, sir, I am satisfied to confine myself to practical things—to the securing of such practical measures as the country really wants. I am satisfied not to have a reputation for indulging in imaginary schemes and harboring visionary ideas that may end sometimes in an annexation movement, sometimes in Federation and sometimes in a legislative union, but always utopian and never practical. I am satisfied to leave the imaginary, the poetic and the impossible to the hon. member for Chateauguay. The other day the honorable gentleman paused to say, in the course of one of his little, numerous, by the by speeches, that in taking the course I have done on this question—that of advocating a Federal instead of a Legislative union—I violated all the principles of my former life having a bearing on this subject. Mr. SPEAKER, it is quite true that after a careful examination of the Constitution of the United States, in connection with its practical working, and the civil war that has grown out of it, I saw many weaknesses in connection with the Federal system, as operated in that country, and I was as desirous as any man could be in taking part in the Conference relating to union between the Provinces of British North America, that as much as the legislative form of government as possible, and as few of the weaknesses which experience had shown to exist in the American Constitution, should be incorporated in ours. I do not like to refer to any remarks of mine in times past; but as this charge has been brought

against me, I will read, by permission of the House, a passage from a speech of mine, in relation to representation by population. And I might here say that it is the only speech I ever delivered in my life, which I have ever taken any particular trouble to revise. The hon. gentleman will see, from this passage, what my sentiments were, in 1861, on the subject, while taking part in a debate on representation by population. I was replying to a speech made by my present colleague, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture. I said:—

The only feasible scheme which presented itself to his (my) mind, as a remedy for the evils complained of, was a Confederation of all the provinces. (Hear, hear.) But in speaking of a Confederation he must not be understood as alluding to it in the sense of the one on the other side of the line. For that had not been successful. But then he did not say so from any feeling of satisfaction at such a result. Far from him be any such idea. He heartily agreed with the junior member for Montreal (Hon. Mr. McGEE) in every word of regret which he had expressed at the unhappy and lamentable state of things which they now witnessed in the States, for he remembered that they were of the same blood as ourselves. He still looked hopefully to the future of the United States. He believed there was a vigor, a vitality, in the Anglo-Saxon character and the Anglo-Saxon institutions of the United States, that would carry them through this great convulsion, as they had carried through our Mother Country in days of old. (Loud cheers from both sides of the House.) He hoped with that honorable gentleman (Hon. Mr. McGEE), that if they were to be severed in two—as severed in two he believed they would be—two great, two noble, two free nations would exist in place of one. (Hear, hear.) But, while he thus sympathized with them, he must say, let it be a warning to ourselves that we do not split on the same rock which they had done. The fatal error which they had committed—and it was, perhaps, unavoidable from the state of the colonies at the time of the revolution—was in making each state a distinct sovereignty, and giving to each a distinct sovereign power, except in those instances where they were specially reserved by the Constitution and conferred upon the General Government. The true principle of a Confederation lay in giving to the General Government all the principles and powers of sovereignty, and that the subordinate or individual states should have no powers but those expressly bestowed on them. We should thus have a powerful Central Government, a powerful Central Legislature, and a decentralized system of minor legislatures for local purposes.

These, sir, were the opinions I uttered in a

speech delivered in 1861; and I say that the Constitution which this House, by a majority of three to one, has carried out as far as it is concerned, is, in spirit and letter, that which I then pointed out; and that was not the result of my experience, my thought and my opinion alone, but of the experience, thought and opinion of every man who had studied and taken into consideration the character of the Constitution of the United States. I know that in making that quotation I am committing the error which I have charged upon other hon. members of the House of going back in the debate; but I thought that it was due to myself to read it to the House, because the hon. member for Chateaugay—not in that blunt, plain-spoken style which characterises some hon. gentlemen, but with that soothing, soft language that is so grateful to one's feelings—(laughter)—stated that in proposing a Federal union of these provinces I belied the whole of my political life, and that it was for this reason I made so feeble and ineffectual a speech when I offered these resolutions to the House. As to the feebleness and ineffectiveness of my speech, that, sir, I admit; but as to my sentiments on Confederation, they were the sentiments of my life, my sentiments in Parliament years ago, my sentiments in the Conference, and my sentiments now. (Hear, hear.) Mr. SPEAKER, I submit, with all due deference to your decision, that the motion proposed by the hon. member for Peel is in order; and it is a point, I am free to admit, of such doubt that I ought not to set up my opinion against that impartially given by yourself, for one is very apt to decide in his own favor in a doubtful case. It would have been very convenient for the Government to have it declared out order, and our feelings may therefore have caused us to take a less impartial view than that taken by yourself; and it became our duty to submit to your ruling, unless we believed in our conscience that beyond all doubt you were wrong. Having been declared to be properly before the House, I must say that the motion of the hon. member is altogether inconsistent with his votes upon the question of Confederation. (Hear, hear.) I cannot understand how an hon. member who gave the two votes he did last week upon that question, could make the motion in amendment now under consideration. (Hear, hear.) Indeed I understood him to say that he did not design this as an amendment, but as a separate and independent motion;

and I think it is to be regretted that having made up his mind to support the resolutions I proposed, he did not also support the formal machinery necessary to give them effect; that he did not accept my invitation to propose his views in a separate and distinct motion, instead of in the shape of an amendment to an Address for which he himself voted. (Hear, hear.) When I say that I regret that my hon. friend has taken this course, I must at the same time congratulate him upon the sound doctrine he has laid down in his speech; for if I wanted, if the House wanted, an argument in favor of the measure which the Government has laid before the House, we could not have had it in more eloquent and convincing language than that contained in the speech of my hon. friend. My hon. friend is always eloquent and always convincing, but he could not have been more eloquent or more convincing than when he spoke on this question of Confederation.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—What a compliment!

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—It may be a compliment, but it is not flattery. A compliment is the statement of an agreeable truth; flattery is the statement of an agreeable untruth. Now, were I to state that the hon. member for Cornwall delivered an eloquent and convincing speech, that would be flattery—(great laughter)—but when I state, in all sincerity, that the speech of the hon. member for Peel was an eloquent and convincing one, I may compliment, but I do not flatter. (Hear, hear.) But what struck me as strange was that while my hon. friend stated to the House that he was not a man to make an unconstitutional motion, or to make a motion committing in any way a breach of constitutional usage, or to propose anything less than a constitutional appeal to the people, he should oppose the motion before the House; for I know that my hon. friend is not the man to commit a fundamental error against constitutional and free institutions. He knew well, and it is much to the credit of my hon. friend as a sound constitutional lawyer, that although he drew his notice of motion hurriedly, it was necessary, when he presented it to the House, to guard against mistake; and he took care that the appeal he proposed to make to the people on this question should be a constitutional appeal by the members of this House going to the polls. (Hear, hear.) But my hon. friend the seconder of

the resolution, who called upon the House to support it, says he does not believe a word of it. (Laughter.) The very first sentence that he uttered was that he did not believe in the resolution; for he said that he was in favor of submitting yes or no to the people, but not in the mode proposed by the resolution, the only mode known to our Constitution.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—I do not wish my language to be misrepresented by my hon. friend. What I stated was that I did not consider that to be the only way of ascertaining the views of the people, and did not think it wrong to take a vote, yea or nay, upon the question.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—Well, my hon. friend from Peel submitted that the appeal should be made in one way, the constitutional way, and that was the way my hon. friend from North Ontario did not like. How could my hon. friend suppose that a vote like that could be taken in a country whose Constitution is modelled on the Constitution of England? By what contrivance known to our Constitution could we take such a vote? There is none such. There is no means, no system, by which we could make an appeal of that kind, and in order to do it we should have to subvert the principles of the British Constitution. The hon. gentleman knows there is no means of doing it. We might, indeed, pass a law declaring that the people shall vote yes or no on this question; but such a law would in itself be a change in our Constitution, and I would like to see any man representing Her Majesty in this country give his sanction to a measure of that kind, which would be a subversion of the first principles of British constitutional government. Sir, we in this House are representatives of the people, and not mere delegates; and to pass such a law would be robbing ourselves of the character of representatives, and be a proceeding which even the honorable member for Chateauguay himself denounces in language, although he supports it in countenance when pressed by others. That hon. gentleman is too familiar with the principles of British constitutional government to support such a proceeding himself, but still he encourages others to do it, and to say that which he would not advance himself. (Hear, hear.) Sir, a reference to the people—a direct reference to the people—of a question of this kind may be the means by which

a despot, an absolute monarch, may get that popular confirmation and approval which he desires for the laws necessary to the support and continuation of his usurpation. It may be the means by which a despot, at the point of the bayonet, may ask the people to vote yea or nay on the measure he proposes; but in every free country where there is a Constitution at all, the vote must be taken by the constituted authorities, the representatives of the people, and not become a mere form and cover to tyranny, but a measure which accords with the calm and deliberate judgments of the people, as expressed through their representatives. (Hear, hear.) I was rather alarmed when I first read the notice given by my hon. friend from Peel, and feared that he was going to take the course advised by the hon. member for North Ontario, because the language of his notice was undefined upon the subject. I, however, had every confidence in the constitutional principles—the conservative principles—of the hon. gentleman; but as the language of the notice was not clear, I was exceedingly relieved when he read the motion to the House in its present complete shape. I admit that it was quite open to any member of this Parliament to move either that the House be dissolved or not dissolved. I admit that the hon. member had a constitutional right to move that the House be dissolved, with a view of referring this question to the people, and therefore it was that I felt relieved when I found that this was the course he proposed, and regret, on the other hand, that the hon. member for North Ontario has so far fallen away from his old conservative principles as to take the other ground. Now, what is the opinion entertained upon this subject in England? I was exceedingly pleased to read lately the report of a speech delivered to his constituents, at Huddersfield, by Mr. LEATHAM, a member of the Imperial Parliament. He is, I believe, a brother-in-law of Mr. JOHN BRIGHT, and belongs to the advanced Liberal school of English politicians, known as the Manchester school; and although educated in the political doctrines of that school, he yet had the courage to get up before the people of Huddersfield, as Radical a constituency as any in all England, and spoke in strong language against the Permissive Bill, a temperance measure which resembles that passed through this Legislature by the hon. member for Brome, because he held that it was uncon-

stitutional to hand over to the people the power of voting directly upon a law before it came into effect. He contended that the responsibility of voting for a measure must rest upon the Legislature alone, and that it could not refer this responsibility to the people. When you find an advanced Liberal like Mr. LEATHAM taking that ground, and going to the length he did in support of it, you can well understand the principles that actuate the great majority of the people of England. Allow me to read to the House the language employed by Mr. LEATHAM on this point. It is not long, and it seems to me exceedingly instructive. *The Times*, in an article on the speech, says:—

Mr. LEATHAM's argument on this subject is well worthy of attention, not only for its bearing on the question of compulsory temperance, but from the much wider range of subjects to which it is applicable. "It is," he says, "the essence of representative government that the electing class, which is analogous to the class paying rates, shall possess no direct legislative power; and the principle of parliamentary representation is that not even the representative principle shall alone legislate. We have taken the precaution to protect the rights and property of Englishmen by the prerogatives of the Crown, the privileges of the Lords, and the authority of a representative Assembly. All these constitute the three-fold and invaluable shelter which we have raised over the rights and property of the meanest subject in the realm. But here is a proposition which, with naked and revolutionary simplicity, proposes to intrust the property and maintenance of the rights of a large class of persons to diminutive, homogeneous, democratic, and irresponsible parliaments set up all over the country, in place of a central, responsible, compound, and constitutional one. It seems to me that this strikes at the root of a constitutional and representative system."

These, sir, are the words used by an advanced reformer, a member of one of the most advanced schools of politicians in England. They are words of wisdom, and ought to rest with weight on the mind of every admirer of representative institutions, who does not wish to see those institutions degraded in this country, and representation become mere delegation. (Hear, hear.) Why, sir, for what do we come to this House, if it is not because we are supposed to be convinced by argument, if it is not that we are to sit down together and compare notes and discuss the questions that may come before us, and to be convinced according to the force of the reasons that may be advanced for or against

them? And if we are honest, conscientious men, we change our opinions as we become convinced that that which we held before was wrong and the opposite right. But if the other doctrine obtains, that we are not representatives but delegates, we might as well meet here and pass measures without any discussion whatever, every man voting according to the instructions of the commission which he holds in his pocket from his constituents. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—What was the previous question?

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—Well, that was not voted upon without argument; for full opportunity was given to discuss it before hon. members were required to vote. I was saying, sir, that the hon. member for Peel committed an act of inconsistency in voting for these resolutions, and then proposing this amendment. What did the resolutions amount to? The honorable gentleman voted for an Address to the Queen, praying that she may be pleased to lay before the Imperial Parliament a measure for the union of these colonies, on the basis of the resolutions of the Quebec Conference. He voted for it because he approved of the proposition; and if we had followed the practice of the Imperial Parliament, the Address would have been adopted by the vote which he and a majority of hon. members gave, and probably would be on its way to England now for presentation to Her Majesty. It is a practice lately adopted to refer the Address formally to a committee, to report it back again to the House. Well, my hon. friend, by his vote, affirmed that this Address should be sent to Her Majesty; but what does this motion proposed by him declare? Why, that the Address which he declared by his vote should be presented to the Queen, should not be sent. That is the plain meaning of it, and—I was going to say that it gives the lie to his former action, but—is the very opposite to the previous vote of the hon. gentleman. (Hear, hear.) That is the course which my hon. friend has taken, and I must say that it is an extraordinary and inconsistent one.

HON. J. H. CAMERON—It is strictly parliamentary.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—It is parliamentary because the Speaker ruled it so; but I maintain that the motion of my hon. friend is entirely inconsistent with his vote on my resolution.

HON. J. H. CAMERON—My hon. friend says that it is merely a matter of form to refer an Address adopted by the House to a committee, and is so regarded in England. But I wish to point out to my hon. friend that in the Imperial Parliament, on the 7th of February last, the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne was moved and unanimously assented to by the House; that it was then referred to a committee of the House, which committee reported it back, and that on the Address coming up for a second reading, Mr. SCULLY moved an amendment in reference to the state of Ireland, in opposition to the Address for which he had himself before voted. (Hear, hear.)

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—I quite agree with hon gentleman as to the fact stated, but in the first place there was no vote of the House upon the Address.

HON. J. H. CAMERON—Yes, the vote was unanimous. I can give another case if my hon. friend desires it.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—Well, if Mr. SCULLY was present when the Address was first voted, he would no doubt have voted against it. But this is the first case I have yet heard of an honorable member voting to carry a certain motion, and then proposing an amendment to upset it; and when he did propose it, I myself thought it was unparliamentary, but the Speaker ruled it in order, and to his decision I bow. Now, if the hon. gentleman thought that from the circumstances of the country or for any other cause, no Address of the kind should go to the Queen, he should have said so by voting against it. But he did not say that; on the contrary, he said that there should be an Address to the Queen, praying Her to lay a measure before the Imperial Parliament—that measure to contain a Constitution for these colonies, and that Constitution to embrace all the resolutions adopted by the Quebec Conference; and the very next moment the hon. gentleman gets up, and like the boy who builds up and then knocks down a house of cards, moves an Address to the Governor General, praying him not to send that Address to the Queen, and thus defeats the very motion for which he voted. (Hear, hear.) He voted first that this House should address the Queen, and then by his motion says that it shall not address the Queen at all, but that this House shall be dissolved, and that there shall be an election, and then that another House shall

address the Queen. (Hear, hear.) After voting that this House shall address the Queen, it seems to me to be little less than an insult to Her Majesty to say that the House shall be deprived of all possibility of passing the Address, and that a future, not this Parliament, shall do so. It seems to me that my hon. friend's inconsistency is clear, palpable, and beyond all doubt. (Hear, hear.) Sir, I shall not enter into the question as to the reference of this subject to the people. The small paragraph I have read from Mr. LEATHAM's speech contains very shortly the wisdom of ages, and I might appeal, if further testimony were required, to all the great men who have acted on the political stage of England. Mr. PITT scouted at the idea; and it was never countenanced by any of the great public men of England. My hon. friend says that at the time of the union of England and Scotland, there was a distinct reference to the people of Scotland. It is true that proclamations were issued, calling upon the people to elect representatives from the boroughs on the question of union with England; but the hon. gentleman knows very well that Scotland had no free representative institutions at that time—he knows that until the passage of the Reform Bill, elective institutions were only a mockery in Scotland. The boroughs were in the hands of close corporations, who elected whom they pleased, and it was quite impossible to obtain, by such means as an election afforded, a true expression of the opinion of the people of that country.

HON. MR. BROWN—The counties were the same.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—There was no country—although the people had a free and manly spirit—that had a more restricted constitution than Scotland till the year 1832. But the hon. gentleman ought to have looked upon the other side of the question, and told the House whether there was an election in England on the question of the union with Scotland. There was not, sir, and the idea would have been scouted by the leading minds of England had it been proposed. (Hear, hear.) Sir, when the Imperial Parliament passed the Septennial Bill to save England from the disastrous consequences of the reign of the STUARTS—for although a Highlandman, I say they were disastrous—when the members who were elected for three years declared themselves elected for seven, without going to the people; and when the union with Ireland

was accomplished without a reference to the people, did any one say that these things were unconstitutional? Has my hon. friend not shown that Sir ROBERT PEEL, who was the great protector of the liberties of Parliament, quoted these proceedings with approbation, as showing what the House of Commons could do if it chose. And so the honorable member for Montmorency quoted the language of WILLIAM PITT, who, although his name in late days was connected with some things which did not meet the approbation of his party, was the leader of the Conservative party, and carried through to his deathbed the principles of his father the Earl of CHATHAM. He was supported by his party and by all the leading whigs when he made his speech on the Irish union, in which he alleged that the Irish Parliament had full power to vote away those rights which it was elected to preserve. His language was quoted by the honorable member, and did time permit, I would read it again to the House, for it is the language of wisdom and truth. My honorable friend from Peel says—"Oh, that is all very well, but this is quite a different thing from the Irish union, because we have only a limited Constitution under our Constitutional Act." That is quite true, but Ireland as well as this country had only a limited Constitution, under which not even a measure of supply could be laid before the Irish Parliament unless it had previously been sent to the English Government, approved, and then sent back for the approval and sanction of the Irish Parliament; and it was not till 1782 that this was changed, and the reference to England of such measures done away with. My honorable friend refers us to the language of the Constitutional Act to show how limited our Constitution is; but by that act we are empowered, in the widest language that could be employed, to make laws for the peace, welfare and good government of the people of Canada. There could be no larger powers conferred upon us, and although it is quite true that our political existence is only statutory, that constitutionally our judges have no right to commit for contempt, and that we have no prescriptive rights such as those which the Imperial Parliament possesses, yet this is equally true—that we stand, with regard to the people of Canada, precisely in the same position as the House of Commons in England stands with regard to the people of England. (Hear, hear.) And no man who values representative government would consent to sit here under

a less extensive commission—no man will get up and disclaim the possession of such powers. But my honorable friend says we can only pass resolutions, and cannot change our Constitution except by addressing the Sovereign, praying Her to give them effect through the Imperial Parliament; and he argues from this that we ought to go to the people and have a new Parliament to do it. A new Parliament can, however, do nothing more than we can do. Sir, I believe in my conscience, that this House, more than any House since 1841, represents truly and faithfully the people of Canada. If the members of this House do not represent the country—all its interests, classes, and communities—it never has been represented. (Hear, hear.) I believe that all classes and interests are represented here; but if the House votes for this motion, it declares that it does not represent them. (Hear, hear.) If we represent the people of Canada, then, in the words of the Constitutional Act, we are here to pass laws for the peace, welfare and good government of the country. But if we do not represent the people of Canada—if we declare so by passing this resolution—then what great criminals have we been in the past! If we do not represent them, if we have no right to represent them, then we have no power to pass one single bill and declare it to be law, even although it be a bill to establish a saw-mill. If we do not represent the people of Canada, we have no right to be here. But if we do represent them, we have a right to see for them, to think for them, to act for them; we have a right to go to the foot of the Throne and declare that we believe it to be for the peace, welfare and good government of the people of Canada to form of these provinces one empire, presenting an unbroken and undaunted front to every foe; and if we do not think we have this right, we are unworthy of the commission we have received from the people of Canada. (Hear, hear, and cheers.)

MR. M. C. CAMERON—I would ask the Hon. Atty. Gen. West, did he support Mr. DUNKIN's Temperance Bill?

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—I don't remember. I don't generally go for temperance bills. (Laughter.)

MR. M. C. CAMERON—If the honorable gentleman did support that bill, he supported what, according to the rule he has laid down, is a violation of the Constitution.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—I am afraid I did.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—Then he has been guilty of a violation of his own rule. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—I think I owe the Hon. Atty. Gen. West a word of explanation. I was not so fortunate as to be in Parliament in 1861, and I have never happened to read the speech from which he quoted. I should be very sorry to misrepresent him, and perhaps I would have misrepresented him in making the statement I did, if I had read that speech. But I think he will bear me out in this, that at the British American League, some fifteen years ago, he did vote and speak in favor of a legislative union.

HON. ATTY. GEN. MACDONALD—My hon. friend is mistaken.

HON. MR. HOLTON—That body, at all events, did pass certain resolutions in favor of a legislative union. The hon. gentleman was a member of that body, and either voted for or against those resolutions—he can say which. My impression is that he supported them. At all events, he will not deny that last session, in the debate on the Address, or on the motion of the honorable member for South Oxford, he did express an opinion in favor of a Legislative union, as distinguished from a Federal union. It was shortly before the change of Government, and there was some difference between the two honorable gentlemen—the Hon. Attorney General East and the Hon. Attorney General West—who were then sitting on this side. And in the committee, formed on the motion of the honorable member for South Oxford, the Hon. Attorney General West voted against the Federative system, and declared himself in favor of the Legislative system in contradistinction to the other, and my impression was that he had uniformly held that ground. It now appears that in his speech of 1861 he shews that at that time he contemplated the possibility of a modified sort of Federation—a Federation very different, however, from the joint authority of the honorable member for South Oxford, who argues that this is the very measure of the Convention of 1859.

HON. MR. BROWN—It is on the same basis.

HON. MR. HOLTON—It is the same basis; but in the one, the federal authority has the preponderance—in the other the local authority.

HON. MR. BROWN—This includes the best features of both systems.

HON. MR. HOLTON—I will not enter farther into that. I only rose to make the remark I did with reference to the speech of the Hon. Attorney General West in 1861. (Cries of "Go on!") Hon. gentlemen opposite are rather difficult to please. Not long since, when the Hon. President of the Council was not in such good humor as he is just now, he complained that I inflicted myself too often on the House. Now they insist that I shall speak. (Laughter.) I had intended to speak at some length on the general question. I came down to this House this afternoon, intending to speak at some length, but I confess that the view suggested by the Hon. Attorney General West had occurred to me, that it was not desirable on this motion to reopen the whole debate. And when my hon. friend and leader beside me (Hon. Mr. DORION) got up, after I had intimated my intention to speak, and stated, on behalf of those who act with him—and I am a good party man, I follow my leader—that we had no desire to reopen the debate, but wished this matter to be got through to-night, I decided to waive my speech, believing that my views on all points of this scheme are sufficiently well known. (Laughter.) But I beg to assure hon. gentlemen that if on any point of the scheme they have any doubt as to what my views are, I shall answer any questions they may choose to put, as distinctly and as concisely as I can. (Hear, hear.)

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—My honorable friend has correctly stated the intention arrived at by this side of the House. It was not our intention to make any lengthened observations on the motion before the House. But honorable gentlemen opposite have not followed the rule they laid down with respect to this.

HON. MR. BROWN—I did.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—Well, I think the Honorable President of the Council made a considerable speech to-night, and impressed his conclusions so strongly on the House as almost to drive away any ideas we may have had as to what we should say. (Laughter.) I was rather struck by the manner in which the Honorable Attorney General West took credit to himself for having refrained from insisting on objections on the ground of order to the motion of the honorable member for Peel, after he had declared that he would avail himself of all parliamentary usages to prevent that motion being put. But the honorable gentleman forgets that English

authority, as well as former decisions in this House, sustain the motion of the honorable member for Peel. In 1843, when an Address was passed in this House, sustaining the stand which Hon. Mr. BALDWIN had taken, in Sir CHARLES METCALFE'S time—after it had passed, an amendment to the Address was moved, but the Speaker who occupied your place ruled the motion to be out of order, and an appeal being made to the House, the House sustained the appeal, and the Address was amended by the passing of an amendment moved by Mr. BOULTON. I say, then, that the Honorable Attorney General West need not have taken credit to himself for not having appealed against the decision of the Chair, because he must have known that the authorities were against him. (Hear, hear.) The honorable gentleman is no doubt possessed of astuteness. No one can manifest greater astuteness than he displays in adapting himself to any new position in which he may find himself. There is not a public man in the country who has maintained his ground so long, in opposition to so many public questions on which he has at last submitted to change his opinions, and which he has finally carried in some shape or other, with the aid of his opponents. (Hear, hear.) Was not the secularization of the Clergy Reserves opposed by that honorable gentleman from the time he came into Parliament in 1844, until 1854—a period of ten years? Did he not declare it was a spoliation of church property? Did he not oppose the demand to have the seigniors deprived of their rights? Did he not call that a spoliation also? Did he not oppose the introduction of the elective principle into the Legislative Council? Did he not, by his speeches and by his votes, declare it was a republican movement, and that we might as well give up the Constitution of this country and adopt that of the United States, as have an elected Legislative Council? But after having battled for ten years against these questions—the abolition of the Seigniorial tenure, and the elective Legislative Council—questions which caused the rebellion in Lower Canada—and that of the Clergy Reserves, which Lord SYDENHAM declared to be the cause of the rebellion in Upper Canada—questions which shook the foundations of society, and brought, not only civil strife, but war—the honorable gentleman gave up the opposition he had maintained for ten years, and in order to get a seat on the Treasury benches, and to

keep his party in power, tamely submitted, and subjected himself to the humiliation of carrying out those measures. Yet he claims to have been consistent! Those three great questions—and others which had occupied the attention of the country, and had caused the greatest political antagonism between parties—those questions were carried by the honorable gentleman, by acting on that side of the House with the very parties to whom he had been opposed in those questions; and with the aid of renegade reformers, he was permitted for nearly ten years to keep possession of the Treasury benches. (Hear, hear.) I am sorry to see that the same course has been pursued in the formation of this Government. What was done in 1854 was repeated in 1864. (Hear, hear.)

MR. A. MACKENZIE—Who moved that the honorable gentlemen, representing the Liberal party, should go into the Government?

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—I found they were going—with the engine at full speed—and that nothing could restrain them. (Laughter.) I found that all the drags that could be put upon the wheels could not stop them from going there. I saw it was impossible to stop them, and I said therefore—"In the name of Goodness, go. True, only those places are made for you, and three may as well go in, although I would prefer that there were three more, and then we might look to get some justice."

MR. A. MACKENZIE—You voted against the motion, that the proposition for three members of the Opposition entering the Cabinet be rejected.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—The honorable gentleman is mistaken.

MR. A. MACKENZIE—I am not mistaken. I moved the resolution myself.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—I voted first against the basis.

HON. MR. BROWN—No, no.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—I stated that I would not commit myself to the explanations which had been made.

MR. H. F. MACKENZIE.—If the honorable gentleman will permit me, I will read from the published proceedings of the meeting. The honorable gentleman did not vote against the basis:—

It was moved by Mr. HOPE F. MACKENZIE, seconded by Mr. MCGIVERIN, That we approve of the course which has been pursued by Mr. BROWN in the negotiations with the Government, and that we approve of the project of a Federal union of the Canadas, with provision for

its extension to the Maritime Provinces and the North-Western territory, as the basis on which the constitutional difficulties now existing could be settled.

There were thirty-four who voted for this motion. Five declined to vote either yea or nay, and among these is the name of the honorable member for Cornwall. (Hear, hear.)

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—It is laid down that "he that is not with you is against you." (Hear, hear.) I will tell you why I did not vote. I did not charge my honorable friend from South Oxford with deceiving us in anything. He said he had a paper in his hand which contained the basis of the arrangement. He may have told us the whole of it, and I did not say it was his intention to mislead us. But I was not satisfied, notwithstanding the excellence of his memory, that he should come with a document in his hand, and, instead of reading it to the meeting, undertake to give us verbally the substance of it. I did not like it at all; and when I refused to vote, it is clear I was not in favor of it.

HON. MR. BROWN—Did you say anything against it?

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—I expressed my opinions to my friends around me.

HON. MR. BROWN—Did you address the meeting against it?

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—There was no use in addressing the meeting—there was such a rush to carry it. (Laughter.) Now, Mr. SPEAKER, my honorable friend the Hon. Attorney General West, in his usual style of addressing the House, after evading the real point in discussion—that of the propriety of referring this matter to the people—went off on another tack, and on several tacks. I never witnessed a more excruciating lashing than he administered to the honorable member for Peel. He ridiculed the whole of the honorable gentleman's motion. But he administered one consolation which, no doubt, the honorable gentleman found to be palatable. He said:—

There is one thing after all—though my hon. friend from Peel is mistaken in every particular—though, notwithstanding his constitutional lore, and ability, and eloquence, and everything which constitutes a statesman, he has done everything wrong—yet there is one thing he has done right—he has inserted in his motion the words "constitutional mode."

These words have in them a peculiar charm in the estimation of the Hon. Attorney General

West, who ought to show us where he has found, in the practice of the English Parliament, a scheme of this kind introduced, then he might say that the honorable member for Peel is wrong; but when he brings in a measure that is at variance with English principles and practice, then I think we are at liberty to try to find ways and means for submitting it for the approval of the people. If it is parliamentary usage for the Government to come down to this House, and, with the assistance of their political supporters, suddenly to change our Constitution, and take away our liberties, then, forsooth, are we not to take our own course as to whether or not we shall ask that their measure shall be referred to those who sent us here? The Hon. Attorney General West scouts the idea of our being delegated only to work under the Constitution that we have. He forgets that when we make laws under our Constitution, we can change them ourselves at any time; but when we make a Constitution, and have it ratified by the Imperial Government, it does not lie in our power to change it by a simple resolution of this House. He dwelt strongly on his belief that we were the representative men of our constituencies, and that through us the people had a voice in this House. Well, if we were legislating for ourselves, and for our own people, under our Constitution as it stands, then I admit that we would be fully justified in carrying out any scheme that we might deem essential for the welfare of the province at large, or for any portion of it; but when he carries that principle so far as to say that we ought not to vote for having a measure of this kind—which will affect other provinces as well as our own—referred to the people, then, I say, he carries the principle to a most unwarrantable length. (Hear, hear.) What can he advance in justification of such a course? He talks about it being unconstitutional. Why, they understand constitutional law in Nova Scotia, or ought to understand it as well as we do. But when we point to Nova Scotia, Ministers tell us that that province does not make laws for us.

HON. MR. MCGEE—They don't know half as much.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—Well, the Honorable Minister of Agriculture has been down there, and it is a pity that his lectures and essays have failed to afford them all needful instruction. (Laughter.) At all events, they seem to appreciate the position in which the Conference at Quebec has placed them. But

the people of New Brunswick, sir, are they so far behind the age as not to understand how to manage their own affairs? We went down to ask them to assist us to get out of our difficulties, though this object was, at first, somewhat disguised. When they began to realize that it was to save us that the Conference took place, and was not organized for the purpose of benefiting them, the people of that province, if not the Government, refused to recognise and support the proceedings of the Conference. Now, if we had not the fact of the Lower Provinces having exercised their rights and privileges, we should have no chance whatever to appeal to precedents. And if the loyal people and governments of the Lower Provinces—people who are one day declared to be loyal, and the next annexationists and under American influence, according to their being for or against this scheme—if they do not know what are their rights, or in what manner to deal with this project, I think we had better teach them. I cannot help, however, feeling the conviction, after the character given of them by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, that it is just as well we have got rid of them. (Laughter.) But if, on the contrary, they are an intelligent people, and possess an intelligent Government, and that Government has adopted the course of referring that measure to the people, how can it be improper for us to advocate the same thing in Canada? Who are the hon. gentlemen that arrogate to themselves the right of telling us that we cannot exercise our privileges in this House, in voting in such a manner as we think best and most conducive to the interests of the people whom we represent? Those honorable gentlemen tell us that the motion of the hon. member for Peel is a most extraordinary one, in the face of the fact that the majority of these same gentlemen were voted out of office by this House only a short time ago, and that since then no appeal has been made to the people. There would be nothing very strange if they were voted out again. (Hear, hear.) The Hon. Attorney General told the hon. member for Peel, though not in so many words, that he did not know what he was about; and in the course of the same speech remarked that if he wanted an argumentative, clear-headed, methodical and able speech, he could not have chosen a better one than that delivered by the hon. member for Peel. Now, I think that that is one of the coolest remarks I have ever heard from an attorney general in this

House. He rejoiced that the speech bore so strongly in opposition to the views of this side of the House, and then states that the hon. gentleman did not really know the effect of his own motion. If the hon. member for Peel thinks that is flattering, then, I must say that he is easily satisfied. The hon. gentleman, however, I think, made out a very good case in favor of his amendment. His language may not be such as we have frequently heard in this House, during the past few days; but it is such as we generally hear on the hustings. When honorable gentlemen appear there previous to their election, they have no hesitation in saying that, if elected, they will go to Parliament for the purpose of carrying out the wishes of their constituents. I am sure my hon. friend from Peel has often, and warmly denounced the invasion of the rights of the Church of England; the Clergy Reserves were being secularized, and I well remember that a motion was made in this House to the effect that before that measure should become law, it ought to be referred to the people; though that was a measure that only concerned our own internal affairs, we did not hear, at that time, a word about the unconstitutionality of referring it to the people. The Honorable President of the Council has often declared that no government should be supported which did not pledge itself to bring in a measure for granting representation according to population; but it is infinitely worse to support a government which proposes to take away our Constitution, and at the same time deprive the people of having a voice in reference to it. My view of one of the duties of a representative is this: when a man goes voluntarily before the people, and tells them that he will vote against such and such measures, and then comes here and votes in the contrary direction, it is his duty to resign; for no man of spirit would stand up in this House after violating the promises he had made to the people. My hon. friend the Hon. Attorney General West says it is not constitutional to take a vote in the way proposed by the honorable member for North Ontario. Sir, I am as anxious to maintain the Constitution of this country as any one can be; but when a motion of this nature comes up, I care not how the vote is to be taken, it shall have my support. The hon. gentleman has violated the British Constitution in bringing in this measure, and as he has

done so, I am prepared to vote in any manner in which the expression of the people can be had upon it, before we legislate away their rights and their Constitution. I am astonished to find that there is such a desire on the part of the members of this House to oppose the motion for submitting the question to the country. It is said that there is something behind the scenes to account for such singular conduct. Of these we get glimpses from day to day. Some of those reasons are patent to every one. One of those is that the Coalition which has been formed out of the most incongruous materials, is supported by the greatest medley of politicians anybody ever saw. Of course, it is to be supposed that we will have an election before another year is out. Members now supporting the Treasury benches, with some of whom I have worked for many years, have suffered very much from expensive elections through which they have been called upon to pass in that period. I know it is very unpalatable that they should have to go back again for reelection, after voting here against the express wishes of their constituents. Under this Coalition arrangement they evidently expect that they will be able to go to their constituencies and be returned by acclamation, because the two extremes—abandoning their old principles—coalesced. But it is a vain hope, sir. Let the elections for North Ontario and the town of Niagara tell how unfounded is the expectation. The failure of the Hon. Provincial Secretary was the first failure, and I may here say that I was sorry to see the breach of faith committed towards him on the part of the conservatives of that riding; but I am happy to see that he has got over it very comfortably by obtaining another county, which I hope he may long be enabled to keep. Notwithstanding this, however, they yet cling to the vain hope of a triumph when they next go before the people; but I am very much mistaken if the indignant voice of several constituencies will not urge some strong candidate against each of them, nor have I a doubt that the fact that these gentlemen endeavor to secure themselves from going to the people now by voting away the Constitution and the rights of the people, will furnish many of them an opportunity to find their political graves. (Hear, hear.) Sir, it has been my misfortune to have been nearly nineteen years of my political life in the cold shades of opposition, but I am satisfied to stay an infinitely longer

period on this side of the House, if that shall be the effect of my contending for the views which I have just expressed. I have always believed that I was here for the purpose of representing the constituency which sent me, and not for the purpose of misrepresenting them. If I were satisfied that I did not properly represent my constituency on any leading question coming before this House, I would scorn to sit here a moment longer than was absolutely necessary, until I could do so by their approval. But, sir, are there not members here who know full well that their conduct has been condemned by their constituents in the most unmistakable manner? And yet these hon. members rise up and express their virtuous indignation at our contending that the people should have a voice in reference to the adoption of this new Constitution.

MR. SCOBLE—Do you mean any honorable gentleman from Upper Canada?

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—Well, if the honorable gentleman will tell me that there are none from that section of the country whom the cap will fit, then I will say I do not mean any such.

MR. SCOBLE—I do not myself know of any.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—Well, Mr. SPEAKER, I do not desire to be personal, and, therefore, I shall make no pointed references; but I see a number of gentlemen before me whom, I think, the cap will fit admirably. Sir, I think it is most monstrous that this House should refuse the people an opportunity of expressing themselves before their Constitution is taken away from them. I am delighted that I have the opportunity of voting for this motion. I vote for it because it is in accordance with the expression of devotion to the interests of the people, which every honorable member feels when standing before his constituents. He has no hesitation, then, in declaring that he will seek to represent their views, instead of seeking to accomplish other objects than those which he has been delegated to promote. If there has been one question more than another before this House, for the last quarter of a century, upon which the views of the people ought to be clearly and distinctly ascertained, it is upon this proposal to destroy our Constitution; and if gentlemen will vote against it, then I hope that at the next general election, the people will pass such a judgment upon them as will prevent any such scheme ever being pro-

posed in any British Colonial Legislature, without the sanction of the people, during all future time. (Cheers.)

MR. T. R. FERGUSON said—I have listened very attentively to the discussion on this question, and it is certainly most singular, as well as amusing, to hear the different views that have been expressed upon it by the advocates of the amendment. The hon. member for Peel, I am certain, felt that his resolution was the most consistent and reasonable one that could have been well introduced on the subject. The hon. member for North Ontario, who seconded the motion, also, no doubt, thought it a very sensible one. I listened carefully to the arguments of both, and I find that they supported the motion from very different points of view. The hon. member for Peel made a strong speech in favor of the scheme of Confederation which has been adopted by this House, and he said he introduced his motion for the purpose of having the people vote upon it, and with the expectation that they would carry it by a very large majority. The hon. member for North Ontario took a very different view of the effect of the resolution, stating that he seconded it because he believed it would result in defeating the Confederation scheme.

MR. M. C. CAMERON—I think the hon. member is quite mistaken. All I said was that I wished the people to have an opportunity of expressing themselves, so that we might ascertain whether or not they would prefer it to a legislative union.

MR. T. R. FERGUSON—I beg my hon. friend's pardon; but that was not the object and aim the hon. gentleman had in view in seconding the motion. If his object was not to have the scheme rejected, then I cannot understand his language at all. I seldom agree with the views of the Hon. President of the Council; but on this occasion, I think he pointed out the inconsistencies of the hon. member for Peel in an excellent manner. But there are a few more left untouched, to some of which I will briefly allude. The hon. member for Peel declared that his motion was designed to secure the approval of the people, and that it would result in their approval of the formation of a new nationality. The seconder of the motion supported it because it was designed to secure the condemnation of the scheme, and prevent us from obtaining that new nationality. The hon. member for Peel stated that he was in favor of

having a dissolution of Parliament, so that a constitutional expression could be had through a general election. Now, for my own part, I doubt whether, if there were a dissolution of this House to-morrow, we would get a full, true and fair expression of opinion from the people at all. I believe that side-issues would creep in in every case—that the Conservative party would hang together in most instances, and the Reform party do the same, and that numerous local questions would interfere with the results sought to be obtained. My hon. friend from North Ontario declares himself in favor of having a direct vote of the people. Were it not that that is declared an unconstitutional method, I should say it was the only true course to be adopted, because it is the only way of properly testing public opinion on any one measure. (Hear, hear.) Now, sir, the hon. member for Peel is one of the cleverest men in the province, but I must say that my experience with regard to his movements in Parliament is that he does not exhibit himself in anything like so clever or successful a manner as he does when pleading at the bar. I have never seen him taking a prominent position in this House, and playing his part in that position in a successful manner. If he had moved his amendment before the resolutions were adopted, I would have been able to have given him credit for sincerity, if not for ability, in advocating it; but after the resolutions have been passed, he brings up an amendment to another motion that is evidently hostile to the resolutions. Well now, let us take a look at the assertions of the hon. member for Cornwall, and I think we will be able to see the inconsistency still more clearly. The position he takes is, that if these resolutions are referred to the people, and are by them voted down, every honorable member who voted for them in this House must immediately resign his seat. Now, sir, what would be the result of that principle as affecting the hon. member who moved and the hon. member who seconded the amendment now in your hands? Why, sir, instead of having them both on the floor of this House to carry out the views of the people, one of them certainly must leave, if the views of the honorable member for Cornwall are carried out. I think every honorable gentleman must see clearly that whatever way you view the positions taken by the mover and seconder of this amendment, their course bears a contradiction on

he very face of it. And what would be the result of a general election? Those two honorable gentlemen, holding such dissimilar views with regard to the motion upon which they have agreed, would go to the country pulling different wires. The honorable member for Peel will use his best endeavors to influence public opinion in such a manner that it will ratify the resolutions in favor of a Federal union, while the hon. gentleman who seconded the motion will go to the people with the very reverse idea. So you will find these two hon. gentlemen, who have joined so cordially to bring this motion before the House, will disagree on every point the moment after it would be carried, and cause the utmost confusion among the people. I cannot understand the matter at all. I do not see how they can defend their consistencies, either before this House or before the country. There was not a single word said by the Hon. President of the Council or the Hon. Attorney General West, with reference to the inconsistency of those two hon. gentlemen, to which every one in this House will not cordially assent. We voted by a large majority, the other night, in favor of those resolutions. I was in favor, when I came here, of having the question referred to the people; and I only wish that such could be yet done; but when I came to understand the emergencies by which we were surrounded, and saw that we were threatened with the loss of the Reciprocity treaty and the bonded system, in addition to the continuation of the passport system, and were also threatened with the putting of American gunboats on the lakes, and without access to the seaboard except upon and by sufferance of the United States Government, I came to the conclusion that it was important for us to take such steps as would procure, in the shortest manner possible, the assistance of English money, English soldiers and English gunboats for our defence, and that, therefore, there was the most urgent necessity for sending some members of the Government home to England, to bring those resolutions before the Imperial Parliament during the present session, and making such arrangements for our defence as it seems we must make. These were the reasons why I voted for a set of resolutions which, I am free to confess, I would not otherwise have supported. Having voted for them on Friday night, along with a large majority of the members of this House, with the full expectation that everything was to be hurried

through, and the session brought immediately to a close, so that the leading members of the Government could go on an important mission to the Mother Country, I understood the hon. member for Peel to have voted with the same understanding. And what are we told now? Why, that there is no necessity for haste in the matter at all; that there ought to be a new election, occupying two months at least, before a return could be made. But is it seriously proposed that during all this time we are to remain in a defenceless state, and without any prospect of having any for another year? Why, the honorable gentleman must see that the proposal bears such a contradiction on the very face of it, that he ought to withdraw it. These resolutions have been passed by this House, or they have not been passed at all. If they have been adopted by the Parliament of Canada in a constitutional way, then in voting for this motion we would be only stultifying ourselves, mocking our constituents, and insulting Her Majesty, for we would be putting ourselves in the most false and inconsistent position in which the representatives of any people ever placed themselves, on this continent. (Hear, hear.) I know the honorable member for Peel laid down the doctrine before he voted for the resolutions, that they ought to go to the people before their final consummation, and to that doctrine every one must assent; but when he voted for the resolutions, as we all did, on the ground that there was a necessity for their immediate adoption, I say it is clearly contradictory for him to bring up this motion after the resolution has been carried by so large a majority. I am sorry that he has thought fit to bring forward this motion at this stage of the proceedings, and I must say—and am sorry to have to say it too—that I think he has accomplished very little good for his party or for his constituents, since he has been in Parliament. (Hear, hear.) I voted for the resolutions because I saw there was a necessity for doing so, and after having thus voted on Friday night, I am not going to nullify that vote on Monday night, by supporting the amendment which the honorable member has proposed, more to gratify his own notions, I fear, than to do the country good. It has been said—and very correctly said, I think—that if a new House should be elected, the members of that House would have to discuss the matter over again, and take another vote upon it. The honorable member for Corn

wall seems to desire that the question should be referred to the people, not by means of a general election, but in such a manner as to have a direct yea or nay upon it. Well, sir, if that mode were adopted, and the scheme were not sustained, most of the members of this House ought to go home at once and resign their seats. And what then? Why, sir, new elections would have to take place to fill the vacant seats, and the summer would be nearly gone before we should have returns. We should then have to explain matters to the newly-elected members in order to convince them that the measure is all right, and in all probability more than six months would transpire before we could record our votes upon it. (Hear, hear.) I think it would be most unadvisable to allow the motion now before the House to be applied in either way. But, sir, I must say that unless the arrangements in respect to the local governments are made satisfactory to the people of Upper Canada, I shall vote to cast them overboard. But when I look at the fact that the honorable gentlemen who compose the Government are the ablest which both political parties could furnish, and went together with the approval of the large majority of their political followers, I think it is not our place to relieve them from the responsibility now resting upon them, of carrying out this measure in a manner that I hope will prove satisfactory to the people. If we took it out of their hands, we would be assuming a responsibility that properly pertains to them; and for my part, I am willing to leave the responsibility on their shoulders at the present time. If they will not do what is right for us, I shall take the liberty of recording any vote against them, and thus give them a practical expression of my opinion. (Cheers.)

HON. MR. HUNTINGTON said—I do not propose to occupy the attention of the House by any lengthened remarks. I think it is most singular that so many honorable gentlemen on the floor of this House should feel so deeply and be so anxious to discuss the subject upon which such great unanimity is said to prevail. It is strange that hon. gentlemen should be so full of the fire of speaking, that half a dozen are jumping to their feet at once to catch the Speaker's eye. (Laughter.) At a previous stage of the debate, I noted a number of points on which I desired to make some remarks, but I forbore. There are a few of them, how-

ever, that relate to the question before us and that, I think, ought to be brought under the notice of this House. I did not think it surprising, sir, that the Hon. President of the Council should be the first to put in his oar this evening, on behalf of the Government. He is supposed to belong to a party that is deeply sensitive to public opinion, and the honorable gentleman himself has had some intimate relations with public opinion in Upper Canada for several years past; while the Honorable Attorney General East, who sits beside him, so far from caring about consulting the views of the country, is reported to have said at the *dejeuner* at Montreal that he did not consult anybody in making up his mind with regard to anything.

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—That is quite correct. I do not consult anybody in making up my mind.

HON. MR. HUNTINGTON—I say that the Hon. Attorney General East can afford to sit there and—I won't say despise—but disregard the views of the people, and arrogate to himself the right to know what is better for the people than they can possibly know themselves. But the hon. member for South Oxford, when he came to put in his oar fairly, surprised me. I felt that he was entirely too severe upon my honorable friend the member for Peel. It was easy to see that the strong feeling of friendship for the Government which he entertained prevented him from making his argument tell in favor of his position as strongly as he might have done. I admired the eloquence which rendered his speech so acceptable to the members of this House, but I felt that he was afraid of offending his friends in the Government. He seemed to select those hammers that would give the lightest blows. He admitted that if an appeal to the people were taken, the honorable gentlemen on the Treasury benches would come back to their seats with, perhaps, even a more numerous following than now. There was one point of his argument that has remained unanswered. He said that in view of the position which the Confederation scheme occupied in the Lower Provinces, and in view of the strong expression in its favor given by this House, there was no further need of haste—no necessity for pressing the resolutions further until the people should be consulted. That position has not been met, and cannot be met. (Hear, hear.) Sir, it is absurd to stand up, now, and declare that there is a panting, and a

hungry and thirsting among the people for having this scheme put into immediate operation. I do not mean to say that the scheme has not been talked of among the people, but the hon. member for Peel, who has been extensively abroad among the people, has told us that there is the greatest apathy in the public mind; but, sir, that apathy does not exist among the people alone. I state it fearlessly, sir, before honorable gentlemen, without any fear of contradiction, that the greatest apathy exists in this House itself. I have seen the votes of honorable gentlemen counted in favor of the scheme, whom we all know have no faith in it, but who have been drawn into casting their vote for it by former party leanings. (Hear, hear.) Having come to the conclusion that something must be done, and this being the only thing they had an opportunity of doing, they recorded their votes for it. The faithlessness of the people has been well represented. Mr. SPEAKER, while the great leader of the Reform party finds it necessary to stand up here and throw dust in our eyes, by trying to make it appear that the people, to whose touch he has been so sensitive in times past, need not now be consulted, the Honorable Attorney General took a different course. He was asked for precedents, and told us that when violent constitutional changes had been made in England, the precedents for the course proposed by this motion were founded. He talked to us about the union of Ireland, in connection with which the career of PITT—a career that was distinguished in Britain, but which was of such a character that, though signalized throughout Europe, it yet produced a reaction that caused England to fall back in the race of national progress for many years. The result of his course was such that some of the brightest names on English history left the reform principles to which they had been attached, and connected themselves with the Pitt party, and the same will be the result here of the game now being played by honorable gentlemen opposite. This is the precedent which, in a British constitutional country of the nineteenth century, is brought up and used as a whip held over our backs. Why, sir, we have no French revolutions at this day. But they say we have an American revolution. We are told by Ministers themselves, and by speakers, under their cheers, that we have to choose between this scheme of Confederation and annexation to a neighboring republic, and they talk to us as if there was no time to lose—that one or other will be accomplished

immediately. How do we know but it may happen while our Ministers are gone to England, and that when they return they will find the flag of the United States floating over their country. Sir, there is no more danger of anything of that kind happening now than there was when this Government was formed last spring. When the honorable and gallant knight at the head of the Government was called upon to form an Administration, and brought his Government before the House, he did not then hold up to us the danger of invasion, unless we supported his Government. The Government did not then inform us that if we did not form a Federal union we would be annexed to the United States. All these threats on their part have grown out of accidents that have happened to their policy since last June. But, Mr. SPEAKER, the game that is being played now is one that cannot but provoke a conservative reaction in this country. Do honorable gentlemen believe that it is really for the best interests of this country that so many honorable gentlemen, who entertained reform views, are found voting to do away with the elective principle in the constitution of the Legislative Council—a principle that has been held sacred in the eyes of so vast a number of the people of Upper Canada, that to accomplish it has been the battle-cry of many honorable men in times past, *ab uno disce omnes*? The Honorable Attorney General, as the leader of his party, may look with favor upon the conservative reaction which seems to await us. We can afford to go back to that dark period of English constitutional history, when Toryism, profiting by the unstable politics of France, ruled England for fifty years, created the public debt, and stifled the progress of free opinion. It is from this period that the Hon. Attorney General quotes precedents against an appeal to the people—a dark period, in which the rights of the people were sacrificed to a want of faith in them. Shall we copy such examples? Shall we attempt to hold up the terrors of the American war—the dreaded instability of American institutions—to frighten ourselves into dread of our own people? Shall we copy the reactionary abuses of the times of PITT, to the extent that we refuse to consult the people upon the great revolution proposed here? (Hear, hear.) The people were surprised by the political earthquake which took place here last spring. They were astonished by what took place, but they were told that there was no risk for them; that it was necessary for the defence of the country that these men should come

together. And now, when the proposition is brought before this House to place the matter before the people, we are told that there are certain precedents against such a course, such as the union of Scotland and the union of Ireland, which I am sure must be particularly strong in the view of my friend the Honorable Minister of Agriculture. We are told that we must accept this scheme at once without a moment's delay, or it would slip through our fingers. I feel, sir, that this is a point which ought to be made—that the ground on which this motion is opposed, that the people having elected their representatives, they have a right to look to them. And if this country was annexed to the United States, if this Parliament is supreme, if it is able to upset one Constitution, why not another? The doctrine is a new one. It may be fortified by strong precedents, but it is not fortified by constitutional practice in this country—it is not fortified by the opinion of the people of this country, which is, that the representative is not elected to frame its Constitution. It is said by the honorable member for South Oxford that a number of elections have taken place, and that the people are in favor of the scheme. But what elections have taken place? There have been a few for the Upper House; but even the hon. member for South Ontario, a gentleman who comes in for a Ministerial constituency represented formerly by the present Vice-Chancellor of Upper Canada, even that honorable gentleman is defeated and another gentleman is elected in his place. That honorable gentleman is the first fruits of the elections, and he comes here and tells us that he pledged himself to his constituents that this subject should be appealed to the people—and more than that, he tells us that they were afraid he would support the Government on the details. It is an unhappy day for this country when it is found necessary to quote precedents from the most unpopular period in European history in support of the course that is being pursued. (Hear, hear.)

MR. JOSEPH DUFRESNE—I did not intend to say anything upon this matter, and I should abstain from doing so, were it not for a statement made by the honorable member for Lotbinière. He stated that parties in Canada upon this question were about equally divided. I deny that. I know too well sentiment in Lower Canada. I say that the bulk of the people in Lower Canada look upon an election as an oath—they want to use it only as a matter of necessity—they look upon it as

an immorality. I know that there are certain parties in Lower Canada in favor of an election, but the bulk of the people are opposed to it. There are also a few honorable gentlemen in this House who may be in favor of it, but in my opinion they are wrong. I can class those who are in favor of an election in Lower Canada—these are the *Rouges*. Under the present circumstances, they say:—"We are only about fifteen or sixteen; what difference will it make if we lose five or six of our number; and who knows that the States will not come here in our country with a few thousand greenbacks and help us?" (Laughter.) I only say this as a supposition. Then the second is the class who sell liquor in the day, and those who sell without a license—who are almost looked upon as public robbers. The third class are the drunkards—those who go on a spree for several days and pay nothing for it. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) Everyone knows that the accounts are sent in and are paid. Of course these words are not applicable to any one in this House; but those are the only ones who are in favor of an election. The bulk of the people are opposed to it; they consider it as an immorality; and if any one doubts that, I wish they would go out into my part of the country and inquire for themselves. (Hear, hear.)

MR. A. MACKENZIE—The language used by the hon. member for North Ontario, on one or two points, requires some notice. He boldly asserted that he did not believe that there was any serious agitation in Upper Canada for constitutional changes. He boldly asserted that an arrangement could have been made, and that till it was made the people could get on. Now, here is the language he used some years ago. In his speech on the Address in 1862, the following occurs:—

I mean to say that the refusal of righteous demands will lead to unpleasant and unprofitable quarrels. The time has come when 300,000 Upper Canadians will be heard on the floor of the House, and if this is not allowed, the results that will follow will be awful.

That is the language of the gentleman who has charged us with making "highfaluting" speeches. I did address the meeting held in Toronto, and a more unanimous meeting, perhaps, never was held in Toronto. I confined myself entirely to the matter under discussion, and made no appeals of any kind. I leave that to the honorable member for North Ontario himself. Then he states again—in

the debate of 1862 on representation by population—"No man with Anglo-Saxon blood in his veins will submit to the present state of affairs." (Hear, hear.) And yet he accuses us now of taking hasty action in this matter. When the MACDONALD-SICOTTE Administration was formed, he devoted himself to denouncing the Hon. Provincial Secretary, who was then Commissioner of Crown Lands. He used all his power in abusing that gentleman, and he prophesied what the result would be when that gentleman appeared again before the people of Upper Canada. I gave my opinion plainly at the time, and I do not believe that any person used such strong language as the honorable gentleman himself. The question had come to be one that must be settled in one way or the other. It was quite clear to me for one, and to the people of Upper Canada, that the Federation project was the only thing we could have to remedy the state of affairs in which they were placed. (Hear, hear.) But I had forgotten one point in regard to the Coalition arrangements being made to carry on the public affairs. When the liberal members held a meeting to consider the propositions made by their Government, the honorable member for Cornwall attended and took an active part in the business of the meeting, and heartily approved of the project. He declined, it is true, to vote yea or nay on the first resolution, approving the policy proposed, but that was merely because the resolution was so worded as to expressly approve of Mr. BROWN's share in the perfecting of the arrangements made. This is proved by the terms of the second resolution, which was moved by the honorable member for Cornwall himself. (Hear, hear.) The motion was in the following terms—"That the proposition for at least three members of the Opposition entering the Government be accepted." Mr. MACKENZIE of Lambton, moved in amendment—"That the proposition for three members of the Opposition entering the Cabinet be rejected, and that the proposition for the settlement of our sectional difficulties receive an outside support." The amendment only received eleven votes; the eloquence of the honorable member for Cornwall carried the meeting against my resolution. That honorable gentleman also moved the third resolution, as follows—"That it is all-important that Mr. BROWN should be one of the party to enter the Cabinet." Only three gentlemen—viz., Hon. Mr. BROWN and Messrs. BURWELL and SCATCHERD—voted against this. Now,

sir, if the honorable member was sincere then, how are we to account for his course now? (Hear, hear.) Was he deceiving us then, or is he speaking against himself now? (Hear, hear.) Considering the part that honorable gentleman had in organizing the Government, it did seem very extraordinary that he should have repeatedly reproached honorable gentlemen opposite with having formed a coalition.

HON. MR. BROWN—Hear, hear.

MR. A. MACKENZIE—Was it possible that he urged the formation of the Government with a view to destroy the liberals who had entered it? I believed then that the best course to pursue was to give the Conservative Government a thorough outside support. I have always had a strong objection to party coalitions. I felt then, as I do now, that they may lead to later results not foreseen at the time, and all that I wished was that the Liberal party should give their support to the Administration for the purpose for which it was formed, that support to cease when the object should be accomplished. The honorable member for Cornwall thought differently, and I do not think it becomes that hon. gentleman to get up now and denounce those hon. gentlemen for the course they have taken. He is not able to say that he did not vote. He voted as here recorded, and with the desire that I have always had to have everything of this kind recorded to prevent future misunderstanding, I took the trouble to have a certified copy of the proceedings, from which I have just quoted. When any honorable member took that course in the caucus, I think he was clearly bound to adhere to the same course. (Hear, hear.)

DR. PARKER—MR. SPEAKER, I had some intention of voting for the resolution in your hands, sir, until I heard the speech of the mover, the hon. member for Peel; but that gentleman has quite convinced me that I ought not to do so. (Hear and laughter.) He proved most conclusively that the proposed Confederation was in itself a most satisfactory and desirable measure, and that the internal state of these provinces, as well as the threatening aspect of foreign affairs, were conclusive reasons for its immediate adoption. Defences, he told us, were immediately required, and that they could only be made effective by first uniting the provinces. Accepting this argument and others advanced by that hon. member, the conclusion is that the necessity for Confederation is imperative and immediate. But, sir, how does this

agree with the terms of his resolution, if we should adopt it, and this House be dissolved, and members sent to the country for election before the new House could adopt the measure? The House of Commons would be dissolved, and the Imperial Parliament could not legislate on it for a year or more—(hear, hear)—so that by the course proposed, the country would still remain, for a year or two longer, exposed to the dangers and difficulties so eloquently described by the hon. member for Peel. (Hear.) If that hon. member had voted against the previous question, and thereby asserted the right to amend or refer the Address before adoption, he could now very properly ask and claim our support to this resolution. But he not only voted for the previous question, but for the Address, and deliberately shose the present time to make this motion. Under these circumstances, he at least has no claim upon the support of the House. (Hear.) Having made a solemn contract with this House on the main question, he now turns round and seeks to upset the arrangement of his own making. His course is best explained by a simple illustration. Suppose four or five gentlemen had entered into an unanimous agreement, when one turns round and says, "I was and am in favor of all that has been done; but unless you now attach this condition, I draw back and retire from the arrangement." (Hear.) That was conduct which could not be approved either in public or private affairs. The position of the seconder of the resolution—the hon. member for North Ontario—is entirely different, because he, like myself, asserted by his vote on the previous question, the desire to have the resolutions amended. The honorable member for Peel told us, even to-day, that this he considered the proper time to place his motion before the House. The resolution itself is highly proper, and one for which I would have voted, had it been made before the adoption of the Address. (Hear.) Now it is entirely out of place. The hon. member for North Ontario remarked just now, in the course of his speech, that this Constitution, if adopted, will soon have to be amended, and therefore, he said, we ought not to accept it. I entirely dissent from that opinion. Why, sir, the British Constitution is but a series of amendments made from time to time—a growth by successive amendments. The objection of my hon. friend is one of the main reasons why I am willing to

accept this scheme. I believe it will admit of amendment as time goes on, so that it may be made to meet the changing wants and requirements of the people. My hon. friend from North Ontario referred to the seductive influence of the breath of the Hon. President of the Council, when breathed into the ears of members, and its magical effects in relaxing the knees, and then, sir, he looked, by way, I presume, of application, at the hon. member for West Elgin. (Loud laughter.) Now I have always regarded the hon. member for West Elgin as one of the most reliable members of this House. (Laughter.) Well, if my honorable friend looked more particularly in this direction, I have nothing to add to the reasons already given in explanation of my vote. The question before me was—"Should we adopt or reject the resolutions?"—and agreeing with the hon. member for Peel that something should be done immediately, I voted for them. I think it would be most outrageous if, after they have been sanctioned by a vote of this House, we were to nullify them by any subsequent proceedings. If the resolutions were to be referred to the people at all, it should have been before they received the sanction of this House. Are we to turn round to-day and reverse what we did on Saturday last? I repeat, sir, that I think the resolutions should have gone to the country—and if my opinion had prevailed, they would have been referred—but not now, after their deliberate sanction by this House; to do so would stultify the Legislature. Our duty is now, in my opinion, to carry them into effect in good faith, and not stand shilly-shallying—blowing hot and cold with the same breath. I, sir, stand by what I have done, and by what this House has done, and shall vote against the amendment of the hon. member for Peel—(hear)—who, I think, occupies a most inconsistent position. (Hear, hear.) There is another point, sir, to which I desire to allude. The hon. member for Peel stated that he voted for the Address as a private individual—as he would have voted on the question if out of this House. Now, sir, no member can shield himself under such a subterfuge. No member can separate his private from his legislative character in this House. If the explanation of the honorable member for Peel be the general doctrine and practice of Parliament, I should like to have it understood, because there are occasions when it would be very convenient to

avail one's self of it. (Hear.) I look on this motion—I refer now to the hon. member for Peel, and except the hon. member for North Ontario—as an attempt to make a little capital at the expense of members who will save its supporters by voting it down. The hon. member for Peel drew a fearful picture of our exposed and defenceless state—of the dark and threatening cloud gathering over us—of the necessity of setting our house in order by a union of these provinces. Now, sir, if I half agreed with him, I should never think of bringing in an amendment causing delay and continued exposure to increasing danger, but would go in strongly for the adoption of measures against such a state of things, the very first hour it was possible. This resolution, from the time at which it is moved, sir, should be voted down at once. The House owes it to itself to give it no countenance at this stage of the proceedings. Had it been moved before the previous question, I would have voted for it; but as it comes up after the adoption of the main resolutions, I will stand by the solemn and deliberate action we have taken—I will stand the responsibility of the House and vote against it. (Hear.)

MR. RYMAL—Being one of the eight members from Upper Canada who voted against the resolutions of the Quebec Conference, and whose names, I expect, will long be cherished by the people of that section, I presume, Mr. SPEAKER, that I may vote for the amendment now in your hands, without being charged with inconsistency, as some honorable gentlemen have been during this discussion. I should not, however, have risen to address you, sir, but for a personal matter that was drawn into this debate, in reference to myself and my connection with the constituency I have the honor to represent—or misrepresent, as some people say. (Laughter, and hear, hear.) According to the doctrines held by the Hon. Attorney General West, it would appear that after I had been elected to this House, I have no business to refer any matter for decision to or consult the feelings of the people who sent me, but to act as I thought best for their interests. Allow me to dissent from this doctrine; but I have been obliged to exercise my own judgment, and I have done so honestly, independently, and fearlessly, irrespective of the consequences that may result to me, or of the half-uttered threats held out over me. These things, sir, have no influence over me; I

shall pursue the course I think best for the interests of my country and of those who sent me here. (Hear, hear.) It matters little whether I enter Parliament again or not; but while I retain my position as one of the representatives of the people, I shall act fearlessly. (Hear, hear.) I regret that the Hon. President of the Council, when speaking of my constituency and myself, should have seen fit to taunt me with and sneer at the narrow majorities by which I have upon occasions been returned to this House.

HON. MR. BROWN—Not at all; quite the contrary.

MR. RYMAL—But I say yes; for, Mr. SPEAKER, I can distinctly recollect when an honorable gentleman, holding a high position in this Government, was twice actually defeated—(hear, and laughter)—and I dare say that the support I have given that hon. gentleman has on some occasions contributed to the narrowness of my majorities. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

The question was then put on Hon. Mr. CAMERON'S amendment, which was negatived on the following division:—

YEAS—Messieurs Biggar, Bourassa, Cameron (North Ontario), Cameron (Peel), Caron, Coupal, De Boucherville, Dorion (Drummond and Arthabaska), Dorion (Hochelaga), Dufresne (Iberville), Fortier, Gagnon, Gaudet, Geoffrion, Gibbs, Holton, Houde, Huntington, Joly, Labreche-Viger, Laframboise, Lajoie, Macdonald (Cornwall), Macdonald (Toronto West), Morrison, O'Halloran, Pâquet, Perrault, Pouliot, Ross (Prince Edward), Rymal, Scatcherd, Thibaudreau, Wallbridge (North Hastings), and Webb.—35.

NAYS—Messieurs Abbott, Alleyn, Archambeault, Ault, Beaubien, Bellerose, Blanchet, Bowman, Bown, Brousseau, Brown, Burwell, Carling, Attorney General Cartier, Cartwright, Cauchon, Chapais, Cockburn, Cornellier, Cowan, Currier, Denis, De Niverville, Dickson, Duckett, Dufresne (Montcalm), Dunsford, Evanturel, Ferguson (Frontenac), Ferguson (South Simcoe), Galt, Gaucher, Harwood, Haultain, Higginson, Howland, Huot, Irvine, Jackson, Jones (South Leeds), Knight, Langevin, LeBoutillier, Attorney General Macdonald, MacFarlane, Mackenzie (Lambton), Mackenzie (North Oxford), Magill, McConkey, McDougall, McGee, McGiverin, McIntyre, McKellar, Morris, Parker, Pinsonneault, Pope, Poulin, Poupore, Powell, Raymond, Rémi-lard, Robitaille, Rose, Ross (Champlain), Ross (Dundas), Scoble, Shanly, Smith (East Durham), Smith (Toronto East), Somerville, Stirton, Street, Sylvain, Thompson, Tremblay, Walsh, Wells, White, Willson, Wood, Wright (Ottawa County), and Wright (East York).—84.

HON. MR. HOLTON—I have an amendment to offer, sir, which I trust will not be found open to some of the objections taken to the last one by the Hon. Attorney General West. I will read the motion, sir, and offer but a few remarks upon it, for it is not my purpose to detain the House myself, or to provoke a lengthy debate. I move, sir :—

That all the words after "That" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—"the said resolution be referred to a committee of the whole House, in order so to amend it as to express the earnest hope of this House, that any Act founded on the resolutions of the Conference of Delegates held at Quebec in October last, which may be passed by the Imperial Parliament, will not go into operation until the Parliament of Canada shall have had the opportunity of considering the provisions thereof, and shall, after the next general election, pray Her Majesty to issue Her Royal Proclamation to give effect to the same."

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS—That is the same thing as the last amendment.

HON. MR. HOLTON—Hon. gentlemen state it is the same thing, but they will see that it is not at all the same. This resolution does not propose to contradict or go back upon the previous action of the House, but to supplement it by asking that any act passed by the Imperial Parliament, founded on the resolutions of the Conference, may be submitted to the House and to the country previous to its adoption. (Hear.) MR. SPEAKER, this is a matter of great importance, but I can now only state the purport of the resolution; for, as I said before, I am not about to provoke a debate. This whole matter proceeds upon the theory that the people of Canada desire a change in their Constitution. Of course we know that the supreme sovereignty rests with the Imperial Parliament—of course we know that the power to change our Constitution and remodel it in any way rests there—but we are proceeding on the assumption that the Imperial Parliament will acquiesce in our desire for a change, and in the nature of the change desired. Well, sir, the gentlemen on the Treasury benches, having the confidence of the majority of this House, and presumably the confidence of the majority of the people also, are going to approach Her Majesty's Government in England and ask them to submit to the Imperial Parliament a change in the Constitution of this country; but, sir, these gentlemen have not explained to us precisely how these resolutions are to be translated into an Act of

Parliament—they have not explained to us which of these resolutions are to form part of our new Constitution, and which of them are to be carried out in some other way. But, MR. SPEAKER, it will be of the last importance to the people of this country to know what their Constitution really is to be before its final enactment. (Hear, hear.) I would recall, sir, especially to hon. gentlemen from Lower Canada, the experience of the past in reference to this matter. In 1852 MR. HINCK'S Government carried through this House an Address in favor of a change in the constitution of the Legislative Council. They sought, by that Address, a change in the Union Act, operating a change in the constitution of the Legislative Council only. But instead of such a change in the Constitutional Act as was desired by the House, power was given to the Legislature to effect such a change, and along with that, the two-thirds clause of the Union Act was repealed—nobody to this day knows how. (Hear.) What assurance have we then—what assurance can we have—that a similar event will not occur now? Hon. gentlemen from Lower Canada must have a vivid recollection of our own very recent experience in constitutional changes. The change actually made in the Union Act in 1852 was one which was deprecated by all the representatives from Lower Canada—by the entire people of Lower Canada—and was brought about in a way which has never yet been satisfactorily explained. Well, sir, presuming that the people of this country are making for themselves a new Constitution—recognising the power of the Imperial Government to effect any such change as they may deem fit—but also recognising the well-known desire of the Imperial Parliament to meet our views in the matter—I propose that this House shall pray, in this Address, that any act founded on the resolutions of the Conference which met in Quebec in October last, may only be put in force on the prayer of both branches of the Legislature of Canada. With these few words, explanatory of my resolution, I place it in your hands. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. DORION—I desire, as I did with reference to the amendment of the hon. member for Peel, not to discuss at length the motion of my hon. friend the member for Chateauguay, but simply to explain the object of that motion in a few words. The House has just rejected an amendment, asking that an appeal should be made to the people of

this province before the Imperial Government is asked to legislate on the Address of this House. Now, the object of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Chateauguay is to ask that the Constitution adopted in England may not go into force until it shall have been submitted to the Legislature of this province, after the next general election, and until an Address shall have been adopted, asking that it be put in force. We ask the Imperial Government to-day, by the Address which has just been adopted, to submit to the Imperial Legislature an act for the Confederation of the British North American Provinces. If, in place of Confederation, the Imperial Parliament were to establish a legislative union of the provinces, I ask those honorable members of this House who protest against a legislative union, how they are to present themselves before their electors—after having refused to consult them—if they also refuse to declare that they desire to consider the measure again when it is brought back to us, after passing the Imperial Parliament? All we ask by this motion is that the act which is to be passed may be submitted to our Legislature, and ratified and approved by this House, before it is definitely put in force—in short, we ask to be allowed to refuse the new Constitution if it should not suit us. We must not forget what occurred in 1856, when we asked the Imperial Parliament to change the constitution of the Legislative Council, and to render it elective. Let it not be forgotten that they gave us a measure different from that we had asked for. We were, it is true, empowered to render the Legislative Council elective, but, at the same time, a clause was struck out of the Act of Union, which clause declared that the basis of the representation in the Legislative Assembly could not be changed without the concurrence of two-thirds of the members of the Legislature. And with that fact staring us in the face, what assurance have we to-day that the Imperial Government will not give us a legislative union, with representation based upon population, in place of a Confederation? What is to prevent them from changing the clause relative to the Legislative Council, and applying to it also the principle of representation based upon population? (Hear, hear.) Well, it is with a view of avoiding the possibility of any change of that nature that we now propose this amendment. There are many hon. members of this House who fear that in view of the refusal of the Maritime Provinces to assent to this scheme, England may

give us a Confederation of the two Canadas. And I ask—when we find the Ministry telling us, over and over again, that it is absolutely necessary to effect a constitutional change, that the matter is urgent, that even one week's delay cannot be given, nor the time to discuss the amendments we desire to propose to the scheme; that they must have a measure at once, otherwise the most dreadful evils must ensue—I ask, is it to be fancied, for one moment, that the Imperial Government will consent to force the Lower Provinces into Confederation. And what is to prevent that Government from changing the scheme so as to make it applicable to the two Canadas alone? (Hear, hear.) Here is what will happen, or at all events what may very well happen: when our Ministers reach England, and urge upon the Imperial Government the necessity for a change in the Constitution as regards Canada, that Government, seeing that the Lower Provinces do not desire Confederation, will pass a measure for the Confederation of the two provinces, leaving to the Maritime Provinces the right to enter that Confederation whenever they think proper. That is very possible, and the only way to provide against such a contingency is to address Her Majesty, praying that any Imperial measure, relating to constitutional changes, may not take effect until it shall have been submitted to, and shall have received the ratification of, the Legislature of Canada. (Hear, hear.)

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER — Mr. SPEAKER, in reply to what the honorable member for Hochelaga has just said, I shall merely tell honorable members of this House that they need not take alarm at the apprehensions and predictions of that honorable gentleman. I have already declared in my own name, and on behalf of the Government, that the delegates who go to England will accept from the Imperial Government no act but one based on the resolutions adopted by this House, and they will not bring back any other. (Hear, hear.) I have pledged my word of honor and that of the Government to that effect, and I trust that my word of honor will have at least as much weight with this House and the country as the apprehensions of the honorable member for Hochelaga. (Cheers.)

MR. MACFARLANE—Mr. SPEAKER, I had intended giving the reasons for the course I was taking prior to the last vote, and as I still desire to explain, the honorable member for Chateauguay has given me an opportunity

of doing so now. (Hear, hear.) It certainly did require some courage to undertake to vote against the last amendment—a resolution which seems fair enough on the face of it. At first I was almost disposed to accept it, and it was not until I discovered its real bearing that I determined to vote against it. Honorable gentlemen will remember that, before the adoption of the resolutions, I was desirous that an appeal should be had to the people prior to the consummation of the vast scheme which they announce; and with that object in view, my vote is recorded against your ruling, Mr. SPEAKER, on the appeal from your decision at the time an amendment was offered prior to their passage. This House having sustained you in the opinion you pronounced, nothing was then left for me, as one of the representatives of the people, but to decide whether we should adopt the policy of Confederation or ignore it. (Hear, hear.) The latter I was not disposed to do, and the Government received my support on the final vote taken, declaring a union of the British American Provinces to be advisable. These resolutions having been passed, we are now called upon to pass an Address to Her Majesty founded upon them. To this Address, and not to the resolutions, the honorable member for Peel offered his amendment, and to support that would have been the ignoring of my former vote, the declaring an Address different from the very resolutions upon which that Address is to be founded, the sacrificing of a great political scheme for the support of what might unexplained be considered a popular and legitimate motion, but which was in fact a motion subversive of the resolutions, and valueless, save as a means unfairly to be used as a weapon on a hustings. (Hear, hear.) If the honorable member for Peel desired this amendment, and honorable members of this House, myself amongst the number, understood he was intrusted with the care of it, why did he not, as an old member of this House, as one conversant with its rules and its usages, submit it for our consideration prior to the Honorable Attorney General moving the “previous question,” and at a time when, by your ruling, Mr. SPEAKER, it would have been admissible. (Hear, hear.) Had he done so then, members could have voted upon the merits of the amendment. Now that the resolutions are passed, that privilege has ceased. After all the difficulties which have arisen in the management of the public affairs of this country, which have existed so long, and which, I may say, have brought

about the present Coalition, it was necessary that some alteration and some amendment should be made. We could not longer proceed amidst the conflicting sentiments which pervaded this House, in the government of a people whose feelings were becoming as hostile as their representatives were antagonistic. And I ask what other solution acceptable to the two Canadas was to be had; what better scheme was to be adopted than that here submitted? (Hear, hear.) The question of Confederation is no new theory, so far as I am concerned; it is a plan which, during the short time I have taken an interest in public affairs, I have always felt disposed to support, as tending to our development as a country, and our independence and influence as a people; and after the declaration we made by our votes a few minutes ago, namely, that these resolutions should be adopted—after hearing too from members of the Government that they are not now prepared to submit to any alterations, and finding that the effect of not passing this Address, founded upon them, would virtually be to throw us back into the state of political chaos from which we have just emerged, I find another reason why I cannot support this or any other amendment. (Hear, hear.) Looking at the matter apart from these amendments, I am, with a reference to the past and a regard for the future, obliged to consider this question in a military as well as in a political and national point of view, and cannot but deem its consideration in this respect a necessity—placed as we are on the borders of a nation whose citizens are versed in the use of the arms with which their legions are now dealing death in the field—isolated as we are from the nation to which we owe our allegiance and which guards our rights, but whose acts might occasion our invasion, and subject as our territory is to be the battleground in the event of a difficulty between England and the States—it behoves us to combine our individual strength, give weight and concentration to our isolated influences, and thus enable us to join effectively with the Mother Country and repel with vigor any acts of hostility that might be taken against us. It is not by the continuation of things as they were, or by the renewal of the conflicting feelings which have existed between Upper and Lower Canada, that we are to add strength to our arms or lustre to our name; it is not thus we are to develop our resources and give us the revenues requisite for our defence; it is not thus we are to become a people capable of self-government and self-defence, should

England ever leave us to our own resources, and sever us from her list of colonies; but by the cementing of our local relations, by the concentration with us, under one government, of the vast territories of the North-West and the peopled provinces of the east, with one community of interest and one object of design, we will be enabled to place ourselves in a position in which we could maintain our independence of a foreign power, perpetuate our connection with Great Britain, and preserve our allegiance to its Sovereign; and should the time come when a severance of these relations should be requisite, the British people of America will not be a crippled chain of powerless and defenceless colonies, but a vast nation, with its sturdy farmers tilling the soil of the vast west, and its daring seamen gathering the wealth of its seaboard fisheries in the east, the one ready to defend our hearths at home, while the other protects our rights at sea, and both ever willing and able to stand by England in her hour of trouble and in her work of good. (Cheers.) I feel that now is the time for taking such steps if ever they are to be taken. If ever there was an occasion when it was necessary to remove the hostility existing between Upper and Lower Canada, and cement their friendships—if ever there was a time when it was prudent to strengthen ourselves by a union with the other provinces, and place ourselves in a position of defence, it is the present, and I speak, I think, the sentiments of all Upper Canada, certainly of all that section of it where I reside, when I say that there is but one feeling there in reference to this matter, and it is favorable to this proposed arrangement, favorable to this plan for the union of the provinces. (Hear, hear.) Besides, Mr. SPEAKER, though some of the details are objectionable, I am not prepared to risk the loss of the principle which is admitted in these resolutions, which is one that gives to Upper Canada what she has demanded for years, and gives it whether the other provinces accede to it or not; it is the recognition by Lower Canada of Upper Canada's rights to an increased representation; it is the acceding of that which Lower Canada has ever heretofore refused to grant, and I cannot, in cavelling at these details, which may hereafter be modified, jeopardise the attainment of the greater object and sacrifice that which is here insured to us. (Hear, hear.) Again, notwithstanding the declaration of my honorable friend from South Hastings, that this measure seals up the North-

West, I think, on the contrary, that it adds to the prospect of opening up that vast territory. Before long we shall see population extending over these vast plains, across the basin of the Winnipeg and the valley of the Saskatchewan, and thence to Vancouver, and all the sooner if this measure be adopted, supplying as it will a government for the encouragement of its settlement and the protection of its settlers; for the country is as fertile and productive as our own province, and its domain as wide. To the north-west there lies beneath British sway, but as yet all unreclaimed, a vast and varied territory, the mineral and agricultural wealth of which no man can estimate, and the future products of which none can conceive—a territory offering the emigrant the choice of its fertile plains, and the miner the wealth of its hidden riches. Here, then, is the policy which tends to the settlement of this vast territory, the development of its immense resources, the opening up of its inexhaustible mines, and with it the creation of a new people, the establishment of increased revenues, and the extension of British influences and British power on this continent. And while developing our resources in the west, it gives an additional outlet for the products of that living mine of teeming wealth in the east—our fisheries—the protection and encouragement of which is as necessary as their wealth to us is inestimable. (Hear, hear.) Believing, too, that this scheme will tend alike to our internal reform and improvement as Canadians, and the quieting of our political hostilities; that it will give us a larger field for our labors and an additional market for our products; that the connections in trade which it will procure will effect for us enhanced revenues and increased commerce, I, as a Canadian, am willing to adopt it even in this local and selfish sense; but I also see in it a broader policy with a wider field open for our energies and our capital—it is the first step towards establishing on British territory a highway from the Pacific to the Atlantic, and thus procuring for us the carrying trade of Asia and the East with all the enriching revenues which it will insure and the labor it will employ. In short, Mr. SPEAKER, it is the policy of a great colonial combination, effective alike in civil pursuits and military defence, adding strength to the Empire and influencing the destinies of this great continent. For these reasons I voted against the last amendment, and for the same reasons I am prepared to vote against this one also. (Hear.)

The House then divided on Hon. Mr. HOLTON's amendment, which was negatived on the following division:—

YEAS.—Messieurs Biggar, Bourassa, Cameron (North Ontario), Caron, Cornellier, Coupal, De Boucherville, Dorion (Drummond and Arthabaska), Dorion (Hochelaga), Dufresne (Iberville), Fortier, Gaudet, Geoffrion, Gibbs, Holton, Houde, Huntington, Labreche-Viger, Laframboise, LaJoie, Macdonald (Cornwall), Macdonald (Toronto West), Morrison, O'Halloran, Pâquet, Perrault, Rymal, Scatcherd, Thibaudeau, Tremblay, and Wallbridge (North Hastings).—31.

NAYS.—Messieurs Abbott, Alleyn, Archambeault, Ault, Beaubien, Bellerose, Blanchet, Bowman, Bown, Brousseau, Brown, Burwell, Carling, Atty. Gen. Cartier, Cartwright, Cauchon, Chapais, Cockburn, Cowan, Currier, Denis, De Niverville, Dickson, Duckett, Dufresne (Montcalm), Dunford, Evanturel, Ferguson (Frontenac), Galt, Gaucher, Harwood, Haultain, Higginson, Howland, Jackson, Jones (South Leeds), Knight, Langevin, Le Boutillier, Atty. Gen. Macdonald, MacFarlane, Mackenzie (Lambton), Mackenzie (North Oxford), Magill, McConkey, McDougall, McGee, McIntyre, McKellar, Morris, Parker, Pinsonneault, Pope, Poulin, Poupore, Powell, Raymond, Rémillard, Robitaille, Rose, Ross (Champlain), Ross (Dundas), Ross (Prince Edward), Scoble, Shanly, Smith (East Durham), Smith (Toronto East), Somerville, Stirton, Street, Sylvain, Thompson, Walsh, Webb, Wells, White, Willson, Wood, and Wright (East York).—79.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—I rise, sir, to propose another amendment. (Signs of impatience.) I assure the House that I never knew a measure of anything like this importance go through with so few attempts to amend it. Nor do I rise for the mere purpose of putting my amendment on record, for I do feel that the views I am about to express, and which I have ever held since I have been a member of this House, may not commend themselves to any considerable number of hon. members. I have no desire that the rights of the Roman Catholic minority of Upper Canada shall be abridged, nor that the rights and privileges of any other denomination shall be interfered with in any respect. But I wish hon. members to bear in mind that the experience we have had in this country—not to allude to that of the neighboring States, proves that a denial of the right of the majority to legislate on any given matter has always led to grave consequences. I need only mention the Clergy Reserve question. This, it must be recollected, was forbidden to be legislated upon by the Union Act; yet it was the cause of fierce strife and legislation for many years.

The original Constitution of the United States prohibited the question of slavery from being interfered with by Congress; yet an agitation for its suppression was early commenced, and has at last terminated in civil war. (Hear.) The agitation of the Clergy Reserve question produced a rebellion in Upper Canada. I say, sir, that by making a constitutional restriction in respect to the schools of the minority, we are sowing the seeds from which will in the end arise a serious conflict, unless the Constitution be amended. The minority will be quite safe on a question relating to their faith and their education in a colony under the sway of the British Crown; but if you expressly withdraw that question from the control of the majority, the rights of the minority will not be safe in either section of the province, if you distrust the action of the majority. It is our duty, sir, to see that a question which affects us so dearly as the education of our children—a question which has before now created no little excitement in Upper Canada—shall not be withdrawn from the management of the Local Legislature. We ought not to deprive them of a power which they will want to exercise, just because they are deprived of it, and provoke a desire on their part to alter the system. You may rely upon it other religious bodies will be sure to protest against any particular creed having special rights, or an exclusive monopoly of certain privileges, whatever they may be. I should be astonished if any one in this House would say, either to the Protestant minority in Lower Canada or to the Roman Catholic minority in Upper Canada—"You are not to trust to the justice of the majority." Have they ever known a country where the majority did not control affairs, and where the minority had not to submit? Does not the majority rule and the minority submit in England and in France? I have never heard of any state where this was not the case. The minority is safe against undue encroachment on its rights, and I am willing to trust to the sense of justice of the majority in Upper Canada to preserve the religious and educational liberties of the Roman Catholics of Upper Canada. I am now getting somewhat advanced in years, and I am the more anxious to put my opinions on record, because before long I shall have the satisfaction of saying, though perhaps not on the floor of this House, that I protested against resolutions intended to prevent the free expression of opinion by the majority of the people

of Upper Canada, and the exercise of a power which ought to be intrusted to them. My amendment is:—

That the following words be added to the original motion:—"And that it be an instruction to the said Committee to consider whether any constitutional restriction which shall exclude from the Local Legislature of Upper Canada the entire control and direction of education, subject only to the approval or disapproval of the General Parliament, is not calculated to create wide-spread dissatisfaction, and tend to foster and create jealousy and strife between the various religious bodies in that section of the province."

If hon. gentlemen think they are going to silence the bitter feelings which have been engendered in Upper Canada in consequence of the attempt to make permanent a certain system of education, they are much mistaken; and I desire to have the expression of the opinion of the members of this House on the subject, whether they think that the restriction in the proposed Constitution I have mentioned is calculated to bring about harmony, and whether it is not better to let the Catholics of Upper Canada and the Protestants of Lower Canada protect themselves, or rather trust for protection to the sense of justice of their fellow-subjects. (Hear.)

MR. A. MACKENZIE—Sir, having already voted for the whole of these resolutions as part of the scheme, I cannot have any hesitation in voting against the amendment, but in doing so I desire to explain my position. (Hear, hear.) If the hon. member for Cornwall (Hon. J. S. MACDONALD) had shown the same zeal against the separate school system when he had the power to prevent legislation on that subject, he would have saved himself and the party which kept him in power some trouble. It seems curious that he who was so anxious to promote the separate school system then should now be anxious in quite another direction. (Hear, hear.) This can only be done for the purpose of party strife, to put as many of us Upper Canadians as he can in a false position; but I can only tell him that I, having struggled as much as any one to prevent legislation tending to break up our common school system, and having found my efforts utterly ineffectual, do not see that our position would be any worse if the resolutions are carried into law. (Hear.) I formerly stated that I thought the separate school system would not prove very disastrous if it went no further. I do not now think they

will do much harm, if they remain in the same position as at present, and therefore, though I am against the separate school system, I am willing to accept this Confederation, even though it perpetuates a small number of separate schools. (Hear, hear.) Under the present legislative union we are powerless in any movement for the abrogation of the separate system; it is even very doubtful if we could resist the demands for its extension. (Hear, hear.) We will not be in any worse position under the new system, and in one respect we will have a decided advantage, in that no further change can be made by the separate school advocates. We will thus substitute certainty for uncertainty. I deeply regret that the honorable member should have thought it necessary for any purpose to move this resolution.

Hon. J. S. MACDONALD's amendment was then negatived on the following division:—

YEAS—Messieurs Biggar, Burwell, Macdonald (Cornwall), Macdonald (Toronto West), Ross (Prince Edward), Rymal, Scatcherd, and Wallbridge (North Hastings).—8.

NAYS—Messieurs Abbott, Alleyn, Archambeault, Ault, Beaubien, Bellerose, Blanchet, Bourassa, Bowman, Bown, Brousseau, Brown, Cameron (North Ontario), Carling, Caron, Attorney General Cartier, Cartwright, Cauchon, Chapais, Cockburn, Cornellier, Coupal, Cowan, Currier, De Boucherville, Denis, De Niverville, Dickson, Dorion (Drummond and Arthabaska), Dorion (Hochelaga), Duckett, Dufresne (Iberville), Dufresne (Montcalm), Dunsford, Evanturel, Ferguson (Frontenac), Fortier, Galt, Gaucher, Gaudet, Geoffrion, Gibbs, Harwood, Haultain, Higginson, Holton, Houde, Howland, Jones (South Leeds), Knight, Labreche-Viger, Laframboise, Lajoie, Langevin, Le Boutillier, Atty. Gen. Macdonald, Mackenzie (Lambton), Mackenzie (North Oxford), Magill, McConkey, McDougall, McGee, McGivern, McIntyre, McKellar, Morris, Morrison, Pâquet, Parker, Perrault, Pinsonneault, Poulin, Poupore, Powell, Raymond, Rémillard, Robitaille, Rose, Ross (Champlain), Ross (Dundas), Scoble, Shanly, Smith (East Durham), Smith (Toronto East), Somerville, Stirton, Sylvain, Thompson, Tremblay, Walsh, Webb, Wells, White, Willson, and Wood.—95.

Mr. BOURASSA then moved in amendment:—

That the following words be added to the original motion:—"And that it be an instruction to the said Committee to provide that the Roman Catholic minority of Upper Canada be placed on the same footing as the Protestant minority of Lower Canada, under the local governments of the Confederation of the Provinces of British North America."

This was negatived on the following division :—

YEAS.—Messieurs Bourassa, Caron, Coupal, Dorion (Drummond and Arthabaska), Dorion (Hochelaga), Dufresne (Iberville), Fortier, Geof. frion, Holton, Houde, Labreche-Viger, Laframboise, Lajoie, Macdonald (Cornwall), O'Halloran, Pâquet, Perrault, Pinsonneault, Rymal, and Sylvain.—20.

NAYS.—Messieurs Abbott, Alleyn, Archambeault, Ault, Beaubien, Bellerose, Biggar, Blanchet, Bowman, Bown, Brousseau, Brown, Burwell, Cameron (North Ontario), Carling, Atty. Gen. Cartier, Cartwright, Cauchon, Chapais, Cockburn, Cornellier, Cowan, Currier, De Boucherville, Denia, De Niverville, Dickson, Duckett, Dufresne (Montcalm), Dunsford, Evanturel, Ferguson (Frontenac), Ferguson (South Simcoe), Galt, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gibbs, Harwood, Haultain, Higginson, Howland, Jones (South Leeds), Knight, Langevin, Le Boutillier, Atty. Gen. Macdonald, Macdonald (Toronto West), Mackenzie (Lambton), Mackenzie (North Oxford), Magill, McConkey, McDougall, McGee, McGiverin, McIntyre, McKellar, Morris, Morrison, Parker, Poulin, Poupore, Powell, Raymond, Rémillard, Robitaille, Rose, Ross (Champlain), Ross (Dundas), Ross (Prince Edward), Scatcherd, Scoble, Shanly, Smith (East Durham), Smith (Toronto East), Somerville, Stirton, Thompson, Tremblay, Wallbridge (North Hastings), Walsh, Wells, White, Willson, Wood, and Wright (East York).—85.

The main motion was then agreed to on a division, and a select committee appointed accordingly.

Hon. Atty. General MACDONALD, from the said committee, reported the draft of an Address, which is as follows :—

TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN,

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty for the purpose of praying that Your Majesty may be graciously pleased to cause a measure to be submitted to the Imperial Parliament for the purpose of uniting the Colonies of Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, and Prince Edward Island in one Government, with provisions based on the accompanying resolutions, which were adopted at a Conference of Delegates from the said Colonies, held at the city of Quebec, on the tenth of October, 1864. All which we, the Commons of Canada, humbly pray Your Majesty to take into Your gracious and favorable consideration.

1. The best interests and present and future prosperity of British North America will be promoted by a Federal Union under the Crown of Great Britain, provided such union can be effected on principles just to the several Provinces.

2. In the Federation of the British North American Provinces, the system of Government best adapted under existing circumstances to protect the diversified interests of the several Provinces, and secure efficiency, harmony and permanency in the working of the Union, would be a General Government charged with matters of common interest to the whole country, and Local Governments for each of the Canadas, and for the Provinces of Nova Scotia; New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, charged with the control of local matters in their respective sections,—provision being made for the admission into the Union, on equitable terms, of Newfoundland, the North-West Territory, British Columbia and Vancouver.

3. In framing a Constitution for the General Government, the Conference, with a view to the perpetuation of our connection with the Mother Country, and the promotion of the best interests of the people of these Provinces, desire to follow the model of the British Constitution, so far as our circumstances will permit.

4. The Executive Authority or Government shall be vested in the Sovereign of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and be administered according to the well-understood principles of the British Constitution, by the Sovereign personally, or by the Representative of the Sovereign duly authorized.

5. The Sovereign or Representative of the Sovereign shall be Commander-in-Chief of the Land and Naval Militia Forces.

6. There shall be a General Legislature or Parliament for the Federated Provinces, composed of a Legislative Council and a House of Commons.

7. For the purpose of forming the Legislative Council, the Federated Provinces shall be considered as consisting of three divisions: 1st, Upper Canada; 2nd, Lower Canada; 3rd, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island; each division with an equal representation in the Legislative Council.

8. Upper Canada shall be represented in the Legislative Council by 24 members, Lower Canada by 24 members, and the three Maritime Provinces by 24 members, of which Nova Scotia shall have 10, New Brunswick 10, and Prince Edward Island 4 members.

9. The Colony of Newfoundland shall be entitled to enter the proposed Union with a representation in the Legislative Council of four members.

10. The North-West Territory, British Columbia and Vancouver shall be admitted into the Union on such terms and conditions as the Parliament of the Federated Provinces shall deem equitable, and as shall receive the assent of Her Majesty; and in the case of the Province of British Columbia or Vancouver, as shall be agreed to by the Legislature of such Province.

11. The Members of the Legislative Council shall be appointed by the Crown under the Great Seal of the General Government, and shall hold office during life; if any Legislative Councillor

shall, for two consecutive sessions of Parliament, fail to give his attendance in the said Council, his seat shall thereby become vacant.

12. The Members of the Legislative Council shall be British subjects by birth or naturalization, of the full age of thirty years, shall possess a continuous real property qualification of four thousand dollars over and above all incumbrances, and shall be and continue worth that sum over and above their debts and liabilities; but in the case of Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island, the property may be either real or personal.

13. If any question shall arise as to the qualification of a Legislative Councillor, the same shall be determined by the Council.

14. The first selection of the Members of the Legislative Council shall be made, except as regards Prince Edward Island, from the Legislative Councils of the various Provinces so far as a sufficient number be found qualified and willing to serve; such Members shall be appointed by the Crown at the recommendation of the General Executive Government, upon the nomination of the respective Local Governments, and in such nomination due regard shall be had to the claims of the Members of the Legislative Council of the opposition in each Province, so that all political parties may, as nearly as possible, be fairly represented.

15. The Speaker of the Legislative Council (unless otherwise provided by Parliament) shall be appointed by the Crown from among the Members of the Legislative Council, and shall hold office during pleasure, and shall only be entitled to a casting vote on an equality of votes.

16. Each of the twenty-four Legislative Councillors representing Lower Canada in the Legislative Council of the General Legislature shall be appointed to represent one of the twenty-four Electoral Divisions mentioned in Schedule A of Chapter first of the Consolidated Statutes of Canada, and such Councillor shall reside or possess his qualification in the Division he is appointed to represent.

17. The basis of Representation in the House of Commons shall be Population, as determined by the Official Census every ten years; and the number of Members at first shall be 194, distributed as follows:

Upper Canada	82
Lower Canada	65
Nova Scotia	19
New Brunswick	15
Newfoundland	8
Prince Edward Island	5

18. Until the Official Census of 1871 has been made up, there shall be no change in the number of Representatives from the several sections.

19. Immediately after the completion of the Census of 1871, and immediately after every decennial census thereafter, the Representation from each section in the House of Commons shall be readjusted on the basis of Population.

20. For the purpose of such readjustments,

Lower Canada shall always be assigned sixty-five Members, and each of the other sections shall, at each readjustment, receive, for the ten years then next succeeding, the number of Members to which it will be entitled on the same ratio of Representation to Population as Lower Canada will enjoy according to the Census last taken, by having sixty-five Members.

21. No reduction shall be made in the number of Members returned by any section, unless its population shall have decreased, relatively to the population of the whole Union, to the extent of five per centum.

22. In computing at each decennial period the number of Members to which each section is entitled, no fractional parts shall be considered, unless when exceeding one-half the number entitling to a Member, in which case a Member shall be given for each such fractional part.

23. The Legislature of each Province shall divide such Province into the proper number of constituencies, and define the boundaries of each of them.

24. The Local Legislature of each Province may, from time to time, alter the Electoral Districts for the purposes of Representation in such Local Legislature, and distribute the Representatives to which the Province is entitled in such Local Legislature, in any manner such Legislature may see fit.

25. The number of Members may at any time be increased by the General Parliament,—regard being had to the proportionate rights then existing.

26. Until provisions are made by the General Parliament, all the laws which, at the date of the Proclamation constituting the Union, are in force in the Provinces respectively, relating to the qualification and disqualification of any person to be elected, or to sit or vote as a Member of the Assembly in the said Provinces respectively, and relating to the qualification or disqualification of voters, and to the oaths to be taken by voters, and to Returning Officers and their powers and duties,—and relating to the proceedings at Elections, and to the period during which such elections may be continued,—and relating to the Trial of Controverted Elections, and the proceedings incident thereto,—and relating to the vacating of seats of Members, and to the issuing and execution of new Writs, in case of any seat being vacated otherwise than by a dissolution—shall respectively apply to elections of Members to serve in the House of Commons, for places situate in those Provinces respectively.

27. Every House of Commons shall continue for five years from the day of the return of the writs choosing the same, and no longer; subject, nevertheless, to be sooner prorogued or dissolved by the Governor.

28. There shall be a Session of the General Parliament once, at least, in every year, so that a period of twelve calendar months shall not intervene between the last sitting of the General Parliament in one Session, and the first sitting thereof in the next Session.

29. The General Parliament shall have power to make Laws for the peace, welfare and good government of the Federated Provinces (saving the Sovereignty of England), and especially laws respecting the following subjects:—

1. The Public Debt and Property.
2. The regulation of Trade and Commerce.
3. The imposition or regulation of Duties of Customs on Imports and Exports,—except on Exports of Timber, Logs, Masts, Spars, Deals and Sawn Lumber from New Brunswick, and of Coal and other Minerals from Nova Scotia.
4. The imposition or regulation of Excise Duties.
5. The raising of money by all or any other modes or systems of Taxation.
6. The borrowing of money on the Public Credit.
7. Postal Service.
8. Lines of Steam or other Ships, Railways, Canals and other works, connecting any two or more of the Provinces together, or extending beyond the limits of any Province.
9. Lines of Steamships between the Federated Provinces and other Countries.
10. Telegraph Communication and the Incorporation of Telegraph Companies.
11. All such works as shall, although lying wholly within any Province, be specially declared by the Acts authorizing them to be for the general advantage.
12. The Census.
13. Militia—Military and Naval Service and Defence.
14. Beacons, Buoys and Light Houses.
15. Navigation and Shipping.
16. Quarantine.
17. Sea Coast and Inland Fisheries.
18. Ferries between any Provinces and a Foreign country, or between any two Provinces.
19. Currency and Coinage.
20. Banking—Incorporation of Banks, and the issue of Paper Money.
21. Savings Banks.
22. Weights and Measures.
23. Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes.
24. Interest.
25. Legal Tender.
26. Bankruptcy and Insolvency.
27. Patents of Invention and Discovery.
28. Copy Rights.
29. Indians and Lands reserved for the Indians.
30. Naturalization and Aliens.
31. Marriage and Divorce.
32. The Criminal Law, excepting the Constitution of Courts of Criminal Jurisdiction, but including the procedure in Criminal matters.
33. Rendering uniform all or any of the laws relative to property and civil rights in Upper Canada, Nova Scotia, New

Brunswick, Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island, and rendering uniform the procedure of all or any of the Courts in these Provinces; but any statute for this purpose shall have no force or authority in any Province until sanctioned by the Legislature thereof.

34. The establishment of a General Court of Appeal for the Federated Provinces.
35. Immigration.
36. Agriculture.
37. And generally respecting all matters of a general character, not specially and exclusively reserved for the Local Governments and Legislatures.
30. The General Government and Parliament shall have all powers necessary or proper for performing the obligations of the Federated Provinces, as part of the British Empire, to foreign countries, arising under Treaties between Great Britain and such countries.
31. The General Parliament may also, from time to time, establish additional Courts, and the General Government may appoint Judges and officers thereof, when the same shall appear necessary or for the public advantage, in order to the due execution of the laws of Parliament.
32. All Courts, Judges, and officers of the several Provinces shall aid, assist and obey the General Government in the exercise of its rights and powers, and for such purposes shall be held to be Courts, Judges and officers of the General Government.
33. The General Government shall appoint and pay the Judges of the Superior Courts in each Province, and of the County Courts in Upper Canada, and Parliament shall fix their salaries.
34. Until the consolidation of the Laws of Upper Canada, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island, the Judges of these Provinces, appointed by the General Government, shall be selected from their respective Bars.
35. The Judges of the Courts of Lower Canada shall be selected from the Bar of Lower Canada.
36. The Judges of the Court of Admiralty now receiving salaries, shall be paid by the General Government.
37. The Judges of the Superior Courts shall hold their offices during good behaviour, and shall be removable only on the Address of both Houses of Parliament.
38. For each of the Provinces there shall be an Executive Officer, styled the Lieutenant-Governor, who shall be appointed by the Governor General in Council, under the Great Seal of the Federated Provinces, during pleasure: such pleasure not to be exercised before the expiration of the first five years, except for cause: such cause to be communicated in writing to the Lieutenant-Governor immediately after the exercise of the pleasure as aforesaid, and also by Message to both Houses of Parliament, within the first week of the first session afterwards.

39. The Lieutenant-Governor of each Province shall be paid by the General Government.

40. In undertaking to pay the salaries of the Lieutenant-Governors, the Conference does not desire to prejudice the claim of Prince Edward Island upon the Imperial Government for the amount now paid for the salary of the Lieutenant-Governor thereof.

41. The Local Government and Legislature of each Province shall be constructed in such manner as the existing Legislature of each such Province shall provide.

42. The Local Legislature shall have power to alter or amend their Constitution from time to time.

43. The Local Legislatures shall have power to make laws respecting the following subjects:

1. Direct taxation, and in New Brunswick the imposition of duties on the export of Timber, Logs, Masts, Spars, Deals and Sawn Lumber; and in Nova Scotia, of Coals and other Minerals.
2. Borrowing money on the credit of the Province.
3. The establishment and tenure of local offices, and the appointment and payment of local officers.
4. Agriculture.
5. Immigration.
6. Education; saving the rights and privileges which the Protestant or Catholic minority in both Canadas may possess as to their denominational schools, at the time when the union goes into operation.
7. The sale and management of Public Lands, excepting lands belonging to the General Government.
8. Sea Coast and Inland Fisheries.
9. The establishment, maintenance and management of Penitentiaries, and Public and Reformatory Prisons.
10. The establishment, maintenance and management of Hospitals, Asylums, Charities and Eleemosynary Institutions.
11. Municipal Institutions.
12. Shop, Saloon, Tavern, Auctioneer and other Licenses.
13. Local Works.
14. The incorporation of Private or Local Companies, except such as relate to matters assigned to the General Parliament.
15. Property and Civil Rights, excepting those portions thereof assigned to the General Parliament.
16. Inflicting punishment by fine, penalties, imprisonment or otherwise, for the breach of laws passed in relation to any subject within their jurisdiction.
17. The Administration of Justice, including the constitution, maintenance and organization of the Courts, both of Civil and Criminal jurisdiction, and

including also the procedure in civil matters.

18. And generally all matters of a private or local nature, not assigned to the General Parliament.

44. The power of respiting, reprieving, and pardoning prisoners convicted of crimes, and of commuting and remitting of sentences in whole or in part, which belongs of right to the Crown, shall be administered by the Lieutenant-Governor of each Province in Council, subject to any instructions he may, from time to time, receive from the General Government, and subject to any provisions that may be made in this behalf by the General Parliament.

45. In regard to all subjects over which jurisdiction belongs to both the General and Local Legislatures, the laws of the General Parliament shall control and supersede those made by the Local Legislature, and the latter shall be void so far as they are repugnant to, or inconsistent with, the former.

46. Both the English and French languages may be employed in the General Parliament and in its proceedings, and in the Local Legislature of Lower Canada, and also in the Federal Courts and in the Courts of Lower Canada.

47. No lands or property belonging to the General or Local Governments shall be liable to taxation.

48. All Bills for appropriating any part of the Public Revenue, or for imposing any new Tax or Impost, shall originate in the House of Commons or House of Assembly, as the case may be.

49. The House of Commons or House of Assembly shall not originate or pass any Vote, Resolution, Address or Bill for the appropriation of any part of the Public Revenue, or of any Tax or Impost to any purpose, not first recommended by Message of the Governor General or the Lieutenant-Governor, as the case may be, during the Session in which such Vote, Resolution, Address or Bill is passed.

50. Any Bill of the General Parliament may be reserved in the usual manner for Her Majesty's assent, and any Bill of the Local Legislatures may, in like manner, be reserved for the consideration of the Governor General.

51. Any Bill passed by the General Parliament shall be subject to disallowance by Her Majesty within two years, as in the case of Bills passed by the Legislatures of the said Provinces hitherto; and, in like manner, any Bill passed by a Local Legislature shall be subject to disallowance by the Governor General within one year after the passing thereof.

52. The Seat of Government of the Federated Provinces shall be Ottawa, subject to the Royal Prerogative.

53. Subject to any future action of the respective Local Governments, the Seat of the Local Government in Upper Canada shall be Toronto; of Lower Canada, Quebec; and the Seats of the Local Governments in the other Provinces shall be as at present.

54. All Stocks, Cash, Bankers' Balances and Securities for money belonging to each Province at the time of the Union, except as hereinafter mentioned, shall belong to the General Government.

55. The following Public Works and Property of each Province shall belong to the General Government, to wit:—

1. Canals.
2. Public Harbours.
3. Light Houses and Piers.
4. Steamboats, Dredges and Public Vessels.
5. River and Lake Improvements.
6. Railway and Railway Stocks, Mortgages and other debts due by Railway Companies.
7. Military Roads.
8. Custom Houses, Post Offices and other Public Buildings, except such as may be set aside by the General Government for the use of the Local Legislatures and Governments.
9. Property transferred by the Imperial Government and known as Ordnance Property.
10. Armories, Drill Sheds, Military Clothing and Munitions of War; and
11. Lands set apart for public purposes.

56. All Lands, Mines, Minerals and Royalties vested in Her Majesty in the Provinces of Upper Canada, Lower Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, for the use of such Provinces, shall belong to the Local Government of the territory in which the same are so situate; subject to any trusts that may exist in respect to any of such lands or to any interest of other persons in respect of the same.

57. All sums due from purchasers or lessees of such lands, mines or minerals at the time of the Union, shall also belong to the Local Governments.

58. All Assets connected with such portions of the Public Debt of any Province as are assumed by the Local Governments, shall also belong to those Governments respectively.

59. The several Provinces shall retain all other Public Property therein, subject to the right of the General Government to assume any Lands or Public Property required for Fortifications or the Defence of the Country.

60. The General Government shall assume all the Debts and Liabilities of each Province.

61. The Debt of Canada, not specially assumed by Upper and Lower Canada respectively, shall not exceed, at the time of the Union, \$62,500,000; Nova Scotia shall enter the Union with a debt not exceeding \$8,000,000; and New Brunswick with a debt not exceeding \$7,000,000.

62. In case Nova Scotia or New Brunswick do not incur liabilities beyond those for which their Governments are now bound, and which shall make their debts, at the date of Union, less than \$8,000,000 and \$7,000,000 respectively, they shall be entitled to interest at five per cent. on the amount not so incurred, in like manner as is hereinafter provided for Newfoundland and Prince

Edward Island; the foregoing resolution being in no respect intended to limit the powers given to the respective Governments of those Provinces by Legislative authority, but only to limit the maximum amount of charge to be assumed by the General Government; provided always, that the powers so conferred by the respective Legislatures shall be exercised within five years from this date, or the same shall then elapse.

63. Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island, not having incurred debts equal to those of the other Provinces, shall be entitled to receive, by half-yearly payments, in advance, from the General Government, the interest at five per cent. on the difference between the actual amount of their respective debts at the time of the union, and the average amount of indebtedness per head of the population of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

64. In consideration of the transfer to the General Parliament of the powers of taxation, an annual grant in aid of each Province shall be made, equal to eighty cents per head of the population, as established by the Census of 1861; the population of Newfoundland being estimated at 130,000. Such aid shall be in full settlement of all future demands upon the General Government for local purposes, and shall be paid half-yearly in advance to each Province.

65. The position of New Brunswick being such as to entail large immediate charges upon her local revenues, it is agreed that for the period of ten years from the time when the Union takes effect, an additional allowance of \$63,000 per annum shall be made to that Province. But that so long as the liability of that Province remains under \$7,000,000, a deduction equal to the interest on such deficiency shall be made from the \$63,000.

66. In consideration of the surrender to the General Government, by Newfoundland, of all its rights in Mines and Minerals, and of all the ungranted and unoccupied Lands of the Crown, it is agreed that the sum of \$150,000 shall each year be paid to that Province by semi-annual payments; provided that that Colony shall retain the right of opening, constructing and controlling roads and bridges through any of the said lands, subject to any laws which the General Parliament may pass in respect of the same.

67. All engagements that may, before the Union, be entered into with the Imperial Government for the defence of the country, shall be assumed by the General Government.

68. The General Government shall secure, without delay, the completion of the Intercolonial Railway from Rivière du Loup, through New Brunswick, to Truro in Nova Scotia.

69. The communications with the North-Western Territory, and the improvements required for the development of the trade of the Great West with the seaboard, are regarded by this Conference as subjects of the highest importance to the Federated Provinces, and shall be prosecuted at the earliest possible period that the state of the finances will permit.

70. The sanction of the Imperial and Local Parliaments shall be sought for the Union of the Provinces, on the principles adopted by the Conference.

71. That Her Majesty the Queen be solicited to determine the rank and name of the Federated Provinces.

72. The proceedings of the Conference shall be authenticated by the signatures of the Delegates, and submitted by each Delegation to its own Government, and the Chairman is authorized to submit a copy to the Governor General for transmission to the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

The said Address, being read a second time, was agreed to on a division.

Hon. Atty. General MACDONALD moved, that the said Address be engrossed; which was agreed to on a division.

On motion of Hon. Atty. General MACDONALD, an humble Address was voted to His Excellency, praying that he will be pleased to transmit the foregoing Address to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies, to be laid at the foot of the Throne.

On motion of Hon. Atty. General MACDONALD, the foregoing Address was ordered to be engrossed.

Ordered, That the said Address be presented to His Excellency by the whole House.

Ordered, That such Members of the Executive Council as are Members of this House, do wait upon His Excellency to know what time he will please to appoint to be attended with the said Address.

Hon. Atty. General MACDONALD then informed the House, that His Excellency will be pleased to receive the House with its Address, to-morrow, at 3.30 P.M.

The House then adjourned.

—o—


TUESDAY, March 14, 1865.

At the hour appointed, Mr. SPEAKER and the House attended upon His Excellency with the Address to Her Majesty on the subject of the Union of the British North American Provinces.

And being returned, Mr. SPEAKER reported that the House had waited on His Excellency with the Address to Her Majesty on the subject of the Union of the British North American Provinces, to which His Excellency had been pleased to make the following answer:—

MR. SPEAKER AND GENTLEMEN :

I learn with much satisfaction that you have adopted an Address to Her Majesty, praying that She will be pleased to cause a measure to be submitted to the Imperial Parliament for the Union of the British North American Provinces. I shall have much pleasure in transmitting it to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in order that it may be presented to the Queen.



THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE
STAMPED BELOW

AN INITIAL FINE OF 25 CENTS
WILL BE ASSESSED FOR FAILURE TO RETURN
THIS BOOK ON THE DATE DUE. THE PENALTY
WILL INCREASE TO 50 CENTS ON THE FOURTH
DAY AND TO \$1.00 ON THE SEVENTH DAY
OVERDUE.

APR 12 1939	IN STACKS
FEB 6 1948	MAR 28 1959
7 May 20 1959	REC'D LD
4 Dec 31 HL 22 Dec 31 LI	APR 9 1959
12 May 1959	31 Jan 64 MM
REC'D LD	REC'D LD
FEB 3 1958	FEB 4 '64 -2 PM
IN STACKS	SANTA BARBARA INTERMEDIARY LOAN
NOV 8 1958	JUL 12 1977
REC'D LD	JAN 24 1986
JAN 20 1959	REC'D LD NOV 22 1985
11 Apr 59 INF	DEC 15 2001
	LD 21-95m-7.37

PUBLISHED
LAW BOOKS
PRINTED
Book
GARSWELL CO

GENERAL LIBRARY - U.C. BERKELEY



8000950248

12-18

417519

F1032

A3

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY